players, although we have had no serious injuries in our organization.

Throughout the year we have a group of managers who maintain and distribute the equipment. Each year necessary renovation is taken care of by the organization.

OUR FINANCIAL MEANS

The McKeesport Little Tigers is a charitable organization. All of our expenses are met by donations of interested individuals and organizations, by the selling of raffle tickets, and by the efforts of a hard-working mothers club.

With the help of our benefactors we have been able each year to take the boys on a trip at the end of each season for the past thirteen years. We consider these trips to be of great educational value to these boys.

Each year the mothers club accepts some project as theirs for the year. They have provided much of the equipment and uniforms for the boys.

OUR TRIPS SINCE 1956

1956—National Milk Bowl, San Antonio, Texas.

*1957—National Milk Bowl, San Antonio, Texas.

1958—Sunshine Bowl, Daytona Beach, Florida.

1959—Conch Bowl, Key West, Florida.

1960—National Milk Bowl, Pharr, Texas.

1961—National Milk Bowl, Pharr, Texas.

*1962—National Milk Bowl, Pharr, Texas.

1963—Blue Grass Bowl, Lexington, Kentucky.

*1964—Circus Bowl, Sarasota, Florida.

1965—National Milk Bowl, McAllen, Texas.

1966—Optimist Bowl, Hialeah, Florida.

1967—National Milk Bowl, Durham, North Carolina.

1968—Junior Oil Bowl, Port Arthur, Texas.

1968—Junior Bowl, Monterrey, Mexico.

*These games were lost by Little Tigers.

OUR 1966 RECORD—WE WON THEM ALL!

Opponent:	Score
Wellsburgh, W. Va	52–0
Columbus, Ohio	34–0
*North Braddock, Pa	44–12
*Freeport, Pa	47–6
*Wilmerding, Pa	40–0
*Fort Cherry, Pa	47–0
*Wilkinsburg, Pa	46–6
*Lower Burrell, Pa	33–0
*Aliquippa, Pa	27–0
*Penn Hills, Pa	19–13
*Vandergrift, Pa	14–0
Mon-Yough, Pa	33–7
Durham, N.C., Elks	34–6
West Seneca, N.Y	49–13
Monroeville, Pa	55–6
Hialeah, Fla	28–14

* Games are League games, the rest are exhibition.

OUR 1967 RECORD—THE WINS CONTINUE!

Opponent:	Score
Penn Hills	41–0
West Seneca, N.Y	32–0
*Wilmerding	47–0
Wellsburg, W. Va	36–0
*Monroeville	41–0
*Penn Hills	47–0
*Wilkinsburg	52–0
*Fort Cherry	40–0
*Banksville	34–0
*Aliquippa	35–7
*North Braddock	33–6
*Jeannette	40–0
Hazelton, Pa	33–0
Tonawanda, N.Y	18–7
Durham, N.C., Elks	35–0

* Games are League games, the rest are exhibition.

OUR 1968 RECORD—WE WON ALL BUT ONE—TIED THAT ONE!

Opponent:	Score
Fort Cherry	34–0
Freeport	33–7
Mon-Yough	25–0
*Monroeville	20–7
*Jeannette	39–0
*Penn Hills	33–0
*Wilkinsburg	45–0
*Lincoln-Larimer	38–6
*Wilmerding	41–0
*North Braddock	32–0
*Fort Cherry	25–0
Randallstown, Md	13–13
Lockport, N.Y	32–7
Vandergrift	33–6
Port Arthur, Tex	26–0
**Monterrey, Mexico	25–0

*Games are League games, the rest are exhibition.

** Just our Little boys played this one.

OUR MILK BOWL GAME

We also are able to provide some limited activities for girls in the same age category as the boys on the team. We have an active group of cheerleaders to help provide enthusiasm at our games. Each year on Veteran's Day we play our local Milk Bowl Game. For several weeks prior to the game girls from 10 to 14 are invited to compete for the title of Milk Bowl Queen. The girl who sells the most tickets to the game is our queen and the next two highest salesmen are attendants. The queen is crowned at the game by the mayor of McKeesport. She is invited to go on the trip with the team at the end of the year, expenses paid.

Our opponent for this game is always an out-of-state team. We are given permission to use an enclosed pavilion at Renzie Park for the three or four days that our guests are in town. The local hospital provides cots and bedding. The organization provides the food, and we have the pleasure of having a retired chef do our cooking for this period of time and also for the week the boys are in camp. If all goes well, we may be able to entertain our Mexican friends for this occasion this year.

OUR GRADUATES

Very few boys trained to play with Little Tigers do not go on to play high school football. We have found that many of them eventually are awarded college football scholarships. We are very proud now to claim some of our alumnae as professional football players. One of our boys is also playing professional basketball.

In the pro ranks at present we list: Jim Bienne—Houston Oilers, former All American at Purdue, Frank Liberatore—Washington Redskins, at present farm team, Bill Miller—Oakland Raiders, Ross Fichtner—New Orleans Saints, Fred Lewis—Indiana Pacers basketball team.

Recent college graduates include: Bob Bazylak—University of Pittsburgh quarterback last year, Rick Litteri—will graduate Lafayette University this year and served as captain of this year's football team there.

There are eight high schools in the surrounding area that have boys on their varsity teams that received training with Little Tigers. Many of them play varsity first string before reaching their senior year.

OUR TRIP TO MONTERREY, MEXICO

This past Christmas season it was our pleasure to play in the Junior Oil Bowl in Port Arthur, Texas. From there the boys were admitted as guests of the Cotton Bowl officials for the New Year's day game in Dallas. We then went to Monterrey, Mexico. There the Little Tigers were welcomed as the first American Football Team in their category to visit. Our smaller boys played a 105 pound weight limit team from Monterrey and won the game 25–0.

We were accepted as "Little Ambassadors" from the United States. We are hoping to develop this friendship even further by having these Mexican boys visit us this fall. Perhaps we will return to Monterrey next year. Upon our return to Pennsylvania we received special resolutions from our Allegheny County Commissioners and from the City of McKeesport recognizing us for the good will created on our Mexican trip.

During our short stay in Monterrey each of the boys had the opportunity to spend a night in a Mexican home. The Governor of Nueva Leon requested an audience with us and welcomed us to his country and state. Our American Consulate in Monterrey said that our visit did more than millions of dollars could have done to promote friendship between Mexico and the United States.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES—*Monday, March 3, 1969*

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Edward G. Latch, D.D., offered the following prayer:

O come, let us worship and bow down; let us kneel before the Lord, our Maker. Psalm 95: 6.

O God, our Father, out of the confusion of the world we come with humble hearts to worship Thee. From the things that man has done we come into Thy presence to think of what Thou hast done for man. As we wait upon Thee, renew in us the spirit of wonder and joy and love.

From our worship send us out into this day to be better citizens of our beloved country. Put depth and devotion and dedication into our patriotism. May we not simply salute our Nation's flag and sing our country's songs, but may we shoulder some burden of useful and redeeming service for this land we love with all our hearts. Enlist each one of us in the ranks of those who serve their community and who lift the level of our public life. Thus may we make of our land a fairer place in which our children may live and grow.

In the spirit of Christ we pray. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The Journal of the proceedings of Thursday, February 27, 1969, 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 bill of the following title, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 1058. An act to extend the period within which the President may transmit to the Congress plans for reorganization of agencies of the executive branch of the Government.

The message also announced that the Vice President, pursuant to Public Resolution 32, 73d Congress, appointed Mr. CHURCH to the U.S. Territorial Expansion Memorial Commission in lieu of Mr. Morse, retired.

The message also announced that the Vice President, pursuant to Public Law 90-448, appointed Mr. TOWER and Mr. PERCY as members, on the part of the Senate, of the National Advisory Commission on Low-Income Housing.

BOARD OF VISITORS, U.S. COAST GUARD ACADEMY

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following communication from the chairman of the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries:

Hon. JOHN W. MCCORMACK,
The Speaker,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: Pursuant to section 194 of title 14 of the United States Code, I have appointed the following members of the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries to serve as members of the Board of Visitors to the U.S. Coast Guard Academy for the year 1969: Hon. FRANK M. CLARK, of Pennsylvania; Hon. ALTON LENNON, of North Carolina; and Hon. JAMES R. GROVER, JR., of New York.

As chairman of the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries, I am authorized to serve as an ex officio member of the Board.

Sincerely,

EDWARD A. GARMATZ,
Chairman.

THE LATE ROBERT L. MAY

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

Mr. HARSHA. Mr. Speaker, Robert L. May, 46, assistant minority counsel of the Committee on Public Works and minority counsel of the Special Subcommittee To Investigate the Federal-Aid Highway Program, U.S. House of Representatives, died of a heart attack yesterday at Holy Cross Hospital in Silver Spring, Md.

Mr. May served the Committee on Public Works with dedication and distinction for more than 7 years. Prior to joining the committee staff, he served as assistant general counsel of the U.S. Bureau of Public Roads from 1957 to 1961 and was assistant attorney general of the State of Oregon and assistant chief counsel and chief counsel of the Oregon State Highway Department between 1949 and 1957.

He was born in Newport News, Va., reared in North Carolina, and graduated from Duke University Law School in 1948. Mr. May was admitted to practice law before all of the courts of the State of Oregon, the U.S. District Court for the District of Oregon, and the U.S. Supreme Court. He was a member of the Oregon State Bar Association, the Federal Bar Association, Phi Alpha Delta Law Fraternity, the contracts committee of the department of legal studies of the highway research board of the National Academy of Sciences, the Capitol Hill Club, and a past charter member of chapter 3, Oregon, of the American Right-of-Way Association. He served in World War II and the Korean campaigns, rising to the rank of captain in the Air Force.

Survivors include his wife, Mary Alice "Mickey," and a son, Rodney Hardin May, of the home at 13527 Vandalia Drive, Rockville, Md., a daughter, Robin Lynn May, of Washington, D.C., and a brother, James R. May, of Chattanooga, Tenn.

Mr. Speaker, on behalf of myself and the minority members of the Committee on Public Works, I wish to extend to his lovely wife and family our deep sympathy in the passing of this fine man.

Friends may call at Joseph Gawler's Sons Funeral Home, 5130 Wisconsin Avenue at Harrison NW., Washington, D.C., on Monday, March 3, between 7 and 9 p.m. and on Tuesday, March 4, between 2 and 4 p.m. and between 7 and 9 p.m.

Funeral services will be held at Northminister Presbyterian Church, Alaska Avenue and Kalmia Road, immediately west of Georgia Avenue, one block south of the Maryland State line, Washington, D.C., on Wednesday, March 5, 1969, at 11 a.m. Interment, with military honors, will be at Culpeper National Cemetery, Culpeper, Va., Wednesday, March 5, at 2 p.m.

Flowers may be sent to Joseph Gawler's Sons, Inc., Wisconsin Avenue and Harrison Street NW., Washington, D.C., or contributions may be made to the American Heart Fund.

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

Mr. HARSHA. I am glad to yield to the distinguished gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. EDMONDSON. I am shocked and very saddened by the news of the loss of Bob May. I had the opportunity to get to know Bob well during his services with the Public Works Committee. He was a fine lawyer, a dedicated American, and one who will be missed because of his competence and because of his fine personality by members on both sides of the committee. I certainly join the gentleman in expressing our very deepest sympathy to his family.

Mr. HARSHA. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. ROBISON. Mr. Speaker, like those many others who had the privilege to know and to work with the late Bob May, assistant minority counsel on the House Committee on Public Works, I was shocked and saddened to hear of his untimely death.

Bob May was one of the most knowledgeable persons I have ever met in connection with the work of this committee—on which it used to be my privilege to serve—with his special field of competence relating to the Federal highway program. He was one of those truly dedicated and selfless public servants, of whom we can never have enough, who make this so often unmanageable committee system of ours work; one of those specialists who, though appointed through the majority or minority, are truly apolitical in that they willingly give of their time and talents to legislators on either side of the proverbial "aisle" to the end that good legislation may result.

In addition to which, Bob May was one of the most likable and friendly persons on Capitol Hill, and it does not seem possible that he should no longer be with us.

Mr. Speaker, I know I speak the sentiments of all those Members who, by virtue of their prior service on the Committee on Public Works, knew Bob May, in saying that he will be sorely missed, and I would like, through this medium, to extend my deepest sympathies to his surviving wife and children.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. HARSHA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks on the passing of Robert L. May.

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

There was no objection.

TRIBUTE TO LEW DESCHLER, PARLIAMENTARIAN

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

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, the House is the greatest legislative body in the world. Its ability to function is greatly dependent upon the type of officials we have associated with us in assisting and cooperating with us in the performance of our duties.

One of the most outstanding and beloved members of all time of the high level organization of the House of Representatives, a man who will always occupy the uppermost status in the important position that he has occupied in this body for so many years, is the gentleman about whom I wish to speak. To me he is a man of wisdom, and I know he is to my colleagues; and the new Members, as they come to know him and appreciate him, will feel the same way. He has served under eight Speakers of the House of Representatives in the very important position that he occupies. I understand that one who is seeking a Ph. D. degree must write an original thesis. I would suggest that some time when some scholar is writing such a thesis and is seeking to select a subject which has very rarely been written about, if ever, that he write a thesis about the Parliamentarian of the House of Representatives. In that thesis on the Parliamentarian, and the various ones that have served, they will arrive at the conclusion, I am sure—I know I would if I were writing such a thesis—that the ablest and the most dedicated and the greatest of the Parliamentarians of the House of Representatives is the one whose birthday occurs today—our dear friend, Lew Deschler.

I know I express the sentiments of all Members in wishing Mr. Deschler good health and happiness today and in the future.

TRIBUTE TO LEW DESCHLER, PARLIAMENTARIAN

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

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I was unavoidably detained, and for a moment or two tardy; therefore I did not have an opportunity to hear all the appropriately kind words of the Speaker in reference to our distinguished Parliamentarian, Lew Deschler.

I simply wish to reiterate and re-emphasize from our side of the aisle everything that has been said, not only today, but also in the past, concerning the integrity, the wisdom, and the knowledge of our Parliamentarian, Lew Deschler. I extend to him my best wishes for many years of health, happiness, and continued success.

Mr. HARSHA. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield.

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

Mr. HARSHA. Mr. Speaker, I thank the distinguished minority leader for yielding to me.

Mr. Speaker, I associate myself with the remarks of the distinguished Speaker and the distinguished minority leader particularly because I have the honor of serving the Sixth Congressional District of Ohio and Mr. Deschler is a former resident of that district. We in Ohio recognize the longtime dedication and the outstanding ability of Lew Deschler. We are extremely proud of him and think he is the finest Parliamentarian the House of Representatives has ever had. His distinguished service has brought recognition and a singular honor to the State of Ohio.

I join with my colleagues in congratulating him on his birthday and wish him many more and many years of happiness and good health.

Mr. FLYNT. Mr. Speaker, it is with great pleasure that I join with other Members of the House of Representatives in extending our greetings to Lew Deschler, the Parliamentarian of this body, on the occasion of his birthday.

Lew Deschler has served as Parliamentarian for many years, so many years that all but two or three Members of the House have never known any other Parliamentarian. He performs his duties and discharges his responsibility in a capable and dedicated manner and certainly deserves to rank as one of the great Parliamentarians of all time.

I wish for him a happy birthday and express the hope that he will serve us for many years to come.

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Speaker, I am sure all Members join enthusiastically in your message of congratulations to our able and distinguished Parliamentarian, Lewis Deschler.

The wise, judicious, and able service of this dedicated public servant has been a hallmark of this body for as long as I have served in it, and Mr. Deschler continues to grow in the esteem of all Members with each passing year.

No individual plays a more important role in maintaining high standards of parliamentary procedure and practice than does our Parliamentarian, Lew Deschler. No man could do a finer job in this exacting position.

Let us hope we are observing birthdays for Lewis Deschler for many years to come.

Mr. CHARLES H. WILSON. Mr. Speaker, for 41 years, Mr. Lewis Deschler has served with honor and distinction as Parliamentarian of this distinguished body. His career of dedicated service to this country is both remarkable and laudable. His is not always an easy task—that of insuring proper order and procedure within this diverse and sometimes volatile body of Representatives. A keenness of mind, an understanding of men, and a skillfully sharpened sense of fairness are among the qualities which Mr. Deschler has brought to his complicated and sensitive position, along with masterful understanding of the intricacies governing our proceedings. Combining his abilities as a learned counselor with a deep understanding of our Government's institutions, he has earned our friendship and respect. It is, therefore, with pleasure, Mr. Speaker, that I salute Mr. Deschler and wish him a very happy and healthy 64th birthday, and offer the wish that he shall have these greetings each spring for many years to come.

Mr. ROONEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, I would like to join with my many colleagues who have paid timely tribute to our outstanding Parliamentarian, Lewis Deschler. The occasion is Lew's birthday, but no mere birthday nor even 41 years of service to the House of Representatives, would by itself engender such an outpouring of affection. No, it is more than that; it is the man himself. For more than two decades, Mr. Speaker, I, like most of us here, have sought his advice and counsel on a host of subjects and always he has responded. But more importantly over the past two decades I have been fortunate enough to count Lew Deschler among my close friends. Happy birthday, Lew.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to extend their remarks on this occasion.

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

There was no objection.

SCHOOL SUPERINTENDENTS SURVEY—PART IV

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

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Speaker, this is the fourth in a series of reports on the survey conducted by the Committee on Education and Labor of school superintendents throughout the country. As I have mentioned in previous installments, the committee undertook this survey so that we might have the benefit of the experiences of as many of our local school administrators as possible during our consideration of legislation affecting elementary and secondary education.

The previous reports of the tabulations and analyses of the committee survey have appeared in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for January 30, page 2257, February 6, page 2991, and February 18, page 3762.

The comments of local school administrators have provided valuable insight into the actual operation of programs, as many of the superintendents have outlined both strengths and weaknesses in the design and administration of Federal aid programs for education. The major weaknesses and problems discussed by superintendents are those related to consistency and late funding.

The problem of late funding was first noted in 1966 by the Special Subcommittee on Education, in its study of the U.S. Office of Education. In a special report on late funding released early in the subcommittee study, the severity of the problem and its causes were discussed as follows:

> The detrimental effects of late funding on the various Federal programs (and especially on those under the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 and on the several student financial aid programs) have been brought home repeatedly to the subcommittee through its Washington hearings, its series of field investigations, its national survey of local and institutional program administrators, and its day-to-day contacts with the educational community at large. Indeed, of all the problem areas identified and discussed during the course of the subcommittee's study, late funding was perhaps brought up more frequently than any other matter, and the body of comments on it displayed the highest degree of uniformity.
>
> The roots of the problem of late funding are easily discerned. They line in the disparity that exists between the academic calendar and the Federal fiscal calendar.
>
> It was apparent to all concerned that late funding had exerted noticeable effects on the quality of the programs implemented in that first year of experience under ESEA.
>
> The problem of late funding must be solved if the educational assistance programs of the Office of Education are to accomplish the purposes set for them by Congress.
>
> A decision must be made, and made shortly, if the best interests of American education are to be served.

Largely as a result of the 1966 study by the subcommittee under the very able chairmanship of the gentlewoman from Oregon (Mrs. GREEN), an advanced funding provision designed to meet the problem of consistency and late funding was approved by the Congress as part of the 1967 amendments to the Elementary and Secondary Education Act. The advanced funding authority makes possible an appropriation of funds a year prior to that in which funds are to be obligated.

With passage of the Vocational Education Act Amendments of 1968, advanced funding was extended to all education programs administered by the U.S. Office of Education. Considerable progress has been made, therefore, in alleviating the problems at the local level brought about by late funding. Much of the machinery has been put in place for financing of education programs on a timely basis—in time to permit adequate planning at the local level. The advanced funding authority cannot be used for programs carried on under the Elementary and Secondary Education Act, however, unless there is enactment of legislation extending the ESEA within the next few months.

The Committee on Education and Labor has, as I have indicated in the previous reports on the survey, been hard at work in an attempt to secure early consideration of H.R. 514 proposing a 5-year extension of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act. On Thursday, February 27, in my remarks relating to timely funding of education programs on page 4734, I shared with my colleagues statements relative to the need for advanced funding from the testimony presented to the committee this year.

We must recognize that while some progress has been made, the problem is still very much with us. Just a few weeks ago, this was indicated by Dr. E. C. Stimbert, superintendent of schools, in Memphis, Tenn., when he said:

The funding of Federal programs is tied inescapably to the funding of local programs. Sound financial planning by school systems requires that sources and amounts of funds be known in advance. We appreciate the efforts to achieve advanced and timely appropriations, but we would be remiss if we did not point out that the problem is still with us.

A review of the comments of school administrators responding to the committee questionnaire underscores Dr. Stimbert's statement that indeed the problem is still with us. When asked about the status of funding of the ESEA, 70 percent of the local officials responding indicated that ESEA was underfunded. Of these, nearly one-third went on to discuss their continuing problems with consistency and late funding, as evidenced by the following tables:

PERCENT OF "QUALIFIED UNDERFUNDED" RESPONSES DISCUSSING PROBLEMS OF CONSISTENCE AND LATE FUNDING BY SCHOOL ENROLLMENT AND REGION

		School enrollment				
Region	Total	Under 1,000	1,000 to 4,999	5,000 to 34,999	35,000 to 99,999	100,000 plus
New England	26.6	38.8	25.4	25.0	0	----
Mideast	43.3	41.5	47.1	35.5	33.3	0
Great Lakes	37.7	35.5	37.5	44.9	100.0	0
Plains	35.5	32.6	38.3	48.0	33.3	0
Southeast	16.2	18.9	15.6	15.2	22.2	0
Southwest	29.4	26.9	34.0	31.5	0	----
Rocky Mountain	27.5	22.8	36.4	16.6	50.0	----
Far West	21.1	31.4	25.0	24.6	28.5	100.0
United States	31.9	31.3	34.9	29.5	27.6	14.3

Percent of "qualified underfunded" responses discussing problems of consistency and late funding by State and region

	Percent
New England:	
Connecticut	33.3
Maine	38.8
Massachusetts	25.9
New Hampshire	14.2
Rhode Island	0
Vermont	27.3
Mideast:	
Delaware	0
Maryland	57.1
New Jersey	26.3
New York	41.6
Pennsylvania	52.9
Great Lakes:	
Illinois	26.4
Indiana	30.7
Michigan	40.0
Ohio	44.3
Wisconsin	50.0
Plains:	
Iowa	34.9
Kansas	40.5
Minnesota	55.1
Missouri	25.3
Nebraska	25.0
North Dakota	38.1
South Dakota	47.1
Southeast:	
Alabama	12.0
Arkansas	22.2
Florida	9.0
Georgia	4.5
Kentucky	33.3
Louisiana	14.2
Mississippi	0
North Carolina	18.1
South Carolina	10.0
Tennessee	15.0
Virginia	13.0
West Virginia	12.5
Southwest:	
Arizona	36.4
New Mexico	31.2
Oklahoma	28.8
Texas	29.1

Percent of "qualified underfunded" responses discussing problems of consistency and late funding by State and region—Continued

	Percent
Rocky Mountain:	
Colorado	32.3
Idaho	16.6
Montana	18.5
Utah	3.3
Wyoming	43.7
Far West:	
Alaska	0
California	21.1
Nevada	100.0
Oregon	22.2
Washington	43.6
United States	31.9

The following comments from school administrators demonstrate in still another way the scope and severity of the uncertainities associated with late funding of education programs. The number in parentheses following the city and State represents the school enrollment figure for that school system:

Bennett, Iowa (510): "I have just today (October 23, 1968) received approval for the 1968–69 school year (fiscal 1969). Our school has been in session since August 26, 1968. I have had to watch the number of people I had employed for our E.S.E.A. project to see that none were employed that could not be dropped should our project be rejected. I also had to be certain that our local budget could pick up the salary of these people if no project was approved or if no money is appropriated. The psychological effect on the teachers for these two months is that they may be fighting for a 'lost cause' in planning and carrying out a program."

Veneta, Oregon (1,653): "The value of E.S.E.A., which is really the only program to reach the small district which does not have the personnel to cope with these programs, is greatly limited because (1) there is no way of knowing about the amount available; (2) the actual funds are announced long after the time when responsible planning can be done by the conscientious district seeking to really fulfill the intent of the act.

Camarillo, California: "No doubt there are many ways the Federal Government could assist local school districts in providing quality education. One of the most crucial areas is that of the allocation of funds late in the budget year. Our school district must provide a final budget by the first week in July which means that programs to be developed or expanded must be assured funds several months in advance of this date. In addition, funds should be allocated over a longer period of time so that programs can be planned for the continuing service to children."

Windom, Minnesota (2,024): "In our particular case, the Elementary and Secondary Education Act is underfunded, as it is approximately 50 per cent of what it was two years ago. We have a difficult time in planning year by year as we do not know how much aid we will receive until we are about half of the way through the year in which we need the necessary aid. This year for exour school program; but at this point, the our school program; but at this point, the Federal Government still has not specified definite amounts that will be allocated to the States."

Catron County, New Mexico (375): "Yes. I feel the Federal Government is doing its share providing funds. The only suggestion that I have is the funding should come earlier in the year. The way the funds are appropriated now each school must obligate salaries and monies before we are sure we are going to receive them. Our budget hearings are held around April and May and we do not receive Title I monies until September."

Winona, Minnesota (5,500): "Our major concern has been the uncertainty as to that amount of money available and when it will be available. We have what we consider the utterly ridiculous situation of having school start in September and not knowing until October or November what, if any, funds will be available."

Newton, Connecticut (3,246): "The greatest problem confronting the schools in regard to ESEA is the inability to make any long range plans based upon the present funding practice. We do not know from year to year the amount of money we will receive and therefore are unable to perform adequate planning to utilize the money."

Dale City, California (6,481): "In regard to Federal Impact Aid legislation, may I plead that your decisions and apportionments be made early in order to allow school districts to plan their programs."

Torrington, Connecticut (2,260): "The greatest problem at this level of operation concerning federal funding is the knowledge that continuity of funding will prevail. We should know at least 18 months in advance when changes are to occur in the financing of projects so that alternate plans can be made."

North Tonawanda, New York (9,050): "We are in serious trouble with our ESEA projects in this district. We were told at the beginning of the program that 'this is only the beginning' in a context which led us to believe that there would be substantially increased funds in the future. We therefore cranked up a number of worthwhile projects which we have had to curtail We are underfunded in this district by $100,000 in order to carry on our basic programs at a minimum level."

Corona, New Mexico (188): "It is not underfunding so much as the uncertainty of the amount of funds we will receive. If we could know our exact amounts in March or April for the following year then we could make better plans for the use of the funds."

Pittsburg, California (6,200): "Year to year appropriations are the biggest deterrent to the success of a program. Qualified people will not leave good jobs to work in an uncertain one-year program whose future is questionable."

Monroe, Iowa (768): "Our biggest problem is not knowing for sure how much we will receive until after our budget is prepared, contracts offered, etc. Then when our funds are cut, we have to make up the difference. This year we went down from $16,000+ to about $10,500. Yet when final approval was given, it was closer to $9,000. We did not find it wise to cut out any of the programs we had started, so we find ourselves with an extra $7,000 load on the budget. The inconsistencies have caused us to turn our back on Title III. We cannot afford not knowing where we stand."

Maynard, Iowa (700): "How are we expected to run a program when the appropriations are made after we have set our budgets and hired our staff. This year alone the cut was 15% and the cut was made after our budget was set and our staff hired. It is impossible to operate on this kind of planning."

Oglethorpe, Georgia (2,019): "In answer to your first question, I would like very much to see the Federal Government assume a larger share of the budget; but, more than that, I would like to see the Federal Government become a more dependable source of support. Many Federal program allotments have not been approved for this school term until 1/5 of the term has been completed. It is impossible to make the most efficient and effective use of funds where there is no assurance of continuity."

Sunnyvale, California (10,700): "One of the chief concerns about ESEA funding, as well as some other Federal financing, is the uncertainty of the programs and availability of adequte funding. If large sums of money are to be wisely invested in education they must be made available on a basis that assures continuity and makes it possible to plan effectively."

Rogers Public Schools, Texas (550): "The greatest needs concerning E.S.E.A. funds, and all other funds that come from Congress are:

"(a) Consistence and constancy. In the short few years we have had the E.S.E.A. funds, we have been faced with the necessity in mid-summer of having to cancel teacher contracts when federal funds were cut. In late July of 1968, for example, we received word that funds would be cut 15% and for schools to adjust their budgets accordingly. We had to discharge two teachers the latter part of July. That is most unfortunate.

"(b) School administrators need to know in March or April what funds they are going to receive for the following school year, because budgets are made in the spring and personnel is employed in the spring. If we wait until late summer to hire teachers, there are none left. Therefore, when we do not know about federal funds until late summer or fall, it is very difficult for us to plan successfully."

Burlington, Iowa (7,973): "The greatest change I would recommend in P.L. 81-874 and 81-815 is about the same complaint or change I would recommend in all federal programs. We do not know from one year to the next what programs are going to be funded. If we know this year these programs are going to be funded next year, we can plan better."

Franklin, Georgia (1,400): "Have been of substantial value. Can be of even greater value if funds could be used to meet the most pressing education needs of the system and if funds could be firmly committed at an earlier date which would make possible better and more orderly planning."

Gainesboro, Tennessee (1,700): "The recent enactments of Congress furnishing support for elementary and secondary education has been of great value, in this county, in providing more and improved opportunities to our children. The greatest hinderance has been the delay in funding the programs causing the Title I Program to seem a separate part from our regular program. Our regular school is in operation approximately two months before we are able to begin our Title I programs."

Downey, California (18,924): "Recent enactments of Congress have been of substantial help. There does, however, need to be consideration given to lead time for planning projects and dates for funding, etc."

Grinnell, Iowa (2657): "Federal money and amounts should be firmly committed before the beginning of the school fiscal year so that defensible budgets could be made and commitments to teaching contracts could be made with some assurance that they would be funded. The present after-the-fact funding of federal educational projects and the uncertainty thus engendered is frustrating, to say the least."

Norfolk City, Virginia (56,000): "One major factor which helps to reduce potential impact of recent enactments is the lack of a reasonable advanced funding feature. This school system is currently developing its 1969-70 E.S.E.A. Title I program which will begin next September. We begin recruiting teachers in February. The average lead time for purchasing materials and equipment has grown to several months, and in some instances approaches one year. Despite these facts, notification of the actual funds available to this school system under E.S.E.A. Title I will not be made before late spring 1969. An advanced funding feature which would let school systems know the amount of funds available well in advance would assist greatly for better planned and more efficiently executed programs."

Racine, Wisconsin (30,036): "The biggest problem for school administrators that are involved in any federal program is the uncertainty of the funding. We are held up on purchasing and employment of personnel. Our contracts for personnel run generally from July 1 to June 30. If it could be designed that federal programs relating to education could follow pretty much this same time it would be of great help."

Waterloo, New York (2,550): "There is no opportunity for long range planning since we never know how much money will be allocated to our district. For example, at this time we have only an estimate of the amount we will receive for the 1968-1969 school year."

Sylvester, Georgia (4,200): "Definite understanding concerning the funding of the law should be determined at least one year ahead."

Manning, Iowa (869): "With regard to PL-874 and 815. I am satisfied when the present distribution of funds other than the late date that they are determined; this is long past our date to determining the school budget and leaves us in the dark in budgeting our needs."

Tabor, Iowa (700): "The amount of the funds provided by the Federal Government is not really as significant as it total appropriation of that which is proposed. Schools must have definite knowledge of the dollar amount available when the application for these funds is made. This year, application was made in August and to date, we do not know whether or not the programs indicated by the application will be completely funded."

Duarte, California (5,012): "Recent enactments of Congress have provided declinlngly less value in supporting education since there continues to be less money. Also, we have not licked the bugaboo of obtaining money before programs need to be planned for and put into effect. It seems incredible that the representatives in Congress of the United States have not realized for so long that you simply must hire teachers in February and March, and April of a given year in order to have them start the year in September. This means that planning for the program has to precede the hiring of teachers which goes back into the previous fall. Getting money at the same time that school opens or two or three months before is a pretty useless gesture at best. Current support of public education from the federal level obviously in all areas it seems has been declining. There have been some fine ideas and thoughts, but these have been so snarled in red tape and delaying actions that I see them as of little value at this point."

New Port, Pennsylvania (1,311): "Recent enactments of Congress furnishing support for elementary and secondary education has been of a moderate value to our school district. We find that each year these allocations to our school district are cut making it necessary to eliminate some valuable projects that we were previously supporting with Federal funds. Due to the way that money is funded by Congress we never know from year to year what our allocations will be, thereby making it impossible to plan sound educational innovations and projects. As an administrator, I find it necessary to plan the programs, facilities for programs, materials for projects and funds for these projects many years in advance, otherwise they are just stop gap projects. I am greatly concerned about stop gap programs. To educate children and to provide a good sequential learning situation we need to know at least a year in advance what funds will be available."

Stamford, Connecticut (20,517): "In Title I, limitation of funds has resulted in a cutback in the program and elimination of new programs or expansion of services. If it were not for similar Connecticut state funds available for services to disadvantaged children, Title I funds would meet less than half our fiscal needs. The most difficult problems are caused by late congressional action causing lack of necessary lead planning time and great instability on the level of local funding for the fiscal year."

Marysville, California (8,825): "One of our greatest needs is to provide continual funding of the educational program so that it can be an ongoing smooth operation. As of this late date, we do not know what will be the funding of various NDEA projects for reading and science at both the elementary and secondary levels."

Northwood, Iowa (1,000): "I prefer that E.S.E.A. funds be handled as they presently are with this exception—that the appropriations be made well in advance of each school year so that adequate planning and arrangements could be soundly completed in the spring preceding each school year."

Bloomfield, Iowa (2,075): "When we first started getting the Title I funds we were to get some $86,000 plus, for this district. We did not receive these funds until sometime in January or February, and it was difficult to try and provide or design realistic programs to spend this much money in less than one year's time."

Union Grove, Wisconsin (710): "Because of increased use by more schools and because of static, or in some cases, reduced appropriations, E.S.E.A. funds available to our school has been substantially reduced. This obviously hampers current programs and makes extremely difficult the budgeting and planning processes. In this latter regard, I should like to recommend in the strongest possible terms that the Congress enact and fund programs in advance of the fiscal years in which they are to operate. Program effectiveness and efficiency is seriously handicapped by uncertainties at the present time when the enactment and appropriations are frequently not known until the program year is under way. To be most effective, these programs should be funded at least two years in advance. I strongly urge that you and your committee support this advanced funding."

Oceanside, California (7,466): "I basically feel the Federal government has made a commitment to provide funds for improving the quality of elementary and secondary education in the United States. The big problem has been a failure to fulfill the commitments that have been made and provide money at a time of the year when it can be used to intelligently set up a program. School district budgets in California operate from July 1st through June 30th. Many times we do not receive approval of Federal programs until after June 30th and thus we are not able to utilize properly the funds that are available."

Clarksburg, Tennessee (405): "The major complaint that I have concerning Federal Aid, is the funding of the money. We, as administrators, are held responsible for utilizing the funds wisely, which we should be. Yet, we never know, until after school has begun, whether we are approved for funds or how much we can depend on. How can we be expected to spend the money wisely, when we cannot even make definite plans or commitments until after schools have begun."

Tenafly, New Jersey (3,300): "Recent enactments in furnishing support for elementary and secondary education have been of great value and we trust that they will be continued and increased. However, I would like to point out—as we have so often—the need for taking action whether it is to increase or decrease federal aid long enough in advance for appropriate plans to be made in the school system. For example, it is very embarrassing for us to employ teachers under the Title I program and then be informed in September that there will be a reduction of a certain percentage of money. Then we have to contact the teachers and tell them that the program will have to be discontinued early, and so forth. I am not complaining about the reductions, I understand why these are necessary; it is the lateness of notification that really bother us."

North Bellmore, New York (4,100): "The local district should know at least six months prior to the beginning of the school year how much money will be given for a particular program. At present we must start programs without any knowledge of the total allotment. Intelligent planning is, herefore, next to impossible."

Burnside, Iowa (606): "One major improvement in the Federal Aid to school program would be to make the appropriations sooner than is now being done. We should know now what we are to receive for the 1969–1970 year and still dont' know what we are going to receive this 1968–1969 year."

Schenectady, New York (12,551): "Recent enactments have been of moderate value to date because of the relatively small amounts and because of authorizations and approvals being made so late in the school year. Larger appropriations together with longer term and earlier commitments could make the value substantially greater."

Lodi, California (10,944): "I'm sure you know that it is very difficult to develop programs when Congress is so late in appropriating funds. Usually we do not know until after school starts in the fall what our appropriations will be. This means that we cannot start our programs with the assurance that they will be adequately funded."

East Meadow, New York (16,500): "An important change that must be accomplished to make present federal aid legislation more workable is to bring the Congressional calendar in line with the school calendar with reference to authorizations, appropriations, and regulations. Full funding of all educational programs already authorized by Congress is required. Uncertainty about the continuation of programs and the amount of money to be granted makes it impossible to adequately and effectively plan grograms and employ required personnel."

Santa Clara, California (24,143): "The recent changes made in P.L. 874 have made the program extremely easy to administer but as a result of Congressional lateness in funding, we find it difficult to budget with any degree of security on a year-to-year basis."

Howard-Winneshiek, Iowa (2,200): "It is underfunded approximately 30% or the amount that it has been cut since the original act was passed. Projects are set up ahead of time and it creates difficult problems when teachers have to be relesaed and orders cancelled because of insufficient funds. Earlier funding and some type of inflationary growth factor should be included in future acts."

In summary, Mr. Speaker, I could continue to cite similar comments of responding superintendents. Many, many more than those I have quoted today expressed concern about late funding and the uncertainties which local school administrators face when working with Federal funds. I could continue to cite statements made before our committee this year which emphasizes that late funding is still very much with us and that it is perhaps the greatest complication in the administration at the local level of federally assisted education programs. Just last Thursday, Dr. Reed P. Wahlquist, principal of Kearns High School in Salt Lake City, Utah, said:

> I believe the ESEA has been perhaps the most dramatic thing that has happened to education in this century.

A comment which reminded me of the response of the superintendent of schools of Lawrence County, Ala., that it is "our considered opinion that ESEA has been of the greatest educational value of any single piece of legislation ever passed by the Congress of the United States."

Dr. Wahlquist indicated that he was most satisfied with the results from expenditures of ESEA funds in his district, and that he preferred the approach contained in ESEA, to the so-called block grant approach. The major problem which Dr. Wahlquist mentioned was the one which I have discussed with you here today, that of late funding. He said:

> One of the problems of many of the Federal programs in the past, Mr. Chairman, is that we have not known until the school year began how much money we were to receive. He then added that "A five-year program that would allow the schools to plan and make proper staffing arrangements would eliminate some of the difficulties in the past of not really knowing and not being able to make up a budget until the school year was well along.

He then stated:

> Prior understanding of what the budget would be, would be a tremendous help.

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, there is over 3 years of testimony which demonstrates that the problem of late funding must be corrected. It is obvious from the comments of local superintendents that this matter continues to be one of their greatest worries, if not their greatest concern. We have already enacted legislation which makes it possible for education programs to be funded on a timely basis. For this to work, it is imperative that we move to enact H.R. 514 and to extend the Elementary and Secondary Education Act at the earliest possible date.

LEGISLATION TO ESTABLISH NATIONAL ECONOMIC CONVERSION COMMISSION

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

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to support legislation which would establish a National Economic Conversion Commission to study ways in which the American economy can be adjusted and diversified so as to provide more adequately for critical nondefense needs. I have long felt that the creation of such a Commission is an essential step towards directing the productive capacities of our economy towards meeting urgent domestic needs. I first introduced legislation to create an Economic Conversion Commission during the 88th Congress. At that time Senator GEORGE McGOVERN, who sponsored the bill in the Senate, and I hoped that military spending would be decreased sharply, and we recognized the need for conversion planning. Unfortunately, our hope was dashed by the Vietnam war. I have reintroduced identical legislation in every Congress since then, introducing H.R. 647 in this Congress, which was introduced on January 3, 1969. I am delighted at the extent of bipartisan support for this legislation this year and look forward to seeing this Commission, which I have espoused for so long, become a reality.

In discussing H.R. 10608 of the 88th Congress on April 6, 1964, I said that it was "becoming more and more apparent that accumulating greater and greater stockpiles of nuclear weapons in an ever-spiralling arms race does not necessarily bring greater national security." Today, in 1969, I think that statement is even more pertinent. For since 1964 the budget of the Department of Defense has steadily grown until today it surpasses $80 billion. Of course, much of the increase has come as a result of the ill-advised escalation in Vietnam. But part of the increases have also gone to increased research and development programs that look to future arms expenditures.

Despite these expenditures for defense items, however, international tensions are ominous in Southeast Asia and the Middle East, and relations with the Soviet Union are strained and aggravated. Moreover, the security of our society here at home is threatened by deep divisions in our social fabric, deteriorating race relations, and rapidly rotting cities. It is apparent that policies of the past few years—which have allocated billions to arms and leftovers to domestic needs—must be overhauled and reshaped to give emphasis to the multitude of ills that beset our major urban areas and the creation of greater opportunities for millions of poor Americans to share in the abundance of our society.

The current negotiations in Paris have encouraged hopes that the war in Vietnam may soon be ended. Although these expectations have yet to be realized—and the war continues to claim thousands of American and Vietnamese lives each week—we nevertheless need to begin planning for the reallocation of national resources that should follow the conclusion of hostilities in Vietnam.

I have long advocated an end to U.S. military involvement in Vietnam. But an end to war expenditures would not in itself improve our ability to respond to long festering domestic problems unless the resources freed are earmarked for domestic areas. We need to assert now—while the allocation of these resources is still at question—the primacy of domestic needs so that these resources are not simply channeled into the new weapons systems which the Defense Department has already announced it intends to seek. Now is the time to establish the budget priorities which are necessary if we are to launch an effective attack against urban ills, poverty, and pervasive racial discrimination. The establishment of an Economic Conversion Commission, which would investigate ways in which the economy could be adjusted so as to more adequately provide for critical nondefense needs, would greatly facilitate the conversion of certain portions of our industrial capacity from defense-related production to civilian needs that are necessary for solving the problems of our major urban areas.

H.R. 647 would establish a National Economic Conversion Commission in the Executive Office of the President composed of several Cabinet members, including the Secretaries of Commerce, Defense, Labor, Health, Education, and Welfare, and Treasury. Other members of the Commission would include the Chairman of the Atomic Energy Commission, the Director of the U.S. Arms Control and Disarmament Agency, the Chairman of the Council of Economic Advisers, and the Administrator of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration.

The Commission would convene a National Conference on Industrial Conversion and Growth to consider the problem arising from a conversion to a civilian economy, and to encourage appropriate planning and programing by all sectors of the economy aimed at facilitating the Nation's economic conversion capability. The Commission would additionally consult with the Governors of the 50 States to encourage appropriate studies and conferences at the State, local and regional level, in support of a coordinated effort to improve the Nation's economic conversion capability.

Planning would also be required by defense contractors to provide for the conversion of industrial resources now utilized for defense purposes to other areas of public need.

A commission similar to the one proposed today was set up after World War II to study ways in which an economy which was heavily committed to a wartime need could convert to peacetime priorities. With opportunities arising for comparable reductions in arms expenditures when the Vietnam war is settled, now is an especially propitious time to establish a similarly oriented commission.

I urge that the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce hold early hearings on this legislation and that the Congress itself give the creation of this Commission a high priority in the legislative business of this session.

HON. BOB TOOTELL, GOVERNOR OF FARM CREDIT ADMINISTRATION, ADMINISTERS OATH TO SUCCESSOR

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

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I was present this morning at a very important ceremony at which Mr. Robert B. Tootell, the outgoing Governor of the Farm Credit Administration, administered the oath of office to his successor, Mr. Ed Jaenke. So Mr. Jaenke now takes over the reins as Governor of Farm Credit, which reins have been very ably held for 15 years by Bob Tootell.

I think most Members know one of the great organizations of this land is the farm credit system. Without the farm credit system and its work in the past 50 years, there would have been far less stability and growth in agriculture than we have had. Farm credit has increased its credit service to agriculture fivefold under the able leadership of Bob Tootell. Of course, he has had a great deal of support from farm organizations and from members of the Federal Farm Credit Board and others.

The farm credit system includes the Federal land banks and associations, the Federal intermediate credit banks and production credit associations, and the banks for cooperatives. Established by the Congress in 1917, and now completely farmer owned, it is a successful mechanism which moves capital to the traditionally capital deficient rural areas from the large cities where investment funds are concentrated. Farmers and their cooperatives presently are using more than $12 billion in credit obtained through this system. But more important, the system sets the pace for other agricultural lenders who tend to follow its example in setting loan terms and interest rates. As a result, all farmers and cooperatives who use borrowed funds benefit.

In my opinion, agricultural progress in my own area would have been much less spectacular if we had not had the credit assistance provided through the farm credit system. I am certain this is also true of all other farming areas of the United States. We are indebted to those men who had the vision and dedication to spearhead the creation of this institution and to those who have managed it so well since that time.

I rise to pay special tribute to Bob Tootell who has made such a large contribution to the welfare of American agriculture and to this system which is so vital to our Nation.

At the same time, Mr. Speaker, I should like to bespeak a successful administration on the part of the new Governor, Mr. Ed Jaenke. May I compliment the Federal Farm Credit Board for selecting Mr. Jaenke, whom I have had the privilege to know, as the new Governor. I am confident that, having inherited this well run organization, he will carry it forward to new accomplishments in the field of farm credit. I know that his previous experience in agricultural activities, including about 8 years as Associate Administrator of the Agricultural Stabilization and Conservation Service of the U.S. Department of Agriculture, will stand him in good stead in his new responsibilities.

BUREAU OF THE BUDGET DEPRIVING THE PEOPLE OF CALIFORNIA OF DISASTER RELIEF

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

Mr. SISK. Mr. Speaker, I wish to call to the attention of the House what I believe to be a shocking situation in which the Bureau of the Budget is depriving the people of California of much needed assistance in the form of disaster relief.

During the past few weeks the people of California have suffered through devastating floods. While the loss of life has been minimal, the losses of property, homes, businesses, and public facilities have been staggering.

As the people of our State go about rebuilding their lives after the unprecedented rains that we have had so far this winter—and as they will do after the floods which are anticipated when the snow melts this spring—the people of California have quite properly looked to the Federal Government for assistance, as have other States of the Union after other disasters.

Day after day, the people tell us that the assistance they are offered through the Small Business Administration is no assistance at all. They tell us that for most of them, all the SBA offers is to guarantee a loan from commercial sources at current exorbitantly high rates of interest.

Few, if any, of them can qualify for direct loans under the stringent guidelines currently in force. I have it on good authority that there is approximately $30,000,000 available in Small Business Administration appropriations which could be used in a meaningful disaster relief program if the Bureau of the Budget would but give its approval.

I am further advised that these policy restrictions were imposed by the Bureau of the Budget as the result of abuses of the SBA program in previous disasters in other areas. While I do not in any way defend the misuse of Federal programs, I am unable to comprehend why efforts have not been made by the Bureau of the Budget to modify these policies in the face of the demonstrated needs in the State of California.

I solicit the active support and assistance of the entire California delegation and of Gov. Ronald Reagan and his administration to convince the Budget Bureau of the need to relax these restrictions in order that thousands and thousands of Californians can be afforded badly needed financial assistance in the form of long-term, low-interest direct Federal loans.

PROPOSED EXTENSION OF FEDERAL EMPLOYEE'S COMPENSATION ACT TO AMERICAN POLICEMEN AND FIREMEN ACTING IN LINE OF DUTY

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

Mr. JACOBS. Mr. Speaker, today along with 20 of my colleagues, I have reintroduced legislation to extend the benefits of the Federal Employees Compensation Act to all American policemen and firemen killed or totally disabled in the line of duty whether or not a specific Federal criminal law happens to be involved. In addition this legislation is being reintroduced in the other body by Senator BIRCH BAYH.

Our theory in extending the act is that this is a nation of travelers. The criminal who shoots a policeman or sets a fire that injures a fireman around Indianapolis might have just arrived from Chicago. On the other hand, the would be victim who is protected by Indiana police and firefighters might just be passing through from Los Angeles.

In short, when a public safety officer dies for law and order he is dying for America, and I believe that the American Government has a responsibility to help compensate. No one can say where it might happen next.

If our bill becomes law, and it is gathering more and more support in Congress every day, a widow would receive 45 percent of the monthly wage rate of her deceased husband if she is the sole survivor and such compensation would continue unless she remarried.

If there are dependent children, the widow would receive 40 percent and each child would get 15 percent, up to a total of 75 percent of the monthly wage rate.

In cases of total disability, if there are no dependents, benefits would equal two-thirds of the monthly wage rate. If there are dependents, benefits would equal three-fourths of the monthly wage.

THE PRESS—A BELIEVABILITY GAP

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

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, many of the Nation's newsmen are upright, responsible journalists, but there are some who do not fall into this category and whose dubious reporting causes the American public to distrust the entire profession.

Most journalists were taught—either in journalism school or during their cub reporting days—that the profession prided itself upon fair, impartial, straight news reporting.

However, with the advent of the theory of "interpretative reporting," scores have taken this to mean editorializing their own opinion in their news stories.

Such cannot present an accurate picture to the American people.

With this dangerous trend now clearly evident at the hands of newspaper, radio, and TV reporters and correspondents, another serious trend has developed primarily within the last 10 years—that of concentration of media outlets in the hands of power-hungry opinion-molding corporations.

While no one needs to name the television, radio, and newspaper journalists who warp the news according to their own views, the public should be made aware of several news corporations, which continue to expend and approach a monopoly in public opinion making.

A prime example of such a monopoly exists here in our Nation's Capitol with the Washington Post Co., which not only controls a newspaper, but also a radio and television station and a national magazine. The Post Co. is threatening further expansion to monopolize the news picture in the greater Washington area.

Mr. Speaker, these are some of the many reasons why the American public has come to discount the believability of news media of the United States.

I include a release from the Publisher's Auxiliary of January 11, 1969, a Washington radio station—WAVA—editorial and a report from the Economic Council Letter of February 15, 1969, and others following my remarks:

[From Publishers' Auxiliary, Jan. 11, 1969]

PRESS INSTITUTE FINDS GROWING DISTRUST OF NEWS MEDIA IN THE UNITED STATES

GENEVA.—Distrust of the news media has been growing in the United States, the International Press Institute has reported, according to an article in a recent issue of the New York Times. The American media, the Institute said, may find it more difficult to regain the public's trust than to overcome the technical and economic problems that beset it.

The press of other countries also has a "communication problem," the institute said in its annual review of press freedom, but it emphasized that of the United States.

The institute is a private organization of newspaper editors of 57 countries, with headquarters in Zurich, Switzerland.

A disquieting development noted in the United States, it said, is the feeling that news media "incite the violence they report" by being present during riots and reporting on them.

The organization commented that this feeling has developed "despite disproof of any direct connection" between the riots and the reporting of them.

The survey, prepared by the Institute's acting director, Antony Brock, a Briton, said that in West Germany, France, Britain, Brazil and other countries the information media had also found itself "both blamed as the real instigators of violence and sometimes, in clashes with police, the object of it."

The media's "loss of acceptance" in the United States was said to have been illustrated strikingly by the riots during the Democratic party convention in Chicago earlier this year in which 34 newsmen were injured.

"Public opinion polls" the survey said, "found wide support for the police action and little for the newsmen, who, it was apparently felt, were as much to blame for what happened as those who struck them."

It was felt in nearly all the countries where reporters were covering riots that they "could expect no protection during violence since they were partly responsible for it," the survey continued.

The Institute also commented on the press in Czechoslovakia, saying that journalists the world over were "indebted to their Czechoslovak colleagues for having so convincingly demonstrated the reality of the cause of the free press" during the last year.

During the period of liberalization before the invasion, the Czechoslovak mass media "were at the forefront, encouraging, criticizing, urging and even leading," the Institute said.

After the invasion, the underground press became the main force of resistance, it went on, and now the press is "bravely maintaining the people's right to decide their own destiny."

The institute found that Greece continued to be the "saddest case among European countries with a free-press tradition."

But "arrests have continued, as has the expulsion, harassment and even mishandling of correspondents whose reporting did not suit the ruling junta."

In Latin America the blackest spots for press freedom remain Haiti and Cuba, the Institute said.

[From WAVA radio, Feb. 24, 1969]

WASHINGTON POST COMBINE: A QUESTION OF EXCESSIVE POWER

Over recent years, the news industry has passed through a revolution of change, which, looking back upon it, has been truly breathtaking. Television, ten years ago dominated by a few VHF stations on a small 13-point dial, has expanded into some 83 channels with UHF.

Radio, which in 1960 was little more than a glorified juke box, has broadened its horizons to include an increasing range of specialized public-service programming, including stations devoted entirely to talk and information, or to all news. The number of competing daily newspapers has shrunk to a point of near non-existence.

As one case, WAVA made its break from the cacophony of spinning records into the beckoning field of solid news as a service to this area in Januray, 1962. It was a long gamble for this station, told then that no one would listen to continuous news on a 24-hour basis; but we made it and your warm response and the subsequent decisions of stations in other cities across the country to begin all-news programming, is testimony enough to its success.

Now the Washington Post station, WTOP, has by an announcement in its newspaper disclosed that it is considering changing its programming to all news. If this move here were by another independent radio station, it would be welcomed in the healthy growth of all-news broadcasting.

In the case of the Washington Post Company's WTOP, however, this has raised a large new question—the huge and growing combined resources of a company which now has acquired and owns Washington's largest daily and only morning newspaper, also one of Washington's three powerful network television stations, also one of its largest FM radio stations, also its biggest news magazine, Newsweek, and Washington's most powerful standard radio station, 50,000-watt WTOP Radio.

In all, these various Post Company media already make 4,900,000 impressions each week on the some 2,000,000 people in greater Washington. Four out of every ten things people read, see, or hear, come from the Post Company. On top of all this, the Post is now moving to publish special localized sections of its newspaper aimed into suburban Virginia and Maryland, a move toward separate local Post editions, which the few remaining local community newspapers acknowledge may be impossible to compete with.

After taking a long breath, you realize that the Washington Post Company not only now dominates the news industry here but is inexorably suffocating its competition. The important issue is not whether one agrees with the Washington Post Company editorially; it is that the nation's capital is steadily losing the availability of diverse news sources and diverse editorial opinion.

As a practical matter, the Washington Post Company, though not by intent, possesses now the raw power of resources to effectively crush anything in its path, including smaller competitors. A laissez-faire day response would have been, "That's tough, Joe." But there is more to it than that.

We have here a developing concentration of power under which the Washington Post Company is establishing an effective monopoly of news control in the nation's capital area—centrally owned news power, the hard daily impact of which ranges through homes and government to indeed being a working catalyst as well on other news organizations here.

It is interesting to note that the Federal Communications Commission has just denied a television license in Boston, WHDH, to the Herald-Traveler Newspaper which had created a similar concentration of power over major news and communications outlets in the Boston area.

The Washington Post Radio change, if made, to all news would carry this corporate giant over the divide to an effective near absolute monopoly of news in Washington. So the time has indeed come for Congress and the people of this area to question the FCC, Justice Department, and Federal Trade Commission, whether on legal and administrative grounds, this is in the public interest.

Politically hazardous as tangling with the Washington Post giant is, further extension of its media power in the nation's capital is not acceptable. At stake here is an issue of the public interest as well as the right of smaller companies to have reasonable protection against monopolistic abuse by the new-day corporate barons of power.

Lest the Washington Post Corporation lose perspective behind its own editorial pledge to justice, it might remember that it is itself not exempt from responsibility—and have the wisdom to recall that "power corrupts, and absolute power corrupts absolutely." If the Washington Post Corporation has grown beyond this realization, then it has got to be challenged and its media separated. The Washington Post Company is being invited to respond to this WAVA editorial.

[From the Economic Council Letter, Feb. 15, 1969]

THE PRESS, RADIO AND TV—"MOST POWERFUL WEAPONS OF THE LEFT"

The wrath of the American people is rising fast. They have been silent while a handful of students led riots and spread disorder and destruction in our colleges, while a handful of peaceniks denounced The United States, burned our flag, and pretended they were concerned about peace. A handful of Negro hoodlums attacked Negroes and Whites, while pretending to speak for all Negroes. But Americans are not the least bit tolerant about the evidence before their very eyes that television, reporters and cameramen grossly distort the stories they are reporting, and distort them to benefit the Left.

The straw that broke the public's back was the reporting of the Chicago convention. A motley mass of protestors, after well-publicized announcements, charged, like an invading army, against a line of Chicago policemen, assigned there by the mayor of the city, to protect the convention delegates.

As the mass media reported it, The New Left protesters were peaceful citizens walking in the park, and the police were Nazi storm-troopers. The TV screen showed the innocent molesters, concerned only with a brave new world. They showed policemen clubbing the protesters. They showed angry members of the Democratic Convention, denouncing the police and on and on, ad infinitum.

It appeared later that some newspapermen had been injured in the riots but it also appeared that some of the cameramen had told the protesters where their cameras would be placed, so that they could stage a bit of action right in front of the TV bases.

ANOTHER VERSION CONCEALED

It would have been extremely difficult for a foreign visitor watching the convention on television to guess that there might have been another version of the nights' violence.

The television reports left out several important things. They did not make clear that the city government of Chicago, the State Government, and several branches of the Federal Government, had received warnings that Hubert Humphrey, his wife and Senator McCarthy and his wife, would be assassinated. Mindful of recent history, Mayor Daley decided there would be no assassinations at the Chicago Convention. And there were none.

The networks also left out the fact that there were State police and other officials and all sorts of Federal Agents there. "Police brutality" is the slogan used by the New Left so the story was concentrated on destroying the police system of our country. The commentators generally avoided also the fact that the New Left organizers had called their allies and followers together, and urged them to come to Chicago to "help."

Mayor Daley asked for time to rebut the slanted reports but the networks refused.

Then one of the staff members of the commission investigating crime in general, wrote—and published—his report on the Convention riots, "proving" that the police had in fact been the real rioters. It is very unusual for staff members of a commission to publish a report before it has been approved or amended by the board itself.

A GANGSTER MOVIE

Here something strange happened. We can only guess what happened, but the open campaign came quietly to an end. Obviously Mayor Daley must have received an overwhelming number of letters from the wrathful American people.

Individually using their own judgment, viewers saw through the slanted reports that appeared to make American elections cheap and vulgar, a sort of gangster movie.

What is even more important, we suspect that the television networks received a similar flood of letters from angry viewers. The networks have been surprisingly quiet about the Chicago doings. The report on the convention, which pretends to be an official report, is still circulating in paperback, and, we are sure, is still being used in the right places to spread the story of American decadence, but on the surface the debate has subsided. You can be sure the same old slogan will rise again if the time appears propitious, but the American people scored a great victory in their angry protest against slanted reporting. It was no part of the plan that the bitter argument should die down. The scenario was too well prepared—Chicago—gangsters—the wild, undisciplined city—Mayor Daley who did not like riots and thought rioters should be arrested and sent to jail—and finally those rows of angry police with upraised clubs.

Propaganda is obviously not based on facts. Neither is it based on lies. They are too easy to detect. It is most often based on old familiar worn-out images which people will not bother to analyze.

Well, for once the well-planned strategy did not work. Without any leadership, without any debate, the people realized this concocted story was false—and very dangerous. And they won—so far.

They won a battle, not a war.

RISE OF THE MASS MEDIA

Television is not the only offender. It is probably by far the most powerful and the most dangerous. But we must not lose sight of the whole picture. Wars are won only by constant watching of the whole chess-board.

The printing press was the principal means of communication (beyond the human voice) from the time of Luther to the 20th Century. Notice certain things about the printed word. It is relatively cheap. Very large numbers of people can buy it. It is easily-moved from place to place and so evades detection. Control is almost impossible. Even the powers of government had limited success in controlling the printing press, until totalitarian governments used their unlimited powers to keep men from communicating with each other.

Newspapers and printed broadsides have always been connected with politics. They succeeded the town meeting or other community meetings as the place where political opinions were shaped and planned.

The Linotype made possible larger printings. The contents changed to appeal to the masses—crime, international gossip and the like. These papers exercised great political influence. (Hearst is charged with bringing about the Spanish-American War), but they also faced plenty of competition.

Then it was discovered that, if a series of pictures taken seconds apart was run off rapidly, it appeared like one moving picture. Crowds flocked to the nickelodeon to watch Greta Garbo and Rudolph Valentino tell the story by their facial expressions while the piano player pounded out accompaniment. Then Warner Brothers brought out the Talking Pictures and movies became imagemakers of a society based on materialism and obsessed by sex—just what is dominant today.

The moving picture substituted the image and the story for words and discussion. At first they were cheap enough to make, but as techniques improved the costs rose and limited the number of people who could start an enterprise. There was competition but competition for audiences of millions was soon reduced to competition between stock ideas.

ADVANCES MADE

After World War I, men who liked gadgets began tinkering with "crystal sets" by which they could hear people talking even in Pittsburgh, without wires. When Al Smith was a candidate for president in 1928, the radio companies succeeded in setting up a radio network reaching as far as Iowa. Listeners in the east could hear every word Smith said, and even the shuffling of the farmers' feet, in the hall, without any wires. Today, we can hear men talk as they circle about the moon.

World War II brought television, which is a combination of moving pictures and wireless. But each new development costs more money to produce. Competition declined. The possibility of control from one or two centers increased.

In 1968 there were 242 million radios in the United States and 78 million television sets. This is power. The number of newspapers is steadily declining. Where is the political power today for influencing public opinion? It is in the movies, the radio and television.

Americans still carry in their minds the long-standing idea of a free press, based on unlimited numbers of newspapers, started by anyone with a little capital. Separately they often had political bias. But in the total market all ideas were represented, or could be represented whenever anybody wanted to start a paper. But the open market in communications, accessible to all, is gone. Therefore, it is gone in political discussion and the making of public opinion.

WHO CONTROLS A MONOPOLY?

As the difficulty of entering a market increases, the industry tends to take the shape of a monopoly or monopolistic competition. Control by a few becomes easy. Those who see the new opportunity grasp it.

Franklin Roosevelt was in office only a few weeks when he announced he would deliver a "Fireside Chat," to explain to the people some of the complexities of the many New Deal programs.

That was the beginning of a trend—which led straight to the slanted politicized reporting of the Chicago convention.

There are still people who think Roosevelt's style was simple, unintellectual, leading nowhere. Nothing could be more foolish. His political writing was brilliant, however many ghost-writers may have helped. If you want a model for his speeches you can find it in Mark Anthony's speech on The Death of Julius Caesar. Not a word is wasted, not a nuance is missed. No slightest opportunity to sway the audience is lost.

How do you talk back to a Fireside Chat? Ask Alf Landon. He knows. But too many Republicans and conservative Democrats were satisfied to talk about "that man Roosevelt," and they lost 35 years in tackling the new communications problems.

In World War II Roosevelt established control over the movies, to get support for intervention in the war and win public admiration for the Soviet Union, and the billions in weapons and other material we were giving them, without any agreement, in return to help shape a "peaceful" post-war world.

The Communists understood the role of communications in politics better than most Americans. Lenin said the Communists would send their pamphlets against the guns of the enemy and silence them. They did.

HIGH RATING

The Soviet strategists still rate the printing press high as a weapon. Every Communist cell is supposed to have a printing press or at least a mimeograph machine and a good supply of ink and paper, so that if the Communists are suddenly outlawed they will be able to work underground.

Communists were deep in the movies in the 30's. After starting their second great attack against the U.S. in 1929, in the East, they moved straight across the Continent to the West Coast. There were several prizes. Some valuable openings for the Senate and the House were obtainable in the Northwest with very little expenditure of time and money. A Senator from Oregon or Washington had a role equal to that of a Senator from New York or Pennsylvania, but elections in the small states were much easier to manage. In the West, they also had their eyes on Hollywood. Ronald Reagan's early political experience was gained fighting the Communists in the Screen Writers' Guild.

Then they always like the pincer's movement. Start out from both ends and crush the center.

Morrie Ryskind was one of those who came east to testify before the House Committee on Un-American Activities, at the risk of his employment. Adolf Menjou was another. We speak often of the honor-rolls that should be drawn up to pay their due to the men and women in the thirties who bravely fought the Soviet master-strategists. A special place should be reserved for those who fought the octopus to keep the movies free of Communist control.

THE INTERLOCK

As the Communists get any sector into their grip, they do what any good military commanders would do. They link it up with the other sectors they have taken over.

They struggled for control of the scenario writers, the actors, the directors, technicians, sometimes through the unions, sometimes outside. They moved their loyal members, their willing collaborators, and dupes they could trust, to the highest positions possible. One always important spot is the personnel office. Another was the always valuable post of administrator to the top man.

Each of these specific areas in motion pictures was linked through the "party" machinery with bridgeheads in radio, in the newspapers, in magazines, in book publishing, in technical reports and journals, and in appropriate government offices.

The thought control machinery of the Communists was as carefully thought out, as specific and definite, as completely prepared for any problem, as the work of National Aeronautics and Space Agency. Nothing was left to chance.

The work of this thought control mechanism in the 30's and 40's was concerned with the familiar Leftist demands for "social goals." It also worked hard to build up American acceptance of World War II, and enthusiasm for the Soviet Union, and the crushing of those who still believed—like Herbert Hoover and John Flynnt—that the Nazis and the Communists should be left to tear each other to bits.

TELEVISION TARGET

The thought-control mechanism was responsible for the incredibly fatuous promises of what we would do and the build up of sentiment for our spending billions on "aid" to the war-torn countries (including a proposal for a billion to reconstruct the Soviet Union).

Then came television. The Communists had a body of men trained to understand and manage communications for their purposes. Television was easy.

The test came in 1954 when Senator Joseph McCarthy aroused the entire country to awareness of the Communist danger in diplomacy, propaganda and the Defense Department. He had a nationwide following. His enemies knew he had to be stopped at the point where he had won his following.

There are many angles to the story including the role of the administration and the surrender of the Senate. But the quick and total destruction of Senator McCarthy's ability to reach the public was the work of the thought control mechanism, centering about television.

Some of the ablest reporters and students of politics in Washington watched in amazement. They could not figure out all the pieces of the interlock, but they knew it was not spontaneous. They had pretty good guesses as to where the headquarters was set up in Washington, and who was behind it.

We must always remember that the Communists are as skillful in winning over dupes and collaborators as they are in organizing. Many of the men who took part in the political assassination of Joseph McCarthy had no idea they were following the Communist blueprint. But they were just as useful—perhaps more useful for all public purposes—than hard core Communists.

TERRIBLE SWIFT SWORD

The ablest observers are still astounded at the speed and completeness with which the job was done. But it was the 25 years of careful building of a thought-control apparatus, out of each new development in communication which made the sudden victory possible.

The center of their effort was the building up of a scenario around the Army—McCarthy Hearings making the Senator's investigation look like a soap opera. The counsel for the Army, Joseph Welch, was a master television director!

The American public knew well that there was dirty work at the cross-roads but they did not see how it was done. For 14 years the thought-controllers have had things pretty much their own way. But the slanted reporting of the Democratic Convention at Chicago was too much. Americans are awake again.

The Behemoth for control of public opinion had been hard at work in the interval. Viewers saw the careful rigging of evidence in the March on Selma, the attacks on the southern police who tried to prevent violence, the more recent riots in the North, the shame of the colleges, the unbelievable campaigns for "peace" as if we compelled the poor Soviet leaders to give up their plans of help their own people because we were so warlike.

This same mechanism has created the myth called "world opinion" which is manufactured largely by American subsidies of foreign newspaper men and other writers.

In Vietnam they have consistently used television to the benefit of the other side. They made a successful issue of the "Buddhist" suicides, though it was obviously all a frame up. Good reporters said the Communists even used corpses for their immolations but the American mass media reported it all as a genuine political and moral crisis.

Not long ago the South Viet Namese police told American television cameramen that Americans were building up riots in Saigon by giving young hoodlums a chance to appear on television. President Hayakawa of beleaguered San Francisco College told the Senate the same thing.

The American people have won a battle, not a war. We have a long way to go, but the revolt of the *quiet* Americans is under way.

[From the Washington (D.C.) Evening Star, Mar. 1, 1969]

RACE RELATIONS TRANSFORMED TO TV ENTERTAINMENT

(By Crosby S. Noyes)

It comes in the middle of a fairly routine shoot-'em-up bit of TV boiler plate, in which most of the shooting happens to be done by a number of highly competent and strongly motivated Negro frontiersmen.

It's a sudden and somehow disturbing feeling that the television industry, like the movies before it, has gone out of the entertainment business and has been taken over, root and branch, by the propagandists.

Somebody out there is trying to tell us something. It almost makes you wonder, while we are all worked up about the "military-industrial complex," whether we might not also take a look at what the entertainment-propaganda complex is up to these days.

It is virtually impossible, of course, to overestimate the propaganda potential of the entertainment industry, once it really puts its mind to a given theme.

Within the lifetime of most of us, we have been successively entertained into hating Germans, Japanese and Russians, loving Russians and Chinese, liking Japanese and some Germans, hating Chinese and re-hating Russians. But this business of international propaganda by the entertainment industry is relative child's play compared to the current effort in the field of social brainwashing, which is a very tricky business, indeed.

Propaganda, by definition, is an effort to shape attitudes and incite people to action. And when it focuses its attention on a problem as complicated and delicate as race relations in the United States, it is not easy to predict exactly what attitudes and what kind of action are likely to result.

It would be one thing if the treatment of the problem consisted simply of platitudes calling for tolerance and brotherly love between the races, but it definitely does not.

Far more often, in fact, it is a matter of dramatizing and exploiting the antagonisms that are assumed to exist between the black and white communities. The content of this endlessly repeated theme, beamed into the living rooms of both communities, involves violence and hatred and sex and all the other things that sell TV shows. And it is being packaged in a racial context that has, or could have, the approximate explosive potential of uranium 235.

If there is such a thing, therefore, as a conspiracy by those who call the shots in the television industry to brainwash the public on the question of race relations, it is a conspiracy of highly questionable wisdom. The intention, no doubt, is the laudable one of promoting reconciliation and harmony. But the unfortunate fact is that the actual result may be quite the contrary. The real problem is of course, that it is hard to propagandize with the same material two different groups which are presumed to be antagonistic to each other. What leads one group to cool it may well incite the other to go on a rampage. Where the antagonism is real, it is no easy thing to please one group without infuriating the other.

In show biz as in real life, to be sure, there is an obligation to tell it like it is. There is plenty of room for social conscience and plenty of reason for changing some of the dramatic stereotypes left over from the past.

But whether problems of prejudice, injustice, resentment and alienation are going to be solved—or even helped—by a concerted deluge of dramatic propaganda is extremely doubtful.

Dignity, after all, is not a quality that can be conferred on anyone by a TV casting director. And whether the image of the American Negro will be much improved by suddenly changing him on millions of television screens from a fall guy to a tough guy remains to be seen.

For the fact is that the American people, for all their susceptibility to propaganda cloaked as entertainment, do have a way of developing a certain sales resistance when the message is laid on hard enough. At the moment, a delicate problem is being handled with what may strike a good many viewers as sledge-hammer finesse. The time for some change in signals—and perhaps some letup in the pressure—may be at hand.

[From the Washington (D.C.) Post, Mar. 2, 1969]

THE DECISIONS AT DUKE UNIVERSITY

I would like to strongly protest the staff-written stories in *The Washington Post* of Sunday and Monday, Feb. 16 and 17, which left the distinct impression with your readers that Duke University capitulated on a series of demands by a group of our black students. The facts simply don't bear this out. This error of impression was further compounded by the headline of your Monday story which went far beyond what the story itself said.

The author of your articles, Mr. William Chapman, admitted to an official of Duke University that, albeit unintentional, there was distortion in his stories to the extent that in capsuling he did not distinguish between *decisions* reached at Duke last weekend and *reports of decisions made earlier*.

The worst thing about such erroneous report is, *not* that in some eyes it makes Duke look weak when it should look strong, but that it gives the illusion of a victory won by confrontation and, therefore, encourages dissidents both at Duke and at other institutions to employ this technique as a means for seeking their goals, be they legitimate or not.

If our colleges and universities are to survive, they not only must understand and solve their problems, including those posed by our students, but they must also make it patently clear that decisions by confrontation will not be permitted. In this effort, we need help and understanding of a strong and honest press. Moreover, in the long run, the problem holds just as much potential danger for the press as it does for our educational institutions.

FRANK L. ASHMORE,
Vice President, Duke University.

THE HUMAN RELATIONS BUNGLERS

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

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, the legal theory of Brown against Topeka rejecting a denial of freedom of choice because of race has suffered mispromotion to the point that today "freedom of choice" is again illegal. We have receded from preventing forced denial of free choice to the opposite extreme of compulsory refusal of free choice—all seemingly as a dedicated maneuver to satisfy intellectual curiosities and fulfill political promises. Everything today not prohibited is mandatory.

That the forced race ratios and cultural genocide is not working is admitted by the same "full equality" theoriticians as they confess that racial problems are worse now than when they started their full freedom campaign.

Why continue the immoral quest, when experience shows no progress? In fact, if their statistics are correct, the results are worsening. And the taxpayers, induced to buy peace, grow weary of "solutions" that only aggravate the problem.

The rationale for continuing lies between profit for one minority, the profiteers, and guilt-obsessed goals for another already rich minority. To others, the egalitarian promise is but a means of retaining power.

The so-called crisis of our cities can be attributed directly to race forcing—causing productive taxpayers to flee to the suburbs. In sequence, the alibi-seeking politicians are caught without revenue as their centuries old business centers were converted into slums. They dare not admit their fallacy. The problem they have created, they would not solve with continued suffering and taxpayers' dollars with a utopian promise called urban renewal.

In educational endeavors the poor minority resists outside interference as foreign and alien philosophy. Environment is not the sole motivator of man.

Given any forcefully integrated school, immediately the black people—denied their culture—organize and demand a black teacher, a black superintendent, black eating, and restroom facilities as well as the teaching of Afro-American studies.

Yet, the race bunglers—who have made tainted money by legalized blackmail—refuse to concede defeat and demand more stringent racial force laws—and more tax money—if only to prove their point.

So-called civil rights bill after civil rights bill has been passed with little or no promised effect.

How far will the ideologists go before admitting they are wrong?

Have not enough people—white and black—been hurt?

Should not honest sociology try another approach? Twenty-odd years of data and experience—all unfavorable to the present trial and error theories—should convince us that changes are needed desperately.

And the answer is so simple—let the people alone.

Mr. Speaker, I place news clippings from local newspapers at this point in my remarks:

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

RACIAL RIFT IN UNITED STATES WIDENING, FOLLOWUP STUDY CONCLUDES

Despite progress on a number of fronts, the separation and inequality of blacks and whites in the United States is increasing, an independent, year-later study of the Kerner commission's findings concluded today.

It was a year ago that the National Advisory Commission on Civil Disorders, headed by Illinois Gov. Ott Kerner, warned:

"Our nation is moving toward two societies—one black, one white, separate and unequal."

The new study, undertaken by two voluntry groups, Urban America and Urban Coalition, backed away from such indictments as "white racism," a phrase from last year's report that produced intense controversy. Yet its conclusion was just about as gloomy.

TWO SOCIETIES NEARER

"We are a year closer to two societies—black and white, increasingly separate and scarcely less unequal."

The study, according to an Urban Coalition spokesman, was launched not as an attempt to revive the Kerner commission, but to revive interest in its findings and to assess what has happened since.

At a press conference this morning John W. Gardner, chairman of the Urban Coalition, said:

"We have made a start—but only a start—on what the commission described as 'the major unfinished business of this nation.' But we have not made the total commitment that is so urgently needed if we are to make this a livable society for every American."

The Rev. Channing Phillips, head of Washington's Housing Development Corp. and a member of an advisory panel on the year-later report, called it a document "written by whites for whites." He said this was proper in that it is the white establishment which must listen to the findings of such studies.

The commission, the new report said, had accurately predicted what would happen in the short run—some improvements but none large enough to reverse racial polarization, with increased violence but less massive disorder because of improved police preparations.

DISORDER FEARED

"If the commission is equally correct about the long run," said the study, "the nation in its neglect may be sowing the seeds of unprecedented future disorder and division."

The study, put together by a seven-member team under the direction of Urban America's Donald Canty, found a number of encouraging signs.

Foremost among them were the gains made by Negroes in geting jobs and escaping the poverty bracket. With continued prosperity the key, incomes are up and unemployment down, "even in the hardest to reach places and categories of people," it said.

Also praised were private industry's increasing involvement in the social arena; the success of the National Alliance of Business's JOBS program of hiring the hard-core unemployed; the passage of last year's Omnibus Housing Act and Fair Housing Act; greater awareness by city and state governments of urban needs and problems; evidence of greater black pride self-help movements.

OFFSETTING FACTORS

But these encouraging signs, said the report, are offset by a number of factors: continuing discrepancy in white and black income in the quality of jobs blacks and whites hold; continuing high unemployment among ghetto youth; the failure so far of Congress to appropriate sufficient funds to carry out the big housing act; the fiscal restraints on communities; the fragmentation of citizen groups that want a share of community control.

Moreover, the report listed other areas where conditions not only have failed to improve but appear to be deteriorating.

One is education, where with the exception of a few middle-sized cities, the drive for integration has been stalled by both white and black resistance, and the "small amount of progress" in improving ghetto schools has been "counterbalanced by a growing atmosphere of hostility and conflict in many cities."

Another is welfare, where in the face of unprecedented prosperity, the welfare caseload continues to rise precipitously. The report blamed much of this on continued family breakdown, with 1968 figures showing 35 percent of Negro families in central cities have no father in the home.

POLARIZATION OUTLINED

The report's second part does not deal with specific urban issues so much as it attempts to spell out the polarization question in light of what happened in 1968.

Depending largely on new census data, the report presents the following picture:

Net migration of Negroes from rural areas into the central cities has just about stopped.

The movement of whites from the cities has accelerated since the riots.

Blacks also are moving out of the cities to the suburbs at an accelerated rate, leading not so much to integration but to new suburban ghettos in close-in areas that are not real suburbs at all.

City ghettos are expanding in size but dropping in population density. Even the poorest people are leaving the worst slum tenements of cities like New York and Newark.

Herman Miller, chief of the population division of the Census Bureau, said that up to 1966, whites are leaving the cities at the rate of 140,000 a year. That rate, he added, has jumped nearly a half million a year in the last two years.

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

RACIAL GAP REMAINS WIDE, DESPITE PROGRESS IN AREA

(By James Welsh)

There has been no evidence of a reversal of the black-white separation in the nation, says a follow-up study of the Kerner (riot) Commission report of last year, and Washington shows a similar pattern.

Events in Washington over the last year have been similar to what the study "One Year Later," sponsored by the Urban Coalition and Urban America, found in the country—that despite progress in many areas there has been a general deterioration in race relations.

Last April's riots proved to be the biggest setback to racial accord in Washington in years. Its residue of bitterness and fear have subsided but have far from disappeared.

At the same time, as the new report said of the nation, police here have gained greater strength, skill and sophistication in heading off disorders.

No accurate figures are available for the movement of blacks and whites in and out of the District, its various neighborhoods and its suburban jurisdiction. The view of many authorities, though, is something like this:

Migration of Negroes into the city has slowed, perhaps to the point where increase in the District's Negro population is represented entirely by natural growth; the events of 1968 led many whites to leave the city; Negro movement to the suburbs in the last several years has been unprecedented; however, a large number of these people find themselves in largely Negro neighborhoods, particularly the close-in areas of Prince Georges County.

Within the city, black political and civic participation is up sharply. Negroes have a significant share of government action. But this has also been accompanied by strident separatist demands by Black Power advocates and considerable conflict among various black interest groups.

Perhaps the most notable progress has come in the area of urban development within the city.

Planners of the Shaw urban renewal project made great strides in 1968, and the Nixon administration has backed its first phase with $30 million. Rebuilding of the riot-torn Seventh Street—within Shaw—will begin this year. Plans also are advancing for the Fort Lincoln new-town project, with racial and economic integration the No. 1 goal.

[From the Washington Post, Mar. 2, 1969]

RACIAL TENSIONS SIMMER IN HARLEM SCHOOLS

(By Susan Jacoby)

NEW YORK.—At Public School 39 in Harlem, seven teachers sit all day in empty classrooms guarded by police. Children who would normally fill the classes are assigned to other teachers.

The seven are all members of the AFL–CIO United Federation of Teachers. They are involved in a dispute with the local elected governing board of an experimental school district in East Harlem. After the teachers defied the board in a controversy over whether schools would be open or closed during the regular holiday vacation, parents had their children transferred to other classes.

The situation at PS 39, with some classrooms empty, children jammed into others that are too small and more than a dozen policemen patrolling the corridors, is a down-to-earth manifestation of the bitter high-level struggle for control of New York's 1.1-million-pupil school system.

The teacher strike that shut down most of the city's public schools for nearly three months last fall was caused by the conflict between groups that control the school system now—the teachers' union and the administrators—and the blacks and Puerto Ricans who are demanding community control of the schools.

SWAHILI VERSUS HEBREW

It is a power struggle with high stakes on both sides. The largely white union feels its very survival threatened by community demands for a voice in hiring and firing teachers. At stake for the blacks and Puerto Ricans is the education of their children, who have fallen further and further behind each year in schools run by the central board of education, and a share of political power over institutions serving their communities.

The racial antagonisms that surfaced during the strike did not end when the teachers went back to work; there is every evidence that tensions are increasing. More than 1300 of the school system's 57,000 teachers had resigned as of December. There were only 1300 resignations during the entire 1967–8 school year.

"The resignations have been coming in very fast since January," says one school official, "and we don't have these recorded yet. What effect this all will have on recruiting new teachers can only be guessed at, but it doesn't look good at all."

Several schools have been the scenes of confrontations when students demanded courses in Negro and Spanish-American history, African history and African languages like Swahili.

The resistance to "black history" on the part of many old-line teachers would be startling if it occurred in Washington, for example, where the teaching of Negro history is scarcely a revolutionary idea. But the New York public school system has a peculiarly ethnic character, shaped by Jewish teachers—more than two-thirds of the total—and Jewish intellectual traditions.

The racial antagonism has been exacerbated by anti-Semitic statements from some blacks and visceral fears of anti-Semitism on the part of the school staff.

Many Jewish administrators contend that Swahili would be a useless subject for a Negro American to study. But Hebrew has been offered as a foreign language in the city's high schools for many years. A strong argument can be made for the premise that Hebrew and Swahili are of about equal use to the average American high school student.

"We don't deny that one of our aims is to impress our own culture on black children," says David Spencer, chairman of the governing board that is responsible for PS 39. "But what's wrong with that? Every other group has done it, if it had the power to do it."

Public school 39 is located in an experimental school district, financed partly by the Ford Foundation, that centers around Intermediate School 201. The IS 201 complex was set up to demonstrate the feasibility of community control, as was the Ocean Hill-Brownsville district in Brooklyn that became the focus of the teacher strike last fall.

Albert Shanker, head of the teachers' union, has called for abolition of the IS 201 and Ocean Hill districts in a plan for school decentralization submitted by the union to the State Legislature. The history of IS 201 is a microcosm of the citywide dispute over community control.

The local governing board consists of ten parents, five community representatives, five teachers and one supervisor. Chairman Spencer, a former elevator operator and youth worker who did not finish high school, is a self-educated man who disputes the union's charge that the proponents of community control are mainly "outsiders" who have no ties to individual black communities.

He has lived and worked in Harlem all of his life and has four children in public schools in his district. A fifth child attends an integrated high school on Long Island under a special busing program.

Spencer became active in school affairs when his wife was president of the Parents Associations at his children's school. He was active in the integration movement before the drive for community control.

PARENTS DO KNOW

Shifting easily between the language of the street and the language of educators, he explains his involvement with the schools. "I believed in integration; I worked for it until it became clear that the white school administration was not going to do anything about integration. Now I believe integration will come eventually, will take care of itself, if we can improve the schools in our own community whether they're all-black schools or not.

"They say, 'What do the parents know? They never finished eighth grade.' Well, the parents do know. They know when their kid comes home without books and without homework, when the kids get left back. They know, and they know nobody but them is going to do anything about it.

"White teachers? About 85 per cent of our teachers are white. Like, I don't care what your hangups or my hangups are. We can get along as long as my kid is learning to read and write."

The governing board has a personnel committee that interviews teachers and supervisors applying for jobs in the district. The committee informs the central board of its choices.

"So far, we've had pretty good luck in getting the teachers we've wanted," Spencer says. "But we think our board should have final authority on this rather than the central board."

A typical question the interviewing committee might ask an applicant is, "What would you do if you found yourself in a classroom without books?"

Spencer explains, "What we want to hear is that the teacher would complain. She can't do her job without books. Too many teachers in the past have kept their mouths shut tight if they found a classroom without proper equipment, because it would make the system look bad. It's up to us, the parents, to see that the teacher has the tools to do her job properly."

Many teachers feel it would be demeaning to have to undergo an interview by parents who lack formal education. Says one white teacher in the IS 201 complex: "I approached the interview with a good deal of apprehension. I was afraid I might be made fun of, asked about my racial viewpoints.

"I was asked if I had previous experience teaching black children. I said no, and they asked how I felt my lack of experience with black people would affect my performance. The questions weren't put in an inquisitorial vein, and I began to find them eminently sensible. Not that there is no tension but these are people I can work with."

The governing board has little official power. Its authority is mainly de facto, wrested from the central board inch by inch and susceptible to being reduced at any time. Spencer and the governing board want formal powers and all-important control of the budget for their district.

The union is opposed to such a plan and is fighting it in the State Legislature in Albany. But the most bitter battles now are being fought in schools like PS 39, tense with antagonisms that continue to disrupt education in the Nation's largest city.

[From the Washington Post, Mar. 2, 1969]

ALEXANDRIA TURMOIL STRAINS OLD SCHOOL TIES—PARENT CRY FOR ORDER AT GW HIGH

(By Richard M. Cohen and Maurine McLaughlin)

"There was discipline when I was going to George Washington," said Joan Clark. "There is none now."

Mrs. Clark's daughter has followed her to Alexandria's George Washington High School, where her husband Jack is president of the Parent-Teachers Association.

With other parents, the Clarks are using the term "discipline" to describe the "missing element" in a school they believe is in trouble. Crime and taxes and discipline in the schools—particularly George Washington—make up a troika of issues in Alexandria's current election campaign for a vacant City Council seat.

George Washington has been, for a generation, a matter of intense pride to the neighborhood it serves—a stable area of modest homes and middle-income families that is now feeling the effects of metropolitan growth, school reorganization, desegregation and an unhurried influx of Negroes.

"We had problems prior to integration but they were dealt with then," Mrs. Clark continued. "Now there isn't any discipline . . . The only thing a child respects is fear.

"Ann Landers, whom I dearly love, agrees with me. You can't be too nice to kids. You can't be buddy buddy with them."

Robert Parlier, George Washington's principal for 1½ years, observes that much has happened since the complaining parents left the school.

"It's no longer the little red schoolhouse they remember," he said. "Maybe there's resentment over integration."

But desegregation alone doesn't tell the story.

"I've never believed discipline was too much of a problem," said Susan Sanders, a leader of the student government. "Any school that's integrated is going to have a problem. It's a group of white kids and black kids who want to be heard. Most of our discipline problem is with white girls."

And then, almost parenthetically, she tells about a meeting between parents and students in which a student referred to George Washington as "our school." The parents met that idea, she said, with bitterness and disbelief: as the parents see it, George Washington is their school.

George Washington High is unusual among Washington area schools, because about half of its 1600 students are children of parents who went there and remember it with affection. When it was built—three stories high and a city block long—in 1932, it was white Alexandria's only high school.

Like most parents, particularly those caught in the turbulence of rapidly expanding metropolitan areas, the Clarks and their 50 or so supporters in the PTA are concerned about the forces pulling youngsters away from the community. That concern has become part of the discipline issue.

"Quite frankly," Parlier says, "some of the parents have lost their kids."

But, Parlier concedes, George Washington and the surrounding Del Ray area have not had an easy time of it. When Alexandria finally closed its Negro high school two years ago, it also revamped school attendance boundaries to achieve racial balance.

George Washington, which was at first supposed to be about 18 per cent Negro, is now conservatively estimated to be 29 per cent black. T. C. Williams High School to the west is about 20 per cent black. Francis Hammond High, still further to the west, has few Negro students.

The boundary changes and the opening of T. C. Williams High took students from the affluent neighborhoods to the south and west. These include children of the Old Town and the new suburbs, many of whom are college bound.

In addition, Parker Gray, the former Negro high school, was redesignated a middle school—meaning seventh and eighth grades—for children who would go to George Washington High. Aging and inadequate, Parker Gray had to be renovated. The work fell behind schedule, and George Washington had to accommodate displaced Parker Gray students.

George Washington went on split sessions last fall, with high school classes in the morning and middle school classes in the afternoon.

"It started," said a dean, "when they brought the Parker Gray kids here. Teachers used to be out in the halls when classes changed and they would watch them until they were cleared." But, he continued, the split session reduced class periods from one hour to 45 minutes, and teachers—anxious to adhere to lesson plans prepared during the summer before they were told of the split session—closed the door and began to lecture at the sound of the bell.

The halls, by most accounts, were noisy. Students were often tardy to classes.

Both schools had to cut extracurricular programs. At George Washington, where there are 46 clubs and a student government that other schools look to as a model, the split session was devastating. Morale sank.

"I got depressed about everything when the Parker Gray students were here," Miss Sanders said. "In the beginning there was just time for classes. I feel that that messed it up. Younger kids just don't treat the school right. Some of the paintings the art club put up were defaced."

Most of the Parker Gray students are gone now; regular sessions have resumed. But emotions have stayed high.

George Washington students, Parlier and his teachers say, have an astounding proprietary interest in the school. For the 60 per cent who end their education here, George Washington is a tradition as firmly imbedded as if the walls were covered with ivy.

Most of George Washington's students, for instance, do not wear their hair long—because the majority frown on the current fad. (Roger Ashby, a long-haired student, was hauled before the honors court and told to trim his hair. "There are just some kids who think it gives the school a bad name," he says.)

But one tradition that has died is the preeminence of George Washington in Alexandria. Now there is the new T. C. Williams High School, $5.5 million worth of glass and air conditioning. There is unquestionable resentment over what is thought to be the City's desire to service the high-income sections at the expense of Del Ray and its neighboring areas.

"It was brought up in this neighborhood—just one block from where I live now," Mrs. Clark says. "I live here because I like it. It hurts me when I see everything going to the west end of town."

Robert McKlveen lives in the Rosemont section, a bit more prosperous than Del Ray, but still within the George Washington attendance zone. He is a graduate of the school and lives in Rosemont, he says, so that his two sons will go to George Washington. He is now a critic of the school.

"It grieves us to see our school—George Washington—going down so, and to see a new 5.5-million school over there," he said, referring to T. C. Williams to the west.

"We in Rosemont are concerned about the school situation because we feel it affects property values. We used to have four members of the School Board living in Rosemont but now two have moved out." McKlveen is Mrs. Clark's brother.

P-TA president Clark says, "The trouble started with the speed of integration forced on both white and black." He says that in visiting the school he has seen "kids running in the halls, using loud, vulgar and boisterous language in the halls."

"What the whole thing boils down to," adds Mrs. Clark, "is that they do not have enough discipline.

"Everything will fall into place if we could get discipline back into the schools."

"The thing that they're complaining about is the thing the world is complaining about," said a teacher who requested anonymity. "So many of the parents went to this school. We have a very active P-TA. It's not a cupcake affair where they come to listen to Mrs. Sidewinder talk about her trip to Haiti.

"The number of fights haven't increased," the teacher, a part-time dean and an 11-year George Washington veteran, continued. "You get two young roosters and they square off over some silly thing."

"There have been kids who have been afraid to come to school," said Miss Sanders. "A lot of the kids just listen to talk. When Martin Luther King was assassinated, the colored kids put the flag down to half mast. A lot of the kids were scared then because they saw all the colored kids together.

"A school," says Henry Ortiz, a senior, "is a school. Actually in the school I haven't seen as much trouble as outside."

There was trouble last fall outside the school, particularly after football games. Last September the school administration threatened to cancel all night games after seven persons were injured in a postgame fight outside the George Washington High stadium. The game, however, was between T. C. Williams and Fairfax County High Schools, and George Washington students think they have been unfairly blamed for the sins of others.

Nevertheless, some observers point out that there is growing tension in the neighborhood between young whites and blacks.

"The area," one said, "has been integrating.

There are tensions in housing and recreation. There are fears of being overwhelmed by the whole racial crisis."

Now Principal Parlier has begun to be more strict.

"They (the school administration) started to tighten up last week," said Travis Payton, a tenth grader. "They send 'em home to their parents. They watch every little thing I do to see if it's right or wrong."

Tardiness now brings immediate action. A behavior clinic (that means staying after school) is now in operation. Students who are late to class more than three times have to see a dean. And the dean sees their parents.

Teachers, administrators and the principal agree that their critics in the P-TA represent about 15 per cent of the parents. But, one added, "they are parents who have a deep-seated interest in their children."

The Clarks, who very much want their children to go to college, fault George Washington High because only an estimated 40 per cent of its graduates go on to college. It used to be, everyone says, 75 per cent.

"I believe that an atmosphere of a school from which students go to college is more conducive to studying on the part of the average student than the atmosphere of a school that doesn't send students to college," Clark said.

The percentage of George Washington's graduates who go on to college has fallen, Parlier admits. But, he says, in past years many of the students simply dropped out when they were 15 or 16. Most of those who graduated went on to college, but too many simply did not graduate. Now, Parlier says, a student cannot leave school until he is 17—very nearly graduation age.

What Clark calls "the speed of integration" has taken a toll at George Washington and it plays a part in the "discipline" problem.

"There are too many old people in the school, too many," said Arthur Funn, a ninth grader. "If you walk into the library they ask you what you want there. No, no, get out of here. Then they say, 'come here you poor boy.' My name ain't boy. My name's not boy. My name's Arthur Funn."

"I'm not sure that many of the teachers have been prepared adequately for integration," one teacher commented.

"That," concedes Parlier, 'is about true. That's a matter of education, too. We started sensitivity training two years ago on the basis of Federal funds and then the funds cut out on us. We only got about 10 per cent of the staff through."

About half of George Washington's teaching staff of 91 is over 50, Parlier estimated. Eight are Negro. "The thing I think is the best description of how they feel is that sometimes they're frustrated." Some of them say, according to Parlier, that they had been teaching, academically oriented kids and "for the past five years I've been teaching other kids."

Meanwhile, discipline in the schools and conditions at George Washington continue to build as a political issue. Clark, a former president of the Del Ray Citizens Association, has formed a committee of parents, teachers and students to investigate the schools.

"The committee," Clark said, "is first investigating the problems of George Washington, but we would like to see it expand to investigate citywide problems and if necessary go into the State situation and . . ."

[From the Washington Post, Feb. 21, 1969]

BLACK POWER STRUGGLE IN CHICAGO SEEN AS TEXTBOOK ON TACTICS

(By D. J. R. Bruckner)

CHICAGO.—A struggle over Black Power which has erupted within the Chicago Metropolitan YMCA could become a textbook on tactics being developed by young aggressive black leaders.

The choice of the YMCA as a target is itself of great significance, since the Y has long been considered by white liberals as a front-line organization in promoting civil rights and black liberation.

But beyond that, the presence of a powerful black caucus within the Y staff, the relations of the Y with the city's power structure, church groups and social organizations and the types of demands made on the Y by the protesters put this struggle on an entirely new map in the area of race relations. The attack was formally launched in December by the Black Consortium and the Committee for One Society (COS), who charged the Y with refusal to comply with demands to "end racism in the YMCA and its operations."

WHITE GROUP

COS is a group of white professional men, led by the Rev. Alvin Pitcher of the University of Chicago Divinity School, which is dedicated to action and instruction against racism in the white community.

The Black Consortium represents 58 militant black groups, ranging from Operation Breadbasket through the Student Nonviolent Coordinating Committee to the Black Panthers. It acts primarily as a center of communications and organization for the groups which belong to it. And, so far, it has shown an impressive ability to marshal its troops for action.

COS and the Consortium are housed in the same building and often coordinate their plans. Both were set up to launch attacks on institutional racism.

The YMCA is an extraordinary target. In Metropolitan Chicago it has 180,000 members and provides services to thousands more. It runs 40 centers there and many smaller centers in outlying areas. In 1963 it started the first intensive job training program in the country for the hard-core unemployed and it has run a citywide street workers program for making contact with and giving help to members of youth gangs.

It runs a large community college which contains a "second change high school," it has a program to set up shops run by gang members in three areas of the city and it is promoting a new program to establish black-owned businesses.

Economically it is a significant force in the city. Its gross annual budget exceeds $30 million. It owns 5 per cent of the hotel rooms in Chicago and employs more than 4000 persons. Its advisory board includes top executives of almost every major business in the area and the top leadership of the city's social power structure.

The Black Consortium and COS met with Y officials twice in December before they issued their public blast at the organization. At the first meeting the two groups presented an eight-page list of demands complete with timetables for compliances, and an elaborate compliance procedure. The two sides differ about what happened at the second meeting.

DEMANDS UNREALISTIC

R. Calvin Lockridge, chairman of the executive committee of the Black Consortium, says officials refused to give the protesters a timetable for change or to discuss meaningfully the changes themselves.

John O. Root, the general executive of the Metropolitan YMCA, says the groups told him they had not come to the meeting to negotiate the demands, but only to receive the Y's acquiescence in them. Root said "some of the demands are unrealistic. In effect, they call for the complete reorganization of the YMCA from top to bottom."

The demands made by COS and the Consortium are sweeping. They demand the Y Board of Managers, its key policy group, be 35 per cent Negro by March 1, and 50 per cent Negro by next year. Similar percentage demands are made for all other boards and committees.

One series of demands calls for a complete restructuring of the staff and all programs to make way for more Negroes, as well as Negro-oriented and devised programs, purchasing procedures and employment patterns.

Another demands new policies on all government-funded programs which would give "the black community" veto power over the programs and which would, in effect, move the Y into a position of support for Black Power drives originated outside the Y. One demand says the Y should disassociate itself from all Model Cities programs until "local citizens have control in each target area."

But the most potent demand calls for establishment of a review committee made up of two Negro and two white Y employes, two Consortium leaders, two COS members and an appointee of the Spanish Action Committee, which would have power to approve or disapprove the Y's efforts to meet all the other demands. Performance records would have to be made up by the Y and presented to the COS and the Consortium for approval.

Officials of the Y agree generally that the key issue is precisely this last demand: They do not want to be monitored by a group which has, they say, no "stake" in the Y organization.

What the Y is doing so far is impressive. There are now 1160 members of various boards, and 170 of them are Negro, a rise of 30 since last Dec. 18.

Bruce Cole, who is Root's second in command in the Y's central office, says the Y hopes to raise this quota to at least 275 board members by the end of the year, but this is a long way from the goal set by the COS and the Consortium.

When it looks to its constituency, the Y officials say, the organization considers its chief aim at this time to be a program to soften suburban attitudes on race and combat the white racism which pervades some outlying neighborhoods of Chicago.

But the fact is that many of these programs still are meaningless to the Consortium leaders, who contend that, no matter how well intentioned they may be, they are still devised by and are being executed by whites.

The Metropolitan YMCA is scheduled shortly to begin a $2.5-million fund-raising campaign to meet current expenses, and it is always seeking increments to its endowment. Furthermore, some of its funds come from hotels and residences, membership fees and other activities.

Thus, it is peculiarly vulnerable to a variety of attacks from any disciplined group of protesters. COS and the Consortium already have written letters to some board members and Y contributors to demand support for their drive.

[From the Washington (D.C.) Post, Mar. 2, 1969]

STITCHING UP OUR COLLEGES

(By F. Champion Ward)

(NOTE.—This article by the Ford Foundation's vice president for the division of education and research is excerpted by permission from the Foundation's annual report.)

Since the latest "crisis in higher education" is easier to discuss than to understand and since it shows no sign of early abatement, we may expect more punditry on the subject. Prophecy already ranges from the visions of the "relevant" university as coextensive with the latest set of the Nation's burning problems to plans for better moats, portcullises and halberdiers to defend the ivory tower from the Urban Coalition, the student Internationale, intrusive politicians and the local police.

The comments which follow have a less apocalyptic theme. They rest on these assumptions: that whatever else may be said about the present crisis, it has strained the institutional fabric of American universities and colleges; that strengthening that fabric is now the first order of business if higher education is to make its aims clear and quicken its responses under stress, and that there is, in fact, slack to be taken up and new weaving to be done before the universities and colleges can be either despaired of or successfully defended.

For the crisis has made it clear that unquestioned routines and unthinking loyalties no longer insure the integrity and rational order of academic communities.

Students take nothing for granted, faculty members are distracted from institutional concerns and administrators, trustees and alumni find themselves calling for unity and civility as fragmentation and disruption increases.

SOME STUDENTS ARE HALF RIGHT

Let us examine the present state of the constituent "publics" or "estates" of a university and consider some ways in which each may be reinforced and connected to the others so as to add to the university's tensile strength. And let us begin where the headlines begin, with students.

In spite of the temptation to generalize about them, students remain very different from one another. This is true even of that large minority of affluent heretics called "dissident students."

Some of the latter are so bent on social revolution that they oppose all sanctuaries and all local repairs to existing institutions. Each part of a decaying society, they hold, should illustrate the rottenness of the whole. At least until the Vietnam war is ended, this group will continue to present the universities with problems of sheer security which can no longer be resolved within what is left of the tradition of civility, community and informal administration.

In this encounter, the stakes for the Nation's intellectual life and social progress are very high, for until force can be made to yield to persuasion, there will be a grave danger that university affairs, including the conduct of individual students, will come under an improper measure of control by the political representatives of an alienated public.

A second group of dissidents seeks to improve the universities and colleges, not to demolish them. But many members of this group are so impatient for perfection that no finite amount of reform is likely to be enough for them.

They are outraged by the combination of imperfection and persistence which, like their parents, existing institutions display. And they are too ardent to accept, or even entertain, the sad truth of Spinoza's dictum that "all things excellent are as difficult as they are rare."

Responsive universities can hope to reduce this group, but not to zero. They should assume that a vigilant and reproachful remnant will survive every actual reform, to inveigh against the renewal of complacency which its adoption has induced and to contrast its superficiality with what must still be done.

There remain many students who are critical of their university or college but are not too visionary to be met halfway. They may be half-baked, but in what they have to say about the programs and teaching which they often encounter they are at least half right.

In fact, most of the words which these students employ in saying what their education ought to be come straight from the lexicon of educational uplift with which all college catalogues begin and convocation talks conclude. In the mouths of responsible dissidents, even the demand for "student power" reflects disappointment in the failure of educators to match deed to word rather than a romantic desire to seize the universities.

COMBINING RIGOR, RELEVANCE

These students are asking questions of higher education which are directed to the relation between established disciplines and courses of study and age-old questions of individual fulfillment and commitment, on the one hand, and the world's tensions and demands on the other.

They do not wish to be processed or certified. (Some of them seem not even to want to be taught.) They are irreverent toward established routines and unquestioned goals, and they see in form the natural enemy of sincerity. They want the university to be both liberal and relevant, pure but not detached, involved in the world but not subserving worldly ends.

Judging from such a case as New College, in Florida, which has lived its first years during the period of student unrest, a mixture of courses, teaching and academic organization on which critical students appear to thrive is not beyond contrivance by serious educators.

Nor need such a program sacrifice intellectual rigor to such threats to established practice as "relevance," "student initiative," pass-fail grading and a three-year B.A.

Sharing of academic responsibilities with students can be expected to add to the cohesion of our universities and colleges by engaging the long-term interest and understanding of future graduates. To date, universities which have so involved students appear to have encountered some success and no recorded disasters.

The level of committee discussion is said to have sunk no lower with students present; students have found some tasks onerous or trival and other sobering; and some promising ideas have been saved from indefinite deferment or adopted sooner than they might otherwise have been.

If experience of educational reform, engaging both educators and students, can be pressed to yield its full lessons during the next few years, the strengths and limitations of "student power" as an influence in university communities can be made clear.

The present "dialogue of the deaf" on this subject shows how important it is that the universities and colleges get beyond the state of affairs now obtaining in many places, where conventional programs compete blindly with gypsy encampments (called "free universities") in the surrounding hills. In the end, the yeast and the lump belong together.

FACULTY MEMBERS AS STATESMEN

As students file a new claim to power, some faculties are finding that their own long-held powers have lapsed from disuse.

The need to meet extraordinary and fundamental challenges found some of our most eminent institutions without central faculty bodies of manageable size, established procedures for meeting or open lines of communication to administrators, schools and departments and students.

Torpid and unwieldy senates and distracted professors are not the stuff of which institutional clarity and responsiveness are made, and administrators seeking in time of crisis to share responsibility with faculties (a partnership not always cultivated in time of peace) have found that they could not be sure of a quorum or even of the support of those professors in attendance.

A first corrective is clearly of this structural kind. Faculties should elect deliberative bodies which meet regularly and which have frequent and substantive contact with the administrators of the university in connection with its general policies and educational program.

But will professors exercise or neglect such duties? We are told that they now neglect them, preferring the undisturbed pursuit of personal advancement. Concern for the overall progress and program of the university is left to administrators, in uneasy association with a few faculty wheelhorses whom the departments depute to protect their interests at unavoidable committee meetings.

This problem is complex and deeply rooted in the academic culture. Yet there are signs that it is going to be attacked by some universities not yet convinced that it cannot be solved.

On the theory that strong "institutional men" or "educational statesmen" can be developed by deliberate means, Stanford University proposes to place a number of its best young scholars and scientists in a special status as "University Fellows" for terms of three years to work with academic administrators, faculty groups and others on problems having to do with Stanford's whole program or aspects thereof which are not reducible to departmental or individual concerns.

This is not a device to lure honest professors into "administration" (half of the University Fellows' time will be available for their own work); rather, it rests on the plausible notion that if faculties are to exercise their general powers over university programs, faculty members should actually deliberate about them from a perspective not restricted to their discipline or department. This may require an altered career line for at least some professors.

Another way in which individual faculty members of high competence might extend their powers as statesmen, teachers and researchers would be through the wider use of initial appointments of six or seven years' duration.

Such a period would be long enough so that the professor would not be forced to choose among these faculty roles but could make room in his professional life for serious teaching, contributions to institutional policy and the completion of a solid book or complex piece of research.

An extension of this means of institutional enlistment of faculty members would involve looking upon the whole of a tenured faculty member's career as embracing all of these kinds of contributions and perhaps a period of national or international service as well.

Whatever the merits of these devices, they at least suggest that universities need not yet accept faculty itinerancy and indifference to institutional concerns as faults already beyond repair.

AID FOR ADMINISTRATORS

Much has been written recently about the multiple burdens now borne by university and college presidents. It has been less often noted that presidents now have considerably more help in academic administration than in the past.

Academic vice presidents, provosts and deans of faculties have multiplied as delegates of the president in matters of education and research. At a time of centrifugal tendencies, this development can have a considerable countervailing influence, if the internal structure of universities can be made more responsive to that influence.

Inventive students, faculty statesmen and academic administrators need to be able to finance at least the exploratory phases of educational improvements from institutional funds functioning as a kind of internal foundation. Whether these devices will begin to restore the balance between internal and external concerns remains to be seen, but the interest of some universities in such a restoration is itself promising in view of the many predictions of disintegration now to be heard in the land.

Administrators worried about the indifference of professors to institutional purposes might consider another means of enlistment. Professors and faculties with institutionally advertised expertise in such subjects as architecture, law, urban sociology, economics and management are too rarely consulted by their own university in connection with its administrative decisions.

It is therefore hardly surprising that those decisions are often deplored by members of the faculty who might have taken part in them and who, had they done so, might even have reached the same conclusions.

TAPPING ALUMNI RESOURCES

In general, graduates are now related to their colleges through appeals for support, invitations to reunions and cheering news of campus happenings and achievements. Even in the stronger colleges and universities, alumni activities as now organized often fail either to exploit or to help fulfill the specialized interests and capabilities of alumni as these develop following graduation.

Quite apart from the need to reach graduates for the usual fund-raising purposes, increased interplay between alumni and current students and faculty on the basis of shared intellectual and social interests could toughen institutional fiber in two ways.

By reducing mutual ignorance, it would lessen the chances of alienation between alumni and the current campus. By engaging faculty, students and capable alumni in joint activities having intellectual or educational substance and social value, the institution's current faculty and student body would be reminded of the long-term results of their educational efforts.

And they might, through such exchanges with able and inquiring alumni, make valuable changes in current programs.

In the case of most institutions, such an effort would require better direction and more information and planning than most alumni offices and associations are now able to provide.

ADVICE AND CONSENT

Boards of private universities and colleges have until recently modeled themselves on Aristotle's diety: moving others, they have not been moved. Now, there are stirrings which suggest that this may cease to be true.

The occasion for change appears to be the "generation gap," which has made for a certain uneasiness about the average age and tenure of trustees. In truth, the procedures of trustee selection tend to elevate the age of those chosen, whether by co-option or alumni election.

It usually takes some time to become wealthy, eminent or prudent and to be judged so by those who are already credited with these attributes. Also, it is difficult for recent graduates to become known widely enough to be selected.

Yet it seems clear that recent graduates must be added to boards of trustees if the latter are to understand the words they hear from students and younger faculty, or even wish to hear them. Some boards are pondering ways to infect themselves with the virus of youth without subscribing to the full metaphysic of "participatory democracy."

Potentially more important, if not yet topical, is the question whether the financial and fiduciary roles of boards of trustees and their roles in respect of academic development should be distinguished more sharply than at present, or even separated.

It is tempting to speculate on the possible value to a university if *all* of its constituent publics were to be represented on an All-University Educational Council charged with reviewing and advising upon the evolution of the university's whole program, not distributively, as in the case of visiting committee's, but in the light of the university's history and central purpose, its chosen relationship to its environment and its resources.

Such a body should include graduates who have themselves entered academic and professional life elsewhere, other graduates whose occupations enable them to discuss the university's program in relation to developments in the Nation and the world, representative faculty members, students and trustees.

It would be presided over by the president of the university. It would exercise a kind of "advise and consent" function which tends to be perfunctory or arbitrary when performed as one part of its task by the usual board of trustees or when limited aspects of institutional problems are dealt with in separation from each other.

The deliberations of such a council could arm its university with a body of educational principles and institutional policies which would not have to be conjured up or smoked out in time of crisis because they would already enjoy the understanding, if not the unanimous support, of all of the university's publics.

[From the Washington (D.C.) Post, Mar. 2, 1969]

THE WRIGHT SCHOOL DECISION

SIR: In a letter to The Star a short time after Judge J. Skelley Wright's decision in the infamous case of Julius Hobson vs. the District School Board, Dr. Carl Hansen, et al., I characterized that proceeding as a bald usurpation of judicial power, a misconception of the traditional judicial function and, in a practical sense, a social and political disaster. Subsequent events, in my opinion, have confirmed this judgment.

Now that this judicial monstrosity has been laid to rest, temporarily at least, by a face-saving decision by four out of seven members of the Circuit Court of Appeals, some further comment may be in order.

The Hobson case should have been thrown out by the trial court at the first hearing; it was lackadaisically defended, since a majority of the old school board seemed to favor the plaintiff; the real parties in interest, the citizens and children of the District, were not represented; Dr. Carl Hansen, the superintendent, one of the finest educators in America, found himself in an impossible position, badgered because he believed in ability grouping for pupils and a sensible and gradual approach to the unsolvable problem of integration. In short, the militant liberals were in the saddle, not only among the defendants, but in the judiciary as well.

So the people and the children lost the contrived battle. A decree came down from the trial judge in effect outlawing de facto neighborhood segregation, ordering busing of of students ostensibly to overcome overcrowding in schools (Congress had prohibited busing to achieve racial "balance"), faculty integration, and the end of optional attendance zones (freedom of choice), and last, but not least, abolishing the track, or ability-grouping system. To enforce his order, Judge Wright took over the function of administering policy in the area involved from the school board.

There is no doubt that this outrageous case was a major factor in causing the decline of any real quality education in the public schools of the District of Columbia and that it has contributed greatly to bringing about the present turbulence, infighting and maladministration characterizing the school system. How can any school educate children without recognizing and making provision for differences among pupils in intelligence and ability to absorb learning? The ideal of equality as applied to such factors is simply nonsense.

As to integration, Appellate Judge Bazelon neglected to face up to the fact that the District enrollment is well over 90 percent black and growing blacker by the year. "Residential patterns and the heavy concentration of black children in the District public schools may defy the best efforts of the Board of Education to achieve racially balanced schools," he said. Thus, it appears that this was the purpose of this litigation from the beginning. But the jurist had no answer to the problem of complete or near-complete black resegregation, now in the offing. He did suggest, however, that the long-run solution might be to extend the District school district into the suburbs, which would presumably bring about a better racial mix.

If there is any lesson to be learned from all this, it is that no universal, enforced integration in the schools in Washington (or elsewhere, in my belief) will ever work, and that, ultimately, the nonbelievers will rouse themselves and militantly and effectively demand that the politicians and the judiciary quit tampering with the country's school districts and that the schools themselves be permitted to go back to old-fashioned, traditional concepts that have educated most of our leaders and in a sense helped mightily in making this country great. Education, if mixed up with or subordinated to social objectives, is bound to languish and perhaps perish entirely.

ALLEN C. PHELPS.

[From the Washington (D.C.) Post, Mar. 2, 1969]

A NEW BREED OF PANTHER

(By Ross K. Baker, assistant professor of political science, Rutgers University)

The bomb came through the open door of the store front at 321 Hawthorne Avenue at 4 in the morning Nov. 21. Carl Nichols, captain of the Newark Black Panther Party, was standing in front of one of the battered wooden desks that served as the main piece of office equipment in the headquarters. The impact from the bomb threw Nichols over the desk, showering him with phosphorus and breaking his right arm. The panel truck from which the bomb was thrown sped away down the street in Newark's black Central Ward. In the view of the Panthers, another skirmish in their war with the police had taken place.

Nichols received emergency hospital treatment and should have been admitted, but he and his colleagues feared another attempt on his life. Since then, Carl Nichols has moved from apartment to apartment in order to prevent his enemies from finishing the job.

The alleged assailants in the bomb incident, as far as the Panthers are concerned, are two Jersey City policemen who, in their off-duty hours, contrive ways to harass and intimidate the Black Panthers. The police have the license numbers of cars owned by the Panther Party members and tow them away for parking offenses for which other vehicles merely receive tickets. The headquarters are closely watched, and when groups of Panthers leave the headquarters (they believe in the safety of numbers and travel in groups) they are usually followed. With New Jersey's new wiretap law, the restrictions on bugging their phones have also been removed, and the Panthers expect to be tapped.

BOMBING THE POLICE

On Dec. 11, 1967, a group of Panthers was traveling south on the Garden State Parkway toward New Brunswick, where they were to appear before a class at Rutgers. One car blew a tire and as the other two stopped to help, the members found themselves surrounded by half a dozen state police cruisers.

The mishap provided the police with an opportunity to interrogate the Panthers and the three white students who were driving the cars.

The parkway incident was a bloodless standoff, but it demonstrated that between battles, tactical intelligence is diligently carried on by the police.

The Panthers are by no means exclusively on the receiving end. A bomb struck a Jersey City station house early in January and the police concluded that it was in retaliation for the attack on Nichols. Several members of the Panthers were arrested. The Panthers denied that they were involved in the Jersey City bombing. If such a reprisal were, in fact, perpetrated by the Panthers, it would have been at variance with their frequently repeated statements of violence only in self-defense.

Self-defense as a belief, a working principle and an operational code has been stressed by Jerry James, a captain from the Orange branch of the party, who has taken charge of the Newark chapter during Carl Nichols' convalescence.

THE PIG IMAGE

Most of the incidents that the Panthers have found themselves in, here and on the West Coast, have been in response to police attempts at search, seizure or arrest. These police initiatives are considered by the Panthers to be provocation requiring acts of self-defense. The slaying of a police officer in Oakland, Calif., and the wounding of Huey Newton, the Panther leader, occurred in the context of a police search of Newton's car. Given the Panther definition of self-defense, the killing of a policeman is usually regarded as a case of justifiable homicide.

The wings of Panther self-defense, however, extend beyond the Panthers themselves to cover the entire black community. The Panthers claim that police activities within the ghetto are usually repressive and aimed at persecution rather than protection. The black man, according to James, is the target of law enforcement rather than its beneficiary.

James asserts that among the police, indeed, within the entire white community, there is a pervasive presumption of wrongdoing in regard to black men. The assumption is that a black man is never really up to any good. When a black man walks along the street with a coat on a hanger, a radio in his hands or a parcel under his arm, he immediately becomes subject to suspicion. That a black person has purchased an article rather than stolen it is difficult for the police to believe.

The normal courtesy rendered by the most hardboiled police officer to the most blatant white malefactor is the quintessence of cordiality when compared to the suspicious, hostile and brutal treatment accorded to the black man. The police presumption of black criminality has its parallel in the black presumption of police savagery.

The image of the policeman as a pig permeates Panther demonology and is everywhere in Panther writings and dialogue. The mention of the word "police," indeed, is avoided assiduously by the Panthers. James referred variously to the "Newark pigs" and the "New Jersey State pigs." The disdain and hatred of the police by the Panthers extends to the self-proclaimed auxiliaries of the police in Newark, such as Anthony Imperiale's North Ward Citizens Council.

There is a highly touted but dubiously effective hot line that runs from the headquarters of Imperiale's white militant organization to the home of Leroi Jones, the black nationalist poet. The efficacy of this cold war link must be judged by the degree of control that Jones has in restraining black passions and Imperiale in controlling white reaction.

Although Jones is well known to Newark blacks and is on the periphery of the Panther Party, he is often gone from Newark on lecture tours, and local black organizations tend to resent the presence of black celebrities, especially during periods of tension and confrontation.

The appearance of Stokely Carmichael at Columbia University during the student riots was regarded by some black student leaders on the Morningside Heights campus as a publicity stunt. The idea of the hot line, generally regarded as the brainchild of Newark's Police Commissioner Dominic Spina, was actually the idea of a professional "crisis manager" brought in as a consultant on ways to reduce tensions.

Such grandstand plays by well-intentioned or publicity-conscious outsiders rarely produce any lasting benefits.

NAIVETE AMONG WHITES

The resentment toward outside luminaries, experts and mediators who attempt to resolve local conflicts of which they are only vaguely aware, demonstrates the fallacy of a monolithic, Nationwide "black community." It also indicates a high degree of naivete among white leaders who feel that any well-known black leader can simply drop in on any black ghetto and can, by dint of his reputation, force of personality or color, effectively ply his good offices.

This simplistic view of black social organization is the supreme act of condescension.

For the nub of community control is that local people conversant with local issues that precipitate local grievances are the only individuals equipped to produce local settlements or agreements.

Despite the appearance of Nationwide organization, and its attendant roster of celebrities, the Black Panther Party is in reality a loosely connected structure of local chapters concerned primarily with local issues. This is one of the greatest strengths of the party.

There is an unspoken but devoutly pursued code that each local chapter is the best judge of how to cope with conditions in its own city. Despite their national reputations, Huey Newton, Bobby Seale and Eldridge Cleaver of the Oakland chapter have strenuously avoided imposing themselves on other chapters.

The Congress for Racial Equality (CORE) and the Student Nonviolent Coordinating Committee (SNCC) produced a large number of peregrinating prima donnas who, armed with the lustre and renown of national recognition, traveled the length and breadth of America as bearers of Olympian advice from their national headquarters. This facile notion of interchangeable leadership has contributed to the decline of these groups and has raised the Panthers to their currently exalted status within many black communities.

LAND FOR BLACK MAN

There is, to be sure, a national platform consisting of ten points, among which are: land for black men, exemption for black men from military service, black control of black communities and freedom for all blacks currently held in state, local and Federal jails.

This last plank, Jerry James explained, was not for the purpose of turning loose convicted felons but rather is related to another plank which states that black men accused of crimes have the right to be judged by their black peers. The underlying theory here is that only a ghetto resident is competent to judge the circumstances which would prompt a black man to commit a crime. According to Panther analysis, all black men currently serving time are illegally incarcerated.

The issue of land for black men is one which the Newark Panthers, at least, speak about most passionately. Urban renewal is characterized by the Newark Panthers as "black removal." The interstate highway and the construction of new office buildings in former areas of high density housing are tangible enemies of the ghetto resident.

As James put it, "When a black man is thrown out of his house, he never puts his roots down again." Urban renewal is perceived as the work of unresponsive and arrogant bureaucrats who cater to the needs of large corporations, affluent suburban motorists and disciples of beautification. For Jerry James, the new high-rise public housing units in Newark are "vertical concentration camps."

Last Dec. 19, James and a group of Panthers from Newark and Orange went to Washington to protest the routing of Interstate Highway 75 through a black area of Newark. What a curious thing for revolutionaries to do, to protest against a proposed highway! Here were men whose public utterances call for a totally restructured society, a socialist economy and the abolition of capitalism. It is difficult to visualize Lenin visiting the Imperial Ministry of Highways in St. Petersburg to protest against a proposed highway through the proletarian quarters of Moscow.

James would explain this by saying, "We pursue our revolution with a book in one hand and a rifle in the other," and that the Panthers serve an educative as well as an agitative function. There is more to it, however.

Under a rather flamboyant doctrinal overlay, there is a profoundly reformist nature in the Panthers of Newark. It is precisely their fearsome revolutionary image, however, that provides the Panthers with the scare power to exert leverage upon the white establishment.

THE CLENCHED FIST

So far, at least, the Newark Panthers have leaned more heavily on the book than on the rifle. They have been less aggressor than the objects of aggression.

Self-protection is necessarily a passive role. If Mao and Castro were only interested in protecting the Chinese and Cuban peasants, they would still be in the caves of Yenan and the hills of Sierra Maestra. The doctrine, symbolism and style of the Panthers are strongly revolutionary. The black beret, the leather jacket and the clenched fist salute all point to a cohesive, dedicated band of black insurgents bent on the destruction of the system. The actual record of the Panthers indicates otherwise. There has not been a single violent incident involving outsiders and Panthers that has stemmed exclusively from Panther initiative.

The random acts of terror directed against New York policemen last summer were not traced to the Panthers. The deaths of two members of the Los Angeles Panthers at UCLA on Jan. 17 were part of an internal power struggle over leadership of the vocal and articulate black student groups at the university. The tragic events of Cleveland last summer when black snipers led by Fred Ahmed Evans fired on police were likewise not precipitated by the Panthers.

The decentralized structure of the Panthers makes it very difficult to generalize about them as a national party, and the Jersey chapters appear to differ in some aspects, both in style and behavior, from the West Coast groups.

Doctrinal leadership and propaganda emanate from the charter chapters on the West Coast, especially Oakland. The weekly newspaper, the Black Panther, comes from the Ministry of Information in San Francisco. The Newark chapter receives its copies of the paper by air from California and distributes them locally. The newspaper comes on as a strident, inflammatory, scatological, revolutionary tabloid which is quite at variance with the relatively subdued, polite, almost cordial manner that the Newark and

Orange chapter members convey in person. In relations with white people, this is the marked difference between the publication and the Panthers in person. This may, however, depend on who the whites are.

WHO IS A RACIST?

In their denunciation of the existing power structure, the Panthers have put their finger on one of the most crucial components of politics in America: the corporate nature of political power, which decrees that a functional ethnic or economic group can wield decisive power and, indeed, veto political actions by virtue of its political "clout" within the system. Blacks have yet to appreciate their own power and have been excluded from this corporate interlocking directorate of American pressure and veto groups.

One of the standard denunciations of the Panthers is that they are racist. Panther Capt. James, however, went out of his way to deny that the Panthers were racist; that they advocated black supremacy or in any way regarded black men as morally or biologically superior to whites.

"A great many people," James said, "think that the Panthers are racist. We find this belief so absurd, Eldridge Cleaver said, we do not even want to respond to such a charge. We consistently maintain that any Panther who is a racist or is thought to be one is immediately expelled from the party. We are an army of liberation for blacks, but in the process we intend to liberate the poor whites as well."

WHITE STUDENTS AS ALLIES

As for the white student radicals, the Panthers see them as important tactical allies. A cynical reading of this view is that the Panthers regard white student radicals as tools, rather than equal collaborators. James does say that "whites can go places that blacks cannot. If they (the white student radicals) can do this and teach the people or at least begin the process of making them aware of their plight, we can finish the job."

The partnership aspects of a black militant-white militant combination, however, are even more strongly stressed by James.

"All through history, black men in America have assumed that all whites are enemies. Now, however, we find that white college radicals are our allies with whom we can fight the revolution together. We will get black power for our people; they will get white power for their people."

As an example of a black racist organization, James points to the Black Muslims. The Newark Panthers are proud of the defections from the Muslims to the Panthers. One of James's aides is Lt. Shabazz, a former Muslim.

The Panthers espouse none of the religious doctrines which characterize the Muslims. Both groups do put a premium on self-defense: the Muslims on judo and karate and the Panthers on marksmanship. James would probably say that karate is not much use against a man with a machine gun.

The two groups have in common a highly moralistic, almost puritanical code of behavior. Some of the ten rules of conduct for the Panthers are:

No party member can have narcotics or "weed" in his possession while doing party work.

Any party member found shooting narcotics will be expelled from the party.

No member can be drunk while doing party work.

There are also prohibitions against theft and against pointing weapons at anyone but the enemy.

One thing that is very striking about the Panther group in Newark and Orange is that women play a clearly marginal role. The "sisters," as they are called, do have the simulated military rank carried by the men, but they are manifestly the support unit in this black army.

The Central Committee of the Black Panther Party includes only one woman, Kathleen Cleaver, the wife of the novelist and Minister of Information, Eldridge Cleaver.

The attractive young black women in the Newark-Orange group were clearly not as serious or as dedicated as the men. James was careful to post a man with the women when they were talking to outsiders lest the women fail to describe properly the goals and nature of the party.

Despite its display of party paraphernalia and invocation of Panther symbols, the "ladies' auxiliary" is clearly not central to the operation of the group. It is a man's movement and one of its unspoken but salient features is the establishment of the primacy of the black male in the context of a revolutionary movement.

First, and most important, the Panthers are a growing movement. They are receiving considerable attention and support from the young black men and women of the ghettos. They have prospered and expanded at the expense of SNCC, CORE and the Black Muslims. The former group has in fact been merged with the Panthers at the invitation of Stokely Carmichael, who is himself a Panther now.

Second, and this may be applicable only to the North Jersey groups, they are neither as menacing, revolutionary nor aggressive as most whites think. They are victims, to a certain extent, of the very success of the image they hoped to create.

WHAT'S IN A NAME?

It is difficult for any group calling itself the Black Panthers to be regarded by the public as anything but dogmatically racist, singularly revolutionary and uncompromisingly violent. This impression has created the desired amount of fear but it has also caused them to be set upon more unjustly and gratuitously than if they had called themselves, say, the "Black Lemmings" or the "Black Chipmunks." But what they lose in public relations with a largely hostile or fearful white community, they gain in the kind of "scare value" that can wrest concessions from the hated establishment.

An equally important gain is in the respect and admiration they garner among blacks. That a black man can be a panther—a fearless, stalking hunter of lesser animals—is similar in many ways to the image of the Israeli as a soldier or an Irishman as a cop.

It is a case of the last becoming first. For the black man, it is transition from supplicant to stalwart; from peon to paladin. How sweet it is, after centuries of being ridiculed and scorned as a bumbling, feckless object of pity, to be the object of fear and dread.

It might be inferred that this public image of the Panthers as unalloyed militants interferes, to a degree, with their efforts aimed at changes within the system; that it would be difficult for them to present themselves as "responsible spokesmen" of the black community. But this is precisely the image the Panthers hope to achieve, for they see their role as "irresponsible spokesmen" as an infinitely more productive approach. That the Panthers prefer to use threats and menacing gestures is less a commentary on black extremism than it is on the unresponsiveness of whites.

This brings up a third characteristic which again may be peculiar to the Newark-Orange group, and that is the strongly reformist, system-oriented posture which characterizes the Panthers as an operational rather than ideological group.

The Panthers do not seem to spend a great deal of time planning the precise configurations of a postrevolutionary society. In the Newark-Orange group, at any rate, there was disagreement over precisely what revolutionary model the Panthers followed. James said the Chinese. Capt. Lou, who had spent several years in North Africa, said the Algerian, and Lt. Shabazz said the Cuban.

Both the revolutionary paradigm and the tactical requirements leading up to it seem to have been left deliberately vague. Revolutionary planning is apparently less important than the projection of a revolutionary image and style.

If the Panthers are not presently dedicated to the total overthrow of the system, why do they employ revolutionary symbols?

The answer probably lies in the fact that low-keyed deferential appeals by old-style, middle-class black groups are seen as failing to win the substantial, tangible benefits produced by violence. Fearful of black riots, the white community has proven considerably more tractable than it was when petitions, boycotts and sit-ins were used to articulate black interests.

When James talks about the book and the rifle, he appears to be offering a choice between the two. But these Panthers with their power to frighten and enlighten have discovered that the book will receive greater attention when the rifle is in plain view.

THE PRICE OF RESTRAINT

The second question relevant to the thesis of the reformist Panthers is whether or not they will continue to operate within the system. The response to this is that they will exhibit restraint if the system is able to process black demands in a reasonably effective fashion, particularly in law enforcement, urban renewal, education and welfare.

The third question is whether they will continue to seek common cause with certain sections of the white community, notably the campus militants. A partial answer was provided by James when he exhorted the students not to change; to maintain their radical views and carry them on after college and pass them on to future university students. The white militant students are the Panthers' only link to white society. As long as these student groups exist, the Panthers will probably trust them and cooperate with them. The most successful Panther chapters are those with easy access to large universities with substantial numbers of white student radicals.

IF DESPAIR SETS IN

The last question is what the Panthers will do if they give up on the system as unresponsive, unsympathetic and obdurate.

There are several models for the Panthers to follow if despair sets in. They can go the way of the Evans group in Cleveland, engaging in hopeless random acts of violence and terror with predictably tragic consequences, given the asymmetry of strength between them and the forces of law and order. They can indulge in revolutionary cabals and conspiracies like RAM (the Revolutionary Action Movement), which allegedly seeks to assassinate systematically moderate black leaders, or they can opt out altogether like Robert Williams and his Republic of New Africa.

One fact does emerge from this assessment of the Black Panther Party: they are neither the most extreme, the most potentially destructive nor the most negative force to emerge from the hopelessness and squalor of America's black ghettos.

If white Americans dig in their heels and attempt to turn back the clock, black organizations will arise that will make white people long for the day when the angry, articulate Black Panthers acted as spokesmen for black people.

This was stated most eloquently by James as he sat in his apartment on the day he was released from Hudson County Jail. Across his lap was a 16-shot, pump action Remington rifle. "There are madmen in the ghetto," he said, "men who will kill any white on any pretext, and they're waiting for me to fail. They may even hurry the process by killing me. You can't deal with these people. Next to them, the Panthers come off looking like moderates."

PREVAILING WAGES FOR MOTION PICTURE INDUSTRY

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

Mr. BROWN of California. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced a bill designed to correct a glaring omission in the pattern of prevailing wage statutes administered by the U.S. Department of Labor pertaining to employees working on Government contracts by extending similar protection to workers engaged in the production and processing of motion picture films by private contractors for Federal departments and agencies.

The American motion picture industry represents an important segment of the national economy in the United States, employing several hundred thousand workers in its various branches. Nearly 45,000 well-trained, highly skilled and specialized craftsmen, technicians, professional employees and related or supporting personnel are directly involved in film production activities.

With the exception of the United States, almost every significant film-producing country of the world subsidizes the domestic production of motion pictures within its borders in one way or another. The superior wage rates and favorable conditions of employment that prevail for American film production employees have been successfully achieved without Government subsidies through many decades of strike-free good faith collective bargaining. In recent years, the economic stability of our domestic motion picture industry has been jeopardized because of so-called runaway foreign film production by American producers in other countries overseas where the advantages of cheaper labor costs and cash subsidies or other forms of State aid are available. At the time time, the leverage of the Federal Government's immense purchasing power to affect film production and processing locally has created an additional handicap to the maintenance of fair labor standards in this field. Millions of dollars are spent annually in this country to make films for departments and agencies of the United States with contractors who compete unfairly for such Government business by paying substandard wages and denying the usual fringe benefits, such as health and welfare and pensions, to their employees.

Ever since the 1930's, the passage of laws discouraging substandard labor conditions as an element in competition among business enterprises seeking to obtain Government contracts has been on integral part of our national economic policy. The first major prevailing wage legislation for Government contractors was initiated back in 1931 when the Congress adopted the Davis-Bacon Act. That legislation provided prevailing wage protection for the public works employees whose hours of labor had long been regulated by the so-called 8-hour law made up of statutes enacted in 1892 and 1912 and amended in 1913 and 1917. The Davis-Bacon Act itself was amended in 1964 to prescribe fringe benefits also for laborers and mechanics employed on Federal public works construction contracts.

The Walsh-Healey Public Contracts Act, enacted 5 years after Davis-Bacon, on June 30, 1936, represents the broadest exercise of congressional power in this field. Walsh-Healey prescribed prevailing wages, overtime pay and other labor standards for employees working on all Government contracts in excess of $10,000 for manufacturing or furnishing of materials, supplies, articles or equipment.

Following the development of appropriate machinery and procedures within the U.S. Department of Labor to make reasonable determinations of prevailing minimum wage rates for specific classes of work in given localities and to enforce these and other labor standards prescribed by Davis-Bacon and Walsh-Healey, various other Federal laws regulating employment conditions for employees working on projects performed for or financed by the U.S. Government were adopted during the 1960's.

The Contract Work Hours Standards Act, as title I of the Work Hours Act of 1962 is known, established weekly as well as daily overtime pay requirements for laborers and mechanics on Federal public works and on work financed in whole or in part by the Federal Government.

The McNamara-O'Hara Service Contract Act of 1965 fixed prevailing minimum wage rate and fringe benefit requirements for craftsmen, manual laborers, guards, watchmen, and supervisors in positions having predominantly trade, craft, or laboring experience who are engaged in work under Government contracts to furnish services to Federal agencies.

The National Foundation of the Arts and the Humanities Act of 1965 applied this same prevailing wage principle to projects of productions assisted by grants from the National Endowment for the Arts. Under section 5(k) of that act, the Secretary of Labor is empowered to establish minimum compensation and other specified labor standards for professional performers and related or supporting professional personnel employed on such assisted projects or productions. Laborers and mechanics employed on assisted construction projects are afforded the protection of Davis-Bacon prevailing minimum wage rates and fringe benefits under section 5(l) of that act.

My bill, which seeks to accomplish much the same purpose as H.R. 3849 introduced on January 16, 1969, by my distinguished colleague from California, the Honorable CHARLES H. WILSON, would provide that prevailing minimum wage rates and fringe benefits for workers employed in the performance of any contract or subcontract entered into with the Federal Government for the production or processing of motion picture films shall be determined and enforced by the Labor Department in the same manner as for service employees under the McNamara-O'Hara Service Contract Act of 1965. Since the protection of prevailing wage legislation is already enjoyed by so many other types of employees working on Government contracts it should be extended to American film workers making motion picture films which are such a valuable aid to the conduct of governmental functions in the field of mass communications.

LEADERSHIP OF AMERICAN AIRCRAFT INDUSTRY THREATENED FROM ABROAD

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

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, my congratulations today go to the consortium of British and French which successfully flew their supersonic transport this past weekend. This achievement came after many serious problems were overcome, but dedication to a program resulted in success and constituted, I might add, a new threat to the leadership in aircraft production now held by American industry.

Likewise there is additional competition, Mr. Speaker, from the Soviet Union which test flew its SST last December and, for all appearances, is determined to become a strong competitor in building airplanes for the world's market.

This, more than ever, demands that we in the United States dedicate ourselves to this program so as to protect the prestige and excellence which now belong to the U.S. aircraft industry. The future of the extensive lead the United States has today in aircraft transport production is at stake, as indicated by the fact that the Boeing Co., today has 122 orders for the American version of the SST as compared to about 70 for the British-French Concorde. This clearly indicates the faith the world's airlines have in American aircraft, but we are faced with the loss of these orders if we do not dedicate ourselves to continued orderly development of the American SST. I should add that 58 of these orders for the U.S. SST are from foreign airlines.

I sincerely trust the administration, after their careful review of the SST program, will call for the continuation of the prototype development, and I urge my colleagues to support this vital program which is essential to the maintenance of American aircraft prestige, vital to our balance of payments, important to American labor to whom it will mean many thousands of jobs, and paramount to the defense of the United States from a military application point of view.

AN IRREGULARITY UNDER THE CORRUPT PRACTICES ACT

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

Mr. KYL. Mr. Speaker, for some time Members of the House have debated the propriety of a number of the mandatory census questions, this especially in light of the revelation that the Census Bureau and other departments of Government sell unpublished materials for commercial interests.

Here on the Hill we also have an example of this kind of business. Under the Corrupt Practices Act every candidate, every party, must file a list of contributors as well as a list of the expenditures made during the political campaign. These records are on file. Now we have enterprising entrepreneurs sending people to the Hill, to the record offices, copying the names of the contributors and selling these lists to solicitors for commercial purposes.

These records are a matter of corrupt practice review and congressional ethics. These reports should be open to the public, completely open to the public, for the purposes of checking on the ethics of politics, but its use for commercial purposes is wrong. I have introduced legislation to void that practice, Mr. Speaker.

LAW ENFORCEMENT EXHIBIT

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

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Speaker, I regret to observe that with respect to law and order, many criticize; however, few are able to recommend constructive suggestions or measures to encourage respectability and rapport between citizen and police officer.

I am proud to bring to your attention the fact that the Federal Bar Association has taken positive, tangible steps to implement such relationships by sponsoring a law enforcement exhibit. The Law Observance Committee of the Federal Bar Association and its chairman, Mr. Harry D. Shargel, are to be commended for their outstanding work.

I am confident the following information relative to this subject will be of interest to all concerned. If the opportunity of taking advantage of viewing this exhibit presents itself, I cannot encourage your patronage strongly enough:

A law enforcement exhibit first displayed in the Philadelphia area on February 22, 1968, has now, 1 year later, been scheduled for display in Texas and New Mexico during this calendar year. The exhibit is sponsored by the Federal Bar Association's Law Observance Committee.

According to the committee chairman, Harry D. Shargel, the exhibit was first displayed in the Plymouth Meeting Hall, in Pennsylvania on February 22, 1968. It was later placed on display in the Cherry Hill Mall in New Jersey.

During the past year it was displayed in eight other shopping centers in the Middle Atlantic and New England States. It is estimated that the exhibit was viewed by more than 1½ million shoppers. Mr. Shargel said that the Law Observance Committee is engaged in a continuing effort to promote respect for law and those who enforce it. He said there are definite indications that the exhibit serves to enhance the morale and stature of the law enforcement community, and has been a vehicle which promotes public cooperation with law enforcement agencies.

Participating exhibitors include the U.S. Treasury, Department of Justice, Intelligence, and Alcohol, Tobacco, and Firearms Division of the Internal Revenue Service, Federal Bureau of Investigation, Federal Bureau of Narcotics, U.S. Customs, Secret Service, Postal Inspection Service, Food and Drug Administration, and State and local police.

The Law Observance Committee of the Federal Bar Association also sponsors radio and television messages by government officials, community leaders, athletes, and entertainment personalities urging respect for law and law enforcement. It also conducts youth projects and coordination conferences for law-enforcement officials, members of the judiciary, prosecutors, and correction and probation personnel, and educators.

EXTENT OF INVOLVEMENT OF THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT IN EDUCATION

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

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, having just been given permission to extend my remarks in a special order later in the day, I just want to let the Members know the subject of those remarks has to do with the extent to which the Federal Government is involved in education.

As we begin our hearings before the Subcommittee on Health, Education, and Welfare of the Committee on Appropriations, I thought it very appropriate that we have in one place the tables of the actual expenditures for fiscal year 1968, the estimates for 1969, and the projected figures for 1970 in the field of education. Here we will have in one place embodied in the course of my remarks all of the activities to which the Federal Government is a part in the area of education. This is a good compilation for your own personal reference in the future.

EQUITABLE SYSTEM FOR FIXING AND ADJUSTING RATES OF COMPENSATION OF WAGE BOARD EMPLOYEES

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

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced a bill entitled the "Prevailing Wage Rate Determination Act of 1969," whose purpose is to provide an equitable system for fixing and adjusting the rates of compensation of wage board employees.

Because the number of wage board employees exceeds 765,000, this bill is of vital concern to one-fourth of all employees of the Federal Government. It directly affects their wages, their own individual rights and obligations as well as the rights and obligations of their union representatives who are bargaining for them and who represent them on the various wage board committees established by this bill.

Basically, my bill is intended to bring order and system out of the chaotic situation which now exists in the Federal Government's procedures for fixing the rates of pay of employees working under the so-called prevailing wage rate system. The information which I have been receiving for some time showed such a great discrepancy between rates of pay for wage board employees performing the identical functions and working in the same community that I found that the presumption of serious inequity and injustice could not be excluded.

This bill would reduce such a possibility of inequity.

While remedying abuses, the bill will preserve, nonetheless, the concept and procedures of the "prevailing wage" system. It thus is not a modification of the wage board system itself but simply a measure to eliminate injustice and inequity by providing new mechanisms to establish basic regulations, to conduct wage surveys, and to adjudicate or arbitrate differences.

The most important single improvement in my bill over the present arrangement is that it will give a statutory foundation to improved procedures for wage board rate determinations. The principal instrumentality provided by the bill to assure that such a policy is pursued is a newly created "standing committee" within the Civil Service Commission, to be known as the National Wage Policy Committee.

Composed of 11 members, the National Wage Policy Committee will have as its Chairman a person who shall be from outside the Federal service and who shall be appointed directly by the President and shall hold no other office in the Federal service during his tenure as Chairman.

To assure that the Chairman is objective, my bill provides that he will serve exclusively at the pleasure of the President of the United States and that his compensation will be $75 for each day spent in the work of the Policy Committee.

In addition, the Policy Committee will have five Federal employee union representatives and five management representatives.

The Federal employee union representatives will be appointed as follows:

Two by the president of the AFL-CIO; and one each appointed respectively by the president of the Federal employee union representing the first largest, the second largest, and the third largest number of Federal employees subject to this act.

The five employer representatives shall be appointed to the National Wage Policy Committee as follows:

Two management representatives will be appointed by the Secretary of Defense, at least one of whom shall be appointed on a rotational basis for a period of 2 years from the Department of the Army, the Department of the Navy and the Department of the Air Force;

One management representative from the Veterans' Administration will be appointed by the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs;

One management representative from the Civil Service Commission will be appointed by the Chairman of the Civil Service Commission; and

One management representative will be appointed, on a rotational basis for a period of 2 years, by the Chairman of the Civil Service Commission from Federal agencies which are leading employers of employees subject to this act.

In addition to establishing the National Wage Policy Committee, my bill will require each Federal department or independent agency designated by the National Wage Policy Committee to establish an agency wage committee, composed of five members. The role of the agency wage committee will be to assure the implementation within the agency of the wage surveys through the functioning of the local wage survey committees.

A most important feature of my bill is the inclusion under its wage rate system of all employees who are now paid from so-called nonappropriated funds. These employees will no longer be considered outsiders to the wage board, or prevailing wage rate, system. They will be assured equity and justice in the same manner as if they were receiving their pay from appropriated funds. Certainly, it is improper that an employee should receive less money for his work simply because his employer or manager draws his checks on a different bank account.

As with all legislation, I realize that this bill may emerge in somewhat different form when it is finally enacted. However, on the basis of my experience, I am sure that the final statute will not be very much different in its essentials than the bill which I introduced today.

MYTHS ON COLLEGE CAMPUS

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

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, at the convocation ceremony which opened the second semester at 140-year-old Illinois College, Jacksonville, Ill., the institution's president, Dr. L. Vernon Caine, reviewed today's campus scene in the United States and exposed some myths that lie at the heart of student rebellion.

Here is an abbreviated version of Dr. Caine's address, a statement I believe to be a sound appraisal of the difficulties and opportunities in higher education:

STUDENTS ARE RESPONSIBLE

(Address given at opening convocation for second semester, February 10, 1969 by L. Vernon Caine)

We live in times of both greatness and tragedy. Only six weeks ago men for the first time moved out of the vast spaces where the pull of earth's gravity is strongest into the greater pull of another heavenly body, the moon. Three men orbited the moon ten times, then fired acceleration rockets and launched themselves back on the 240,000 mile voyage through space to a firy re-entry into the earth's atmosphere. In six days they traveled half a million miles. Nothing like this ever happened before in the history of mankind.

It was less than eight years ago that Yuri Gagarin of the Soviet Union became the first spaceman. He was launched from Siberia for one trip around the earth. I recall seeing him in England the following summer, a blond, fine looking man, who might well have been a college senior. Something like two years ago he was killed in an automobile accident, and last summer I stood at the Kremlin wall and saw the engraved stone which shelters the ashes of the first man to orbit the earth. Now his epoch-making flight seems tame.

This is but one of man's recent breathtaking advances. Only a few years ago the great crippler, polio, was conquered. Had it not been so, some of you would be dead or crippled. It was in our day, to be exact only year before last, that the first heart transplant took place. When we recall that it was only about 100 years ago that any physician dared open the body cavity, we can see how far medical progress has come.

But there is also tragedy in our day. Crime is increasing at such an alarming rate that there are areas in most of our major cities where people dare not go at night. We are engaged in a war in Vietnam which nobody likes and which piles tragedy upon tragedy. In the Middle East hatred seethes, and that world is on the brink of war. There are more military dictators in South America than there have been in a long time. The world is not safe for democracy, and in spite of communication satellites, greater literacy, rapid universal air service, and all the other trappings of scientific achievement, human freedom is suppressed in many areas of the world and leads a precarious existence in other places.

While all these problems are the concern of the educated community, there is another baffling problem that faces the world, and particularly America. The dream of education as the panacea of the ills of society is proving to be a nightmare. The centers of learning have all too often become centers of disorder and the attitudes of young people have become dangerously volatile. It is hard for older people to understand students refusing to go to high school or college classes unless certain demands are met. Oftentimes these students act as if they were doing someone a favor by getting an education rather than taking advantage of a great opportunity.

I am personally very much disturbed by the change in the public attitude towards young men and women who are going to college. It was only a few years ago that to be a college student was all one needed as a character reference. Not so today. There was a day when if one advertised himself as a college student he could sell magazine subscriptions to even those who did not want any because the public wanted to help college students. But things are no longer this way. Because of the excesses of unthinking and sometimes maladjusted students, the public attitude is tending toward the belief that students are spoiled brats who are ungrateful, disorderly, and often dirty and immoral.

A few weeks ago I attended a black tie dinner given in honor of the new President of the University of Chicago. Two thousand people assembled in the Conrad Hilton International Ball Room. At the head table were such former presidents of the University of Chicago as Kimpton of Standard Oil, Robert Hutchins, and George Beadle, the Nobel Prize Winner. The chief speaker was McGeorge Bundy, head of the Ford Foundation, formerly one of President Kennedy's chief advisers. At about five-minute intervals, a long-haired, bearded young man or a girl absurdly clad, students, all who had infiltrated the dinner, would jump to his feet and chant slogans or begin a tirade of some sort. The student then would break for the exit or be hustled out. Five minutes later another one would take up the same act. These planned disturbances went on all evening. In this distinguished company at an occasion of significance these college students had no sense of decency or appropriateness. What do you suppose the 2,000 guests who were the leading men and women in business, arts, education, science, religion, and all the other aspects of life thought of college students after such a demonstration? None of you would engage in such outrageous conduct, but all too often all college students are judged by extremists such as these. . . .

One of the reasons why the public believes that odd balls and disrupters are much more numerous than they really are has to do with the way some students dress, and especially about hair styles and beards. As a thwarted producer of hair, this subject interests me. I am utterly amazed at the vicious attitude that many older people have towards those who grow beards or fail to visit a barber, or by other means dress for dissent. I use beards as a symbol of off-beat dress. I think of the extra hair as an attempt to be different but really of small consequence, but anything that excites as many mature and rational people as this does deserve some consideration.

I was guest at a dinner at the University of Michigan a year ago. The host at my table was the Dean of the School of Engineering. Some of the visitors mentioned the unkempt appearance of a number of students around the university. The Dean responded by telling about a senior in the Engineering School the spring before who was looking for employment after graduation. This young man, with furry hair, a great beard, and a totally unkempt appearance, stuck his head in the office door just before it was to close for the evening and asked a company recruiter, "May I have an interview with you tomorrow?" The recruiter replied, "Yes, come in sometime in the morning." To the surprise of the recruiter, when the young man came in, he had a haircut and a shave. He had on a good suit, a white shirt, and tie. The recruiter said, "You didn't look that way yesterday. What made you change?" The senior replied, "Nobody with any sense would hire me if I looked the way I did yesterday, and I know you wouldn't."

There is nothing the matter with beards or long hair. Custer had long hair, Jonathan Baldwin Turner and the Yale Band had beards, and so did John Calvin, to say nothing of the Smith Brothers who made those cough drops, but I am quite sure that if some of the bearded ones of today had lived back in those days, they would have been clean shaven and had haircuts so as to be conspicuous. I suspect the point for those who have such distate for the hairy ones is that they regard this as the garb of rebellion. Public opinion is such that it would be difficult for any senior man with more than his share of hair or a girl who was absurdly clad to get a job as a school teacher or in a business. About the only place one can go and continue to dress oddly and find something to do is to graduate school, or if the beard is right, run a Kentucky Fried Chicken outlet.

Colleges these days are more likely to be judged by the looks of their students than anything except their disorders. I am always happy to have visitors at Illinois College because most of what they see they like. I do not understand the appropriateness of any human being under modern circumstances on a college campus looking like Robinson Crusoe or something out of a carnival sideshow.

My concern about rebellion or the looks of rebellion is what it is doing to the enterprise of higher education. If student care for the preservation of this magnificent educational system, which is the envy of the world, and for the subsidies of every sort which are available as at no previous time in human history, it is high time that the overwhelming majority of students whom I observe to be sensible, sensitive, discreet, forward looking, and ambitious see to it that the odd balls, the maladjusted, and the exhibitionists are shown up for what they are and not allowed to represent themselves as leaders or typical of the college population. I can testify from personal experience, some not two weeks old, that the bad image of college students which is growing in this country is reducing support for higher education from corporations, foundations, and individuals, and is severely affecting the legislators of Illinois and other states as well.

I could tell you of several gifts which have come to a certain few colleges of our association rather than to the total association because certain donors are fed up with the actions of students on certain campuses. I am proud to say that no discriminating donor has ever eliminated Illinois College from his gifts, but the whole enterprise is suffering because of public reaction to extremes of dress, bad manners, carelessness, misconduct, and the rebellion of some students and some student bodies. The responsibility of reversing this attitude rests squarely upon the shoulders of every college student. . . .

There are a number of myths and unknown errors which are prevalent on college campuses everywhere about which I wish to speak briefly.

(1) Older people simply do not understand. Is there any student in this audience who seriously believes that ten or twenty years from now he will be less wise or less equipped to cope with life than he is at the present time? If such there be, then he has concluded that learning and experience are worse than useless. Those who talk about generation gaps and try to divide the human family into age categories do mischief to the future of society. Whether we be twenty or fifty, we are all in the same boat. Understanding is not an exclusive attribute of the young.

(2) The myth that relevance is a most important factor in determining what we study. The fact is that education that is too specifically relative is rapidly outdated and some of the most irrelevant things turn out to be the most practical in the long run. How would we have ever gotten to the moon if we spent all our scientific know-how on solving the relevant problems twenty years ago? The here and now is not what is most important. It is the future about which we should be most concerned. What is to be is more important than what is. Dr. Lee DuBridge, who was until a few days ago the president of California Institute of Technology and is now President Nixon's scientific adviser, warns us against education for the moment. He says, "Education is not for today. It is of the past and is for the future." A good case can be made that citizenship in a democracy can be learned as well by studying Plato's Republic as by concentrating on current problems. Shallow indeed would be the education of an art student who studied only Pop or Op or whatever the latest craze is and neglected the old masters and impressionists. Those who preach relevancy are often shortsighted for he who does not know history is bound to repeat it, and he who thinks today's concerns are more important than those of tomorrow will soon find that the world has passed him by.

(3) And this one is probably unconscious, nevertheless real. Ingratitude. If someone were to ask me what is the greatest change I have observed in students generally of recent years, I would have to say it is the decline in gratitude. Most students used to be grateful for the chance to go to college and said so. Not many do today even though many more are receiving much greater assistance. Nothing rewards a teacher or even an administrator like a word of appreciation, but these words are much less common than they used to be.

Though I do not have in mind particularly the disadvantaged and minority groups, the problem is especially acute for them. In some cases ingratitude will seriously affect the educational opportunities which young people of minority groups will have in the future. In several cases young people from deprived background have been brought to campuses with all their expenses paid and with special educational assistance provided and the response too often from some have been demands that more be done and in too many cases riotous destruction of property and insubordination that have shocked the most generous minded people of the community. I am quite aware that there are two sides to the problem of providing opportunities for the deprived and the response that should be made. But there is only one result of ingratitude and that is the weakening of the resolution of those who are going out of their way to help the disadvantaged. In some institutions as well as with individuals who have provided the assistance, the response to ingratitude is "never again."

(4) Instant Utopia—It is very easy to point out the ills of mankind and the mess in which we find ourselves. The maldistribution of wealth, pollution of air and water, the growth of crime, juvenile delinquency, the Vietnamese War, the Middle East Crisis, the population explosion, to name only some of them but enough certainly to depress the stoutest heart. It is easy to speak of the failure of this and previous generations in letting society come to such a pass, but to cure these ills is no small task. Our problems will not cease to plague us in 1970 and most of them will be with our grandchildren in spite of even the promise of what you will do. We should as intelligent citizens realize that there is no dramatic or sudden method of correcting most of our major problems.

It seems to me there are reasons for hope as I look at you who are the present college student generation. If you are not led by sirens into strange backwaters, you have some qualities which at least provide hope for the future. One of them is idealism. It is a wonderful thing that you are dissatisfied with things as they are. Any one who is satisfied with the world in which he finds himself does not deserve to be called a man. But idealism does not have to be divorced from common sense. Idealism should lead neither to renunciation of the world or an attempt to destroy society. There is a good chance that you with your idealism like the knights of old can slay at least some of the dragons that infest the countryside and rescue at least some of those who are beset by evil forces. That you resolve to do so is both commendable and heartening. . . .

There was once a generation of American students whose motto was the evangelization of the world in one generation and another which offered its life to make the world safe for democracy and another with a vast and general concern that Negroes should have equal opportunity to eat at lunch counters and to vote. It is too early to categorize this generation but if what has happened at Berkeley, San Francisco State, Columbia, and Swartmore has set the tone, this will be the dark age of our enlightenment. It strikes me that what we need more than anything else is a renewal of our spirits, a lessened concern for our own shins and comforts and a willingness to face eternal issues. To understand what God has done for us is infinitely more important than our pleasures and fancies. To appreciate the heritage of those who lived and died that we can enjoy the blessings of this rich and free nation is of greater significance than to have our own way. This is a time for sober judgments, honest efforts and noble ambitions lest we bring down upon this nation the awful judgment of the Ruler of the Universe.

There is no detaching our times from the march of history. We are at this end of a long line which stretches back into the dim past. We are also the only link with what is to be. Our responsibility to develop and transit the values that are best and noblest to those who come after us is an obligation which should haunt and challenge us. Our whims and comforts are really no more significant in the long sweep of history than those of the Yale Band, our pioneer ancestors, or those who died in World War II or Korea or Viet Nam. What are we doing with our heritage, our hard earned freedoms and rich opportunities? This is the answer history requires of us. A right answer is suggested in the second verse of the Alma Mater. Let it be our watchword, "May the lamps our fathers lighted lead us ere to heights beyond."

FEDERATING NATO WOULD STRENGTHEN LIBERTY

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

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, on the occasion of his election to the board of directors of Federal Union, Inc., a nonprofit, educational membership association, Senator MARK O. HATFIELD, Republican of Oregon, called for a federation of NATO nations patterned on the U.S. Constitution. He said this act would yield vast power to the cause of individual liberty "at microscopic not astronomic cost" in taxes. Here is the text of Senator HATFIELD's significant statement:

President Nixon's trip to Europe has rightly put the accent on the key importance of the free Atlantic community, and on the need of uniting it effectively. This gives fresh urgency to the educational work which the Federal Union association has long been doing and makes me feel the more honored at being elected to its Board.

Study of the immense possibilities which our federal principles offer internationally—especially in revitalizing NATO—have been neglected far too much in our country by government, press, and educational institutions. For 30 years now, Federal Union, Inc.

has been an outstanding exception to this rule. This association and its magazine, *Freedom & Union*, have pioneered in educating the public in this field. Speaking of their leadership, Paul-Henri Spaak, former NATO Secretary General, expressed my own view when he said at Federal Union's Convocation last November:

"I do not know any other example of a comparable activity put at the service of an idea. * * * Those who are in favor of an Atlantic Federation are beyond all question indubitably right. * * * [The members of] Federal Union have fought during so many years in such difficult conditions that one can fully rely on them. One must draw closer to them. Their task is a magnificent one."

Much too long our attention has been concentrated on seeking to strengthen freedom at its periphery instead of its center—in Vietnam, for example, instead of in Atlantica. Whether one seeks in Vietnam to strengthen freedom and peace by any military means, even the complete success of one's policy could not possibly give peace and freedom—and prosperity—anything near the strength they could gain by federation of the Atlantic community.

While we have neglected this fact, the disarray in the Atlantic Alliance has deepened into dangerous disunion—monetary, economic, military, political. Even in face of Russia's invasion of Czechoslovakia, military expansion in the Mediterranean and Mideast—with the darkening threat of nuclear confrontation there—some Atlantic democracies are showing more distrust of each other than of a dictatorship that seems bent now on rehabilitating Stalin. President Nixon's trip to Western Europe could not be more opportune.

Is it not time for all these free people to turn from mutual recrimination to exploration of whether the fault does not lie in the present alliance structure of the Atlantic community rather than in each other? That is what our forefathers did at the Federal Convention they called when the 13 States suffered similar disunion under the alliance of the Articles of Confederation. The far-reaching success of that Convention should encourage us to follow their example now.

No doubt it will take time to achieve federation of the States around the North Atlantic ocean. But the Vietnam way to strengthen peace and freedom has not only taken many years already, but has cost increasingly in lives and billions of taxpayer money. To explore with our allies the Atlantic Union way to incalculably greater power for peace and freedom involves no cost in bloodshed and virtually none in dollars.

As for time—our Founding Fathers, once they called the 1787 Convention, not only worked out our present Federal Constitution but got it ratified and in operation within only two years—by March 4, 1789. Perhaps the historic democracies of Atlantica cannot be federated so rapidly, but who knows, until we try—until we called the proposed Convention to explore the possibilities?

Two things we do know. The sooner we call that Convention, the less time it will take to attain Atlantic Union. Meanwhile, whatever advance we make toward it will strengthen freedom, peace and prosperity far more than we can hope to otherwise and will do this—be it repeated—without bloodshed, and at microscopic instead of astronomic cost to the taxpayers.

The association, founded by readers of Clarence Streit's "Union Now" in 1939, reelected Streit as president, and in addition to HATFIELD, elected as new members of the board Elmo Roper, pioneer pollster, and Jay Cerf, manager of the U.S. Chamber of Commerce international group. Reelected were its chairman, Roy Chipps, secretary of Middlewest Freightways, St. Louis; Melvin Ryder, publisher of Army Times; Mrs. Chase Osborn, District of Columbia, and Attorney Nicholas Doman, New York.

WHY SOYBEANS ARE IN TROUBLE

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

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, tabular material I will include with these remarks helps to explain why soybeans—just 3 short years ago the wonder crop selling well at home and abroad without a costly taxpayer-financed support program—is today in difficulty.

The most dramatic symptom of trouble is that the value of soybeans in Government inventory and under loans is now higher than corn. A massive carryover of soybeans is expected at the end of this crop year, and the forecast is that Government holdings will be mountainous if the loan rate continues at the $2.50 level for another year.

I sympathize with Agriculture Secretary Hardin, who faces the politically unpleasant task of starting his administration by tackling the question of loan rate for beans. The economics of the question is clear: the rate has to be reduced substantially. The politics of the question is something else. I can testify from personal experience, as recently I proposed publicly that the loan rate be reduced to $2.05 per bushel as part of a program to get beans out of trouble. The reaction from farmers has been mixed. A few applauded vigorously, but most complained, insisting—incorrectly, in my view—that a $2.05 loan rate would mean a $2.05 market price.

In order to understand what must be done to right the soybean ship, it is necessary to understand what has been happening across the country in respect to soybean production and prices the last few years.

Attached are four tables. The first shows conclusively that the loan rate does not fix the market price except when it gets too high.

The second shows that, under the Government-guaranteed $2.50 price, thousands of acres have been cleared and planted to soybeans in the southland. A reduction in the loan rate will remove the guarantee and hopefully discourage speculators from clearing additional areas of timber for this purpose.

The third and fourth charts show how sensitive the pricing of vegetable oils and meals is in world markets, and how essential it is to the continued well-being of American farmers that soybeans be priced in competitive markets and not by Government action.

I. U.S. SOYBEANS—PRICE SUPPORTS AND AVERAGE PRICE RECEIVED BY FARMERS, 1960–68

Year beginning Sept. 1	Support price	Average price received by farmer
1960	$1.85	$2.13
1961	2.30	2.28
1962	2.25	2.34
1963	2.25	2.51
1964	2.25	2.62
1965	2.25	2.54
1966	2.50	2.75
1967	2.50	2.49
1968	2.50	----------

Source: USDA, FOS, 245.

II. SOYBEAN ACREAGE BY STATES, 1965 AND 1968 AND PERCENTAGE INCREASE, 1965–68

[Acres in thousands]

State	1965 acreage	1968 acreage	Increase in acres since 1965	Percent increase
North Carolina	776	1,053	277	35.7
South Carolina	806	1,015	209	25.9
Georgia	209	520	311	148.8
Alabama	228	576	348	152.6
Southeast	2,019	3,164	1,145	56.7
Kentucky	295	473	178	60.3
Tennessee	732	1,193	461	63.0
Mississippi	1,461	2,120	659	45.1
Arkansas	3,550	3,949	399	11.2
Louisiana	622	1,345	723	116.2
South Central	6,660	9,080	2,420	36.3
Ohio	2,044	2,276	232	11.4
Indiana	2,871	3,014	143	5.0
Illinois	6,021	6,416	395	6.6
Iowa	4,850	5,720	870	17.9
Missouri	3,051	3,591	540	17.7
Minnesota	3,166	3,447	281	8.9
Eastern Corn Belt	22,003	24,464	2,461	11.1
North Dakota	211	198	−13	−6.2
South Dakota	333	337	4	1.2
Nebraska	696	829	133	19.1
Kansas	873	908	35	4.0
Western Corn Belt	2,113	2,272	159	7.5
All other States	1,654	1,969	315	19.0
United States	34,449	40,949	6,500	18.9

Source: USDA, FOS, 245.

III. WORLD EXPORTS—OILSEEDS, OILS, FATS, 1965 TO 1968, AND PERCENT CHANGE, 1965–68

[Amounts in thousands of short tons]

	1965	1966	1967	Forecast, 1968	Percent change, 1965–68
Cottonseed	427	255	158	165	−61
Peanut	1,088	1,196	1,150	1,180	+8
Soybean	1,981	1,936	2,180	2,135	+8
Sunflower	440	790	1,127	1,350	+207
Rape seed	278	357	389	465	+67
Sesame	85	91	90	85	0
Safflower	75	70	65	45	−40
Olive	58	76	79	90	+55
Corn	12	14	10	15	+25
Palm oils	2,408	2,617	2,154	2,113	−12
Industrial oils (linseed, castor, tung, etc.)	798	735	732	662	−17
Animal fats (butter, lard, tallow)	2,411	2,369	2,652	2,750	+14
Marine oils (whale and fish)	819	741	919	950	+16
Total	10,880	11,247	11,705	12,005	+10

Source: USDA, FAS, FFO, 13–68.

IV. U.S. PROTEIN FEED CONSUMPTION, 1965 THROUGH 1968, PERCENT CHANGE FROM 1965 TO 1968

[Year beginning Oct. 1 (1,000 tons)]

	1965	1966	1967 [1]	1968 [2]	Percent change
Soybean meal	10,274	10,820	10,758	10,600	+3
Cottonseed meal	2,563	1,755	1,465	1,950	−24
Linseed meal	284	248	182	200	−30
Peanut meal	108	115	133	125	+16
Copra meal	109	90	117	125	+15
Tankage and meat meal	1,961	2,068	2,059	2,100	+7
Fish meal and solubles	627	827	1,063	1,100	+75
Milk products	729	680	650	660	−9
Grain protein feeds (gluten, brewers, distillers, grains, etc)	2,211	2,235	2,298	2,340	+6

[1] Preliminary.
[2] Based on November indications.

Source: USDA, FDS, 226.

THE PRESIDENT'S HISTORIC TRIP TO EUROPE

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

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, I am sure I speak for Members on both sides of the aisle in congratulating President Nixon on the success of his European trip.

From all reports it opened a bright new era in relations between the United States and its NATO allies. This development is the most important, and hopefully the most permanent achievement of the President's highly successful tour of major capitals of Western Europe.

During the campaign, Mr. Nixon outlined three objectives of his administration toward Western Europe. First, he promised genuine and meaningful consulation. Second, he promised to "listen more, talk less." And third, he promised to open communications with the Chief of State of America's oldest ally, France. Clearly, as the trip has proven, the important first steps have been taken toward implementing these goals.

No one expects that our relations with Western Europe will be free from political differences or occasional misunderstandings. What is important, however, is for the Europeans to know that the lines of communication are always open and that the defense of Western Europe is, for the United States, paramount.

It is also clear that President Nixon's aim is to give substance and reality to the partnership relationship that has always been NATO's goal, recognizing that the leader-follower relationship so necessary immediately after World War II is no longer appropriate.

PRESIDENT NIXON'S TRIP

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

Mr. RUMSFELD. Mr. Speaker, while it is impossible in a close time perspective to arrive at a precise evaluation of President Nixon's European trip, it clearly was a success in terms of opening up new channels of communications and demonstrating a sincere desire to seek new approaches to some of the major problems facing the world.

One measurement of the success of foreign policy is the degree to which potential problems are avoided by timely action before they become critical. If knotty situations can be unravelled before they tighten to the point of intractability, foreign policy can be said to have been successful.

Of course, the smoother a nation's foreign policy is working, the fewer the problems and the less the success is noticed.

The purpose of the President's 8-day working trip was limited. It was not to plunge into detailed solutions in longstanding areas of concern. It was to establish a broad framework of understanding that will make future consultation more profitable and more relevant.

Judging from all reports, President Nixon succeeded in that purpose. Not only was he received enthusiastically by the leaders of Great Britain and the Continent, he also was greeted warmly by the people of the nations he visited.

His visit laid the groundwork for fresh foreign policy initiatives regarding the future of Atlantic community relationships, the Middle East and NATO. It is this type of effort that can help to prevent the potential problems of tomorrow.

The most noticeable immediate effect of the consultations was the opening of a new relationship with France. After chilly years of cross purposes, President Nixon succeeded in reemphasizing the basic common interests that can help to unite France and the United States.

President de Gaulle and France apparently welcomed this mature approach to foreign policy and endorsed the success of the consultations by promising a return trip to the United States.

The potential for new directions in our relationship with the European nations, and the rest of the world, in this type of atmosphere is clear.

Through a full renewal of dialog and a willingness to listen, in combination with a commitment to consultation on major decisions, President Nixon has succeeded, in his first 6 weeks in office, in avoiding a tendency to react from crisis to crisis and in moving U.S. foreign policy toward an effort of seeking to avoid problems before they become serious.

War is, in short, a failure of foreign policy. It will be our new President's greatest challenge to find those steps necessary to avoid the failures of foreign policy which have marked world history.

PORNOGRAPHIC PROFITEERS

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

Mr. HARSHA. Mr. Speaker, it is not known precisely how many millions of dollars fall into the hands of pornographic profiteers each year; nor is it known precisely how many millions of dollars society pays for the resultant delinquency, violence, and general criminal damage.

There is, however, reason to suspect that whatever the illicit profits, whatever the dollar cost of resultant crime, the combined sums are small compared to the infinitely greater cost of the awesome damage to the national moral fiber, thought, and conduct.

Not the least aspect of the diabolical manner in which peddlers of pornography move against often unsuspecting youth is that in which they pretend that perversity is normalcy and that those who move against them do violence to freedom.

It is in realization of this increasingly more vicious and costly national menace that, today, I am introducing a bill which would respond to the need and demand for effective, enforceable regulation of the merchants of filth who ply their evil trade through the U.S. mails.

This bill is meritorious for several reasons:

First. It is designed to protect children against these despicable peddlers of moral poison.

Second. It is drafted to conform with recent U.S. Supreme Court decisions.

Third. It does not involve itself in the semantics of what may be considered pornographic.

Fourth. It establishes, clearly and definitely, the materials to be proscribed from mailing to children under 16 years of age and to families of which children under 16 years of age are members.

Fifth. It stipulates that a violator "shall be fined not more than $5,000 or imprisoned not more than 5 years, or both, for the first such offense, and not more than $10,000 or imprisoned not more than 10 years, or both, for each such offense thereafter."

In short, this bill would give our now-legally handcuffed authorities the weapons they need to do a job which badly needs to be done—crack down and rid our society of those of the strange mentality who seek profit by placing in the hands of the young that which the majority of Americans view as, at least, objectionable and obscene.

FREEDOM OF CHOICE—THE FAIR APPROACH TO EDUCATION

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

Mr. WATSON. Mr. Speaker, again today I strongly urge my colleagues to join me in offering a freedom-of-choice resolution relative to school attendance. While many of you outside the South may not be experiencing much difficulty in your respective districts, let me assure you that this is a most serious problem in my area and in most districts of the South.

What could be fairer than freedom of choice? The freedom of every child or patron, white or black, to choose the school of his choice, rather than have the Government compel him to attend a distant school purely for arbitrary sociological reasons is a basic right. We should remember the Supreme Court decisions in this area only prohibited discrimination; they never required, or even implied, that a child must be forced to attend a particular school against his or his parents' wishes.

Since Congress enacted the various civil rights laws, particularly title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare has experienced nothing but constant difficulty in implementing these various pieces of legislation. The guidelines that have been issued by that Department have been far less than clear, reasonable, and equitable in my judgment. Since it was Congress who passed this particular law, it is our responsibility to support my resolution, or some similar one, which is designed to clarify once and for all the congressional intent on this matter. Thereby, we can eliminate the confusing, arbitrary, discriminatory, and illegal guidelines which have been issued during the past several years.

Mr. Speaker, education in South Carolina is experiencing serious, if not ultimately devastating, problems. Not only are we witnessing deterioration of some of our schools academically, but from a disciplinary standpoint also. When a zoning system, or any other plan, compels schoolchildren to be bused away from their homes against their wishes, into another area against their wishes, such is not only against the law but inevitably creates many problems.

The uprisings on our college and university campuses today could very well ignite the simmering and potentially explosive situations developing in many elementary and secondary schools. Administrators and teachers have their hands tied in most instances and were they to speak out on this matter, their jobs or Federal funds would be in jeopardy. Parents are concerned when they see for themselves and hear students report disgusting incidents of reverse discrimination, but they are afraid to do anything about it because their own child might be reprimanded or disciplined.

Somehow, Mr. Speaker, people have got to learn that in order to be befriended, a person must appreciate a friend; in order to be helped, he must appreciate help; that acquisition of rights for some can never be maintained at the expense of denying rights to others. It would appear that many white Americans have been self-victimized by a somewhat psychotic indictment in the area of so-called civil rights, which, unless changed, can result in a deepening of the wedge between the races, as the Kerner report has predicted.

Something can be done to correct this problem immediately and to prevent further irreparable harm, especially to our schools, if we will but have the courage to do so. Let us pass this freedom-of-choice resolution so that educators, teachers, parents, and students alike may once again focus their attention upon the principal task of educating the youth of America, rather than spending most of their time implementing sociological concepts.

EFFORTS BY THE YOUNG AMERICANS FOR FREEDOM TO DELETE THE EFFECT OF A CERTAIN STUDENT ORGANIZATION ON COLLEGE CAMPUSES

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

Mr. LUKENS. Mr. Speaker, it gives me great pride as a member of the National Advisory Board for the Young Americans for Freedom to take part in their drive to delete the effect of a certain student organization on college campuses in our United States.

This organization is known as the National Student Association—NSA—and its stands have, at various times, particularly since 1950, been greatly influenced by Communist and socialist positions. It has on many occasions actually opposed foreign policies of the U.S. Government under both Republican and Democratic administrations while receiving funds from that Government or from organizations enjoying a tax-free status from the U.S. Government.

In order that Members of this body may become better aware of the threat this group has posed and still poses to our country and especially its contributions to anarchy and lawbreaking on college campuses today, I would like to submit under special orders a few observations and facts regarding NSA.

The material follows:

A Report on the U.S. National Student Association

INTRODUCTION

To adequately comprehend the significance of the organization known as the United States National Student Association within the context of the present political crises which confront the nations of the Free World, one need merely consider the enormous amount of influence wielded by student groups in other parts of the world. While the National Student Association may not, at this time, influence popular opinion in this country to the extent that similar associations of university students do in nations like Japan and the developing nations of Asia and Africa, NSA does purport to be the recognized voice of the American intellectual community. Testifying before congressional committees, speaking on behalf of American college and university students at national and international youth conferences, and generally claiming to represent the views and aspirations of American youth, NSA deserves our most serious consideration and study.

Responsible students are becoming aware of the devious nature of NSA and are demanding answer to an increasing number of critical questions:

How and in what way is NSA involved in the more radical "student power" movement on American colleges and universities?

What was (and is) the relationship of NSA with the CIA?

Who does NSA represent . . . and who does NSA claim to represent?

How has NSA become a political front for those groups representing the viewpoint of the so-called "new left"?

How are student "leaders" encouraged to participate in NSA?

How is NSA financed?

What is the significance of the "dual corporation" status which divided NSA into basically two separate corporate entities in August of 1968?

Is there any unique or significant value in NSA's "student government services"?

The purpose of this booklet is to provide answers to these and other questions concerning the U.S. National Student Association. We hope that through this report, those who find themselves faced with the almost monolithic Liberal to Radical bureaucracy which has characterized NSA since its inception will find some practical suggestions for counteracting the grossly disproportionate influence of NSA in American student affairs.

GENESIS OF NSA

In the summer of 1946, twenty-five American students boarded a ship in New York for a voyage to Prague, Czechoslovakia, where they attended the World Student Congress and participated in the formation of the International Union of Students (I.U.S.) along with delegates from thirty-eight other countries. According to the official *History of USNSA*, the American delegation "could see the profound need for a forum of American student leadership, a body through which international representation and information could be maintained," and, upon returning to the United States, constituted themselves as "the Committee for the Chicago Student Conference". Supported by nine (9) of the organizations which had originally organized the American delegation to Prague, the Committee sent invitations to student leaders throughout the United States to attend a meeting at the University of Chicago during Christmas vacation in-order-to discuss the formation of a national union of students in this country.

Students representing about 200 colleges and universities and a number of youth organizations answered the summons and attended the Chicago conference in December, 1946, which culminated in the election of a Continuations Committee which was assigned the task of drafting the organization's constitution and planning a constitutional convention.

NSA's Constitutional Convention was held at the University of Wisconsin in the summer of 1947. In addition to adopting the Association's constitution, the more than 300 delegates approved a budget of $25,000 and passed resolutions supporting the World Student Service Fund and United Nations Day. A proposition calling for "qualified affiliation" with the International Union of Students, which was recommended by the Continuations Committee, was defeated although the delegates decided to continue to investigate the possibilities of affiliation with the IUS.

In 1950, representatives of the National Student Association attended a meeting in Stockholm to discuss "new means of international cooperation." Delegates to the conference, including NSA representatives, agreed that no new international student organization should be formed and indicated that the meeting, which became known as the International Student Conference, "was not intended to be a Western international student organization to counter the IUS." However, the next conference, which was held in Edinburgh culminated in the formation of the Coordinating Secretariat of National Union of Students (COSEC). NSA joined the International Student Conference (ISC) in August of 1964 when the delegates to the 17th National Student Congress adopted the ISC Charter. NSA now claims to have withdrawn from all international involvements.

NSA—A POLITICAL FRONT?

While often masquerading as basically a "student government services" organization, over the years NSA consistently violated its own constitution while taking part in various left of center political activities. Such activities and policy positions increased to the point that NSA became widely considered a sounding board for the minority of "New Left" students.

Apparently to avoid unfavorable action from the Internal Revenue Service, and in an effort to move more openly into the political arena, NSA formally altered its structure in August of 1968. The 21st Congress of USNSA meeting at Kansas State University adopted a "dual corporation" proposal which officially divided NSA into two separate corporate entities. (The Kansas State student body rejected NSA membership in November of 1968 by a vote of 4 to 1.)

Officially, the National Student Association became a "C-4 corporation" which can operate openly in the political arena. The student services division, which retains favorable tax status, is now officially known as the National Student Institute. It should be understood, however, that as a practical matter, there has been no real division. Membership in one division requires membership in the other. There is no separate membership offered.

The following information is taken from a report by Jim Graham, Campus Affairs Vice President of NSA and issued in November of 1968 to various student leaders.

"Through a series of rather complicated legal measures, the National Student Association Congress approved what is known as the 'Dual Corporation Proposal' which divided NSA into basically two separate corporate entities. In the past, the Association was limited by the Internal Revenue Service prohibition against 'carrying on propaganda, or otherwise attempting to influence legislation or intervene in any political campaign.' While NSA previously was limited in political activity, its favorable tax status allowed grants from private foundations without jeopardizing the foundation's own tax-exempt status. In addition, U.S. Government agencies—the Office of Economic Opportunity, the Office of Education, the National Institute of Mental Health—are reluctant to fund organizations which lobby for legislation. Therefore, for these and other reasons (including money for administrative expenses gained from foundation grants and financial transfers from NSA's subsidiary corporation, the National Student Travel Association), it was and is important to retain our old C–3 tax status as a non-political corporation.

"Up until the 21st National Student Congress this past August, there existed no national organization which concerned itself with student political interest. The Congress, at that time, approved a proposal which established a new corporation for the purpose of lobbying on those issues under a C–4 corporate status. This corporation, which includes and is supported by the services division, will become, in name, the U.S. National Student Association. The traditional funded programs of NSA will retain their favorable tax status and will be known as the National Student Institute. The new C–4 NSA, will also be financially supported by National Regional dues and publications sales.

"The dues for the new Association, *which include automatic membership in the institute,* will remain the same. *The 'services' of the institute would be available only to the members of the National Student Association, and there will be no separate membership offered.* (Emphasis added.)

"In essence, but quite legally, *the two corporations are 'governed' by the same people, i.e., the National Supervisory Board of NSA is the board of directors for the institute and the officers of NSA are the officers of the institute.*" (Emphasis added.)

In further regard to political activities, it should be noted that NSA claims to represent students "in their role as students." Admittedly, some political areas of NSA involvement do relate to the role of students (others do not) althought the majority of American students—if they hold any opinion at all—would probably not agree with the "solutions" proposed by NSA.

These are some of the controversial policies which were adopted over the last several years by the delegates to the National Student Congress of NSA, acting as the representatives of the American student community. NSA:

Has condemned the U.S. government for acts of "aggression against the people of Vietnam;"

Has called for the "liberation" of all Black people in America "by any means necessary;"

Has strongly urged that the House Committee on Un-American Activities be abolished;

Advocates the admission of Red China to the United Nations;

Views Student power as following the line of Columbia and Berkeley;

Has urged cessation of military and/or economic assistance to Spain, Portugal, Republic of South Africa, Nicaragua, Haiti, Paraguay, Guatemala, Peru, Argentina, and Iran—not a single suggestion that the United States take similar action toward a communist nation.

The basic fallacy with NSA's activities is the failure to recognize that there is no discernible American student opinion on many of these issues.

The only type of organization which can ever speak for the American student is one which concerns itself solely with campus problems: a free student press, faculty relations, speakers policies, student housing, etc. Otherwise, it will be another NSA, just another political pressure group.

This is not to say that students should not be involved in politics. Various partisan organizations exist for this purpose such as the Young Democrats, Young Republicans, YAF, SDS, CORE, Campus ADA, etc. But when an organization ostensibly designed to represent students in their capacity as students allows itself to formulate policy decisions concerning wide ranging political issues, it becomes subject to control by one or more of these partisan groups. This is what has happened to the National Student Association, whose policies consistently reflect a revolutionary, left-wing approach to political and campus issues.

It should be understood from the outset that what we are speaking of when we refer to NSA membership is *student government membership.* There are no such things as *individual* memberships in the National Student Association, and students on a given campus are "represented" by virtue of their school's student government membership in NSA—even if they are not cognizant of NSA or its activities.

To sign-up member institutions, NSA rarely goes to the student body for approval, but instead, seems to prefer to deal with a handful of student leaders. The pattern is identical on nearly every campus. Contact is made with one or two student government leaders who then lobby for NSA among the other members of the student government. NSA will next offer to send a national officer to the campus to confer with members of the student government. Generally this NSA representative is a personable, good-guy type, who tends to belie any reports of the radical image. He proceeds to relate, in grand terms, the services NSA is supposed to provide its member schools, never referring to political activities in any significant way. The local student government members are informed of the free excursions that they can have (paid for usually with student body funds) to attend such NSA activities as the two-week-long National Student Congress, Drug Conferences, etc. It's not long before the local student leaders have convinced themselves that NSA is just what they need to bring their school out of the wilderness of parochial isolation into the great society of national and international awareness. By design, the whole process is over in short order, with a school often becoming a NSA member before the student body is even aware that the issue was pending. Opponents of NSA have little or no time to gather information and present their case.

According to Article II, Section A of the NSA Constitution, membership in the Association is open to any institution of higher learning which is recognized by the United States Office of Education or any institution of higher learning whose minimum course is two academic years or more and which teaches courses other than those which are primarily vocational in nature. This of course means that, with the exception of certain technical schools, any college, university, or junior college in the United States could affiliate with NSA.

Since it is technically the student government and not the school itself which may affiliate with NSA, schools with two or more student governments may send two or more delegations to the Association's annual congresses and, thus be counted twice in votes on highly important and sometimes controversial issues. For example, Harvard College, Radcliffe College, and Harvard-Radcliffe Graduate School, and the men's and women's colleges of the University of Pennsylvania are all represented separately at the annual NSA Congress.

In May of 1961, the National Student Association claimed a total membership of 399 colleges and universities. Although actual membership in the Association has fluctuated considerably since the organization was born in August of 1947, NSA has experienced an increasing number of disaffiliations in recent years. The mass exodus of member schools prompted a lengthy debate at the Seventeenth National Student Congress concerning the Association's political entanglements which many student leaders believed were detrimental to the Association's ability to function as a service organization, but a resolution which sought to limit NSA's political activism was defeated and, by October of 1965, NSA's total membership had plummeted to below the three-hundred mark. Since that time, the membership has fluctuated between three hundred and three hundred fifty as schools continue to withdraw while others are induced to join or re-join. Many of the schools withdraw because of the relative ineffectiveness of the Association's programming services or because of NSA's increasingly Radical image, while only a few withdraw for financial reasons.

The following is a *partial* list of the colleges and universities which withdrew from the National Student Association after January of 1961. The list was compiled from the NSA Codifications of Policy.

COLLEGES AND UNIVERSITIES WHICH HAVE WITHDRAWN FROM NSA SINCE 1961

Alderson-Broaddus College (W. Va.).
Allegheny College (Pa.).
Alliance College (Pa.).
Alma College (Mich.).
American University.
Amherst College (Mass.).
Anna Maria College (Mass.).
Antioch College (Ohio).
Arkansas A&M.
Augustana College (Ill.).
Ball State University (Ind.).
Barry College (Fla.).
Bates College (Me.).
Beloit College (Wisc.).
Bennington College.
Berea College (Ky.).
Brandeis University (Mass.).
California Western University.
Canisius College (N.Y.).
Capitol University (Ohio).
Cascade College (Ore.).
Catholic University of America (Wash., D.C.).
Central College (Iowa).
Central Connecticut State College.
Central Michigan College.
Central Washington College.
Charlotte College (N.C.).
Chestnut Hill College (Pa.).
Church College of Hawaii.
City College of New York.
Chaflin College (S.C.).
Clark University (Mass.).
College of New Rochelle.
College of Southern Utah.
Columbia College (S.C.).
Columbia University.
Concordia Collegiate Institute (N.Y.).
Cornell College (Iowa).
Cornell University.
Cottey College (Mo.).

Dartmouth College.
Davidson College (N.C.).
Delaware State College.
Denison University.
De Pauw University.
Diablo Valley College (Cal.).
Drexel Institute of Technology.
Duke University.
Earlham College (Ind.).
East Carolina College (N.C.).
Eastern Nazarene College (Mass.).
Ellsworth Jr. College (Iowa).
Elmhurst College (Ill.).
Fenn College (Ohio).
Fisher Jr. College (Mass.).
Florida A&M.
Friends University (Kan.).
Gannon College (Pa.).
George Peabody College (Tenn.).
George Washington University.
Glassboro State College (N.J.).
Hibbing Jr. College (Minn.).
Hillyer College (Conn.).
Hofstra College (N.Y.).
Hollins College.
Hunters College (N.Y.).
Huron College (S.D.).
Illinois State University.
Immaculata College (Pa.).
Indiana University.
Iowa State University.
Ithaca College (N.Y.).
Jersey City State College.
Kansas State University.
Kansas Wesleyan College.
Kenyon College (Ohio).
King College (Tenn.).
Knox College (Ill.).
Lakeland College (Wisc.).
LeMoyne College (Tenn.).
Limestone College (S.C.).
Long Island University.
Los Angeles State College.
Lynchburg College (Va.).
Maryland State Teachers College at Frostburg.
Maryville College (Tenn.).
Michigan College of Mining and Technology.
Michigan State University.
Milton College (Wisc.).
Milwaukee-Downer College.
Monmouth College (N.J.).
Montgomery Jr. College.
Morris Brown College (Mo.).
Mundelein College (Ill.).
Muskingum College (Ohio).
Nazareth College (Ky.).
Nebraska Weslayan University.
New York University at Washington Heights.
New York University at Washington Square.
Niagara University (N.Y.).
North Carolina State University.
Northland College (Wisc.).
Northwestern University.
Ohio State University.
Oklahoma City University.
Oneonta State Teachers College (N.Y.).
Ottawa University (Kan.).
Otterbein College (Ohio).
Our Lady of the Elms College (Mass.).
Pace College (N.Y.).
Parsons College (Iowa).
Pennsylvania State University.
Pfeiffer College (N.C.).
Phillips University (Okla.).
Philadelphia College of Textiles and Science.
Pikeville College (Ky.).
Polytechnic Institute of Brooklyn.
Pomona College (Cal.).
Portland State College.
C. W. Post College (N.Y.).
Providence College.
Queens College (N.Y.).
Quinnipiac College (Conn.).
Randolph-Macon College (N.C.).
Rice University.
Ripon College (Wisc.).
Rockford College (Ill.).
Rocky Mountain College (Colo.).
Rosemont College (Penn.).
Salve Regina College (R.I.).
Shaw University (N.C.).
Shelton College (N.J.).
Shimer College (Ill.).
Shorter College (Ga.)
Siena College (Tenn.).
Simpson College (Iowa).
Slippery Rock College (Pa.).
South Carolina State College.
Southern Methodist University.
Southern State Teachers College (S.D.).
Southwestern University (Tex.).
Southwest Missouri State College.
Southwest Texas State College.
St. Anselms College (N.H.).
St. Francis College (Pa.).
St. Johns University.
St. Joseph's College (Pa.).
State College at Salem (Mass.).
State College at Westfield (Mass.).
State College of Agriculture and Engineering (N.C.).
State Teachers College (Md.).
State Teachers College of New Hampshire.
State Teachers College of Vermont.
Stern College (N.Y.).
Stone Hill College (Mass.).
Sweet Briar College (Va.).
Tennessee Wesleyan College.
Thiel College (Pa.).
Trenton Jr. College.
Trinity College (Conn.).
Union College (N.Y.).
University of Baltimore.
University of Bridgeport.
University of Buffalo.
University of Colorado.
University of Dayton.
University of Dubuque.
University of Houston.
University of Kansas.
University of Kansas City.
University of Miami.
University of Michigan.
University of Missouri.
University of Nebraska.
University of North Carolina at Greensboro.
University of North Carolina Women's College.
University of Oklahoma.
University of Portland.
University of Rhode Island.
University of Southern California.
University of Texas.
University of Washington.
University of Wisconsin at Milwaukee.
Upsala College (N.J.).
Ursuline College (Ohio).
Utah State University of Agriculture.
Vanderbilt University.
Vassar College (N.Y.).
Virginia State College.
Washington College (Md.).
Washington State University
Wayland Baptist College (Tex.).
Wayne State University.
Weber College (Utah).
Wells College (N.Y.).
Wesleyan University (Conn.).
Wesley Jr. College (Del.).
Western Maryland College.
Westminster College (Utah).
Wheaton College (Mass.).
William Jewel College (Mo.).
Wilmington College (Ohio).
Worcester Jr. College (Mass.).
Yale University.
Yankton College (S.D.).
Yeshiva College.

WHO DOES NSA REPRESENT?

Contrary to what is often represented, students do not belong to NSA; schools do. Ostensibly then, it is an organization of various student governments.

But one important point must be remembered by every student who attends a college or university which is affiliated with the National Student Association—NSA claims to reflect American student opinion and to be the "most representative" student organization in the United States. According to NSA literature, this representation is most direct at the annual National Student Congress of NSA which the association refers to as "the most representative student meeting in the Nation" (See USNSA Handbook, page 21) despite the fact that less than fifty per cent of the NSA member institutions even bother to send delegates to the conclave and few of those "representatives" in attendance are, in fact, democratically elected by their respective student bodies.

It is interesting to note that the preamble to the NSA Constitution begins, "We, the members of the *national union of students* of the United States . . ." (Emphasis added.) It is easily determined from NSA's publications and activities, that it is, in fact, much more than an organization of "student governments."

STRUCTURE OF NSA

NSA is geographically divided into nineteen (19) regions each of which, with the exceptions of the states of New York, Michigan and New Jersey, is composed of more than one state. Michigan and New Jersey constitute individual regions. New York State is composed of two separate NSA regions—the Metropolitan New York Region and the New York State Region which is composed of all the colleges outside the New York City area. The New England Region of NSA (Vermont, New Hampshire, Maine, Connecticut, Massachusetts, and Rhode Island) contained the largest number of member schools in 1968 with a total membership of 36 senior (four-year) colleges and universities out of the 108 eligible institutions of higher learning in the same category.

Once a region has a school membership of 5 schools or 10% of eligible schools, whichever number is smaller, it is empowered to organize as an official subsidiary of the National Student Association. Regions may place representatives on the Congress Steering Committee based upon enrollment at member schools in the region.

Prior to the Sixteenth National Student Congress of NSA, the regional chairmen and vice-chairmen served as voting members of the highly controversial National Executive Committee (NEC). The NEC was responsible for the vast majority of the Association's legislation prior to 1963 and many hailed its dissolution, but it was quickly replaced with a new, smaller body known as the National Supervisory Board (NSB) which is currently the governing body of NSA. The National Supervisory Board members include the non-voting national officers and voting members representing 4 areas, each area composed of several regions. The areas and their representation on the NSB are: Northwest—3 representatives, Midwest—3 representatives, Far West—2 representatives, and Southern—2 representatives.

The National Supervisory Board has the power to enact interim or "emergency" policies for NSA when the need for such arises between meeting of the annual Congress. In addition to the "emergency" powers, the NSB has the authority to (1) enact the time and place of the annual Congress; (2) elect all of the National Advisors; (3) supervise the execution of the policies and programs as determined by the National Student Congress; (4) approve all appointments made by the President to fill vacancies on the Association's administrative staff; (5) suspend or remove, by a ⅔ vote, the National Officers;

(6) fill all vacancies except President among the National Officers; (7) determine and adopt the annual budget. All of these powers, which are enumerated in Article V, Section D, of the NSA Constitution make clear the fact that the NSB has much more power than any previous governing body of NSA.

As explained in the previous section, "NSA, A Political Front?", the Association is now technically split into two separate corporations—the National Student Association and the National Student Institute. For all practical purposes, however, the two organizations are the same, having the same officers, etc.

THE NATIONAL STUDENT CONGRESS AND THE NEW LEFT

Each summer, hundreds of delegates and alternates representing NSA member colleges and universities located throughout the United States travel to the campus of one of the large universities in order to participate in the national legislative convention of the National Student Association known as the National Student Congress (NSC). NSA material states that the Congress has two principal functions: It provides a meeting place for students from every area of the country to discuss mutual problems and ideas, and it is the official decision-making body for the policies and programs of USNSA. NSA claims that the NSC is "the most representative student meeting in the Nation." (USNSA Handbook, p. 21) One might begin to question the representative nature of the annual Congress, however, when it is realized that (1) less than fifteen per cent (15%) of the junior colleges, colleges, universities, and graduate schools which are eligible for membership in NSA actually belong to the Association; (2) less than fifty per cent (50%) of the member institutions generally send representatives to the National Student Congress; and (3) most of the delegates and alternates which "represent" member schools at annual Congresses are not democratically elected by the students whose views and aspirations they purport to represent. This, then, is the National Student Congress: a forum of student opinion representing the views of a few hundred young men and women who, in reality, can claim to represent no one but themselves, since most of them were not democratically elected by their fellow students. The few who are elected by their constituents usually will admit that they did not base their campaigns on the issues which are discussed at the National Student Congress.

In 1964, the delegates to the 17th National Student Congress adopted an amendment to the NSA Constitution which ostensibly provided for the democratic election of delegates and alternates to the annual Congress. Article III, Section E(1) of the Constitution states that: "No more than two members in a delegation may be selected by means other than a democratic election by their entire student body as long as this procedure does not conflict with the constitution and by-laws of the member school." The loophole is, of course, contained in the latter part of the sentence and might be similar to a mythical Supreme Court ruling which stated that every American should be permitted to vote except in those states where law prohibits the exercise of such franchise to certain groups. In view of NSA's purported concern for the civil rights of the individual, it is ironic that the Association should indirectly abrogate the right of a university student democratically to choose who he wishes to represent his views at a national student forum, but apparently the Association is more concerned with maintaining its status as a vestige of the so-called "New Left" than its responsibility as a "representative" of the American student community.

The National Student Congress generally lasts about two weeks with the first week usually devoted to committee and subcommittee sessions, regional caucuses, political caucuses, ad hoc study groups, workshops, and a number of special events (e.g., films, banquets, dancing) all of which vie for the attention of the delegates, alternates, and observers while the final week is generally dominated by the Congress Plenary Sessions which often last long into the night. While the summer Congress may represent two weeks of fun and frolic to some, the Congress and its pronouncements represent something far more serious for others. Writing of the 16th National Student Congress, William C. Wooldridge of Harvard College said: ". . . the Bloomington fiasco was the inevitable result of the Left's attempt to turn NSA into a sounding board for completely unrepresentative political opinions. Chief organ of the militant Left was the *Liberal Bulletin*, published by the Students for a Democratic Society. A typical Liberal effort, strong on emotional appeal (it had no headline with less than three exclamation marks), the *Bulletin* called the desire for 'more facts' indicative of a 'dangerous self-defeating, and unbecoming mentality all too pervasive at this Congress.' Damn the uncertainties; full speed ahead!" (William C. Wooldridge, "Fiasco at Bloomington," ***National Review***, October 8, 1963, pg. 303.) In a flash of insight, the October, 1965, issue of *Moderator* belatedly announced the emergence of the "New Left" as the dominant force in NSA. Following the 1965 NSA Congress, *Moderator* said: "Liberalism, or more properly the New Left, is in the ascendancy within the USNSA. The organization took a turn toward a movement and away from being purely organizational at its Congress this summer." ("Special Report: The National Student Congress," *Moderator*, October, 1965, pg. 29.) *Moderator* served as NSA's house organ.

It is during the initial week of the Congress that delegates meet to discuss the issues upon which they must legislate during the final few days of the Congress. Armed with background papers which have been compiled by the NSA Staff, delegates begin their quest for truth by listening to the resource personnel which have been provided by the Association also. The background papers generally consist of a series of magazine reprints or excerpts from books. These materials reflect a liberal-left point of view and this mode of thought is usually complemented by the various speakers who appear. The Congress is not used as a forum for the exploration of ideas, but as an instrument for political indoctrination.

Reporting on the 20th National Student Congress (1967), Norm Wilky, vice-president of the University of Southern California Student Association, criticized the Congress for being more interested in taking political than holding student government workshops. "I was pretty disillusioned. If a political session looked like it was going to take more time than it was scheduled for, they would cancel the workshop . . . You could look at the people and you knew they weren't typical. They couldn't be. Everybody at CCNY (City College of New York) couldn't look like the delegates they sent." (*The Daily Trojan*, USC, Sept. 13, 1967, pg. 22.)

Both Wilky and USC student body president, Marty Foley, returned from the 20th Congress with changed views about NSA. Both had supported USC membership in NSA the previous spring. Foley said the Congress was characterized by inefficiency. "As long as NSA remains in the condition I saw it at the 20th Congress," he said, "I'm going to do everything I can personally to make sure USC does not join this organization." (*The Daily Trojan*, USC, Sept. 13, 1967, pg 5.)

A report from the *Christian Science Monitor* reflects the attitude of many attending the 21st annual Congress of NSA held in September, 1968 at Manhattan, Kansas. Paul Krassner, editor of the leftist magazine, *The Realist*, described NSA as "spiritual leader of the yippies" and said that the Democratic convention in Chicago would be "the last big confrontation; people will then go underground and take up mild and not-so-mild sabotage." (*Christian Science Monitor*, Sept. 7, 1968.)

NSA'S SERVICES—SCHOOL MEMBERSHIP NO LONGER NECESSARY

Student leaders on many campuses have often been misled into overlooking NSA's radical political activities by the lure of grossly overrated "services" to member schools. For many years NSA encouraged affiliation by offering information to student governments as well as service programs to aid individual students (travel and record discounts, insurance programs, etc.) These programs were available to member schools only.

Time and again NSA uses these supposed services as its principal selling points. When visiting the campus of a prospective member school, NSA representatives deliberately underrate the magnitude of the organization's political involvement. Students are thus "sold" on the supposed "services".

For some unknown reason, NSA recently (Nov., 1968) made available the programs of its Student Services Division to ***non-member schools***. (See letter reprinted below.) It is no longer necessary to join NSA to participate in these progams. It remains to be seen, however, whether NSA uses this technique as bait to recruit new contacts for membership promotion.

Much of the information provided to interested student governments has been entirely too theoretical to have any practical application. It should be noted that, in the past, there have been programs (of a non-political nature) that were of unique benefit to certain member campuses, but they have been few and far between.

In most cases, the student government and individual student services programs offered by NSA could be obtained elsewhere (and for equal or even less cost) *and* without the radical stigma attached.

MISREPRESENTATION OF "BENEFITS"

Repeatedly, NSA claims of "benefits" and "services" are misleading and often untrue. Consider travel. Students can fly for ½ fare on seven major U.S. airlines without NSA. Consider records and magazines. Comparable student discount rates can be acquired from Records Unlimited and Educational Services, respectively, without NSA. Consider employment. Jobs can be found through Placement Centers or through either the National Employers Directory Service or the National Employment Services Institute without NSA. Student Travel, an organization based in New York City, provides extensive student travel and student tour service.

NSA FINANCING—THE CIA AFFAIR—AND AFTER

An interesting series of frantic meetings, denials, confessions, charges and countercharges followed the startling revelation in early 1967 that the CIA had been financing the National Student Association for many years. The full facts may never be known, but what is known makes interesting reading; two articles from *The New Guard*, reprinted on the following pages, provide necessary facts for a broad understanding of the issues involved.

Despite the contention that all CIA funds have been terminated, NSA has not been paying rent on its handsome four-story headquarters at 2115 S. St., N.W. in Washington, D.C. The *Washington Post*, on February 16, 1967 reported, "Thanks to the generosity of the Independence Foundation of Boston, a CIA foundation, NSA has a 15 year lease on the building free of rent. In addition, NSA received $20,000 to furnish the building when the lease was signed."

The history of NSA's tax exempt status is rather interesting. NSA first applied for tax exemption as an educational organization in 1949. In a letter dated April 25, 1950, the Commissioner of Internal Revenue refused the requested exemption on the grounds that NSA did not qualify under the law. The ruling held that NSA was not operated exclusively for educational purposes and that "a substantial part of its activities consisted of attempts to influence legislation." To get around this, the 1954 NSA president, James M. Edwards again wrote to the Commissioner on March 26, 1954. Edwards pleaded that "students" had prepared the previous request for exemption "without the assistance of counsel" and that they "were not familiar with the Internal Revenue Service procedure on such rulings." Once again, he requested exemption, but this time he submitted a carefully selected stack of NSA publications all of which emphasized NSA's educational activities and ignored the political activities which the previous Commissioner had found as legal ground to refuse exemption.

Apparently, Edward's letter, which was part of the sworn statement submitted by the National Student Association under penalty for perjury, was sufficiently convincing and, within a few months, the tax exemption was granted.

At present, NSA issues only general and vague financial statements. Funds are received from several government agencies as well as *non-taxable* private foundations. The funds allow NSA to employ a large staff which engages in such projects as: White Racism Studies, Drug Conferences and Drug Studies Programs, Student Power Conferences, Southern Human Relations Projects, "Fasts for Freedom", etc. (See reprints in section entitled "Exhibits" [not printed in RECORD] for articles explaining some of these projects.)

By inventing projects, many of which are simply vehicles to further revolution in the United States, such as its Student Power Conferences, NSA justifies its requests for special grants. Actually, these monies underwrite NSA's large, radical staff, its administrative expenses, communications and telephone expenses, and travel of NSA personnel to foment revolution. America's middle class subsidizes revolution through federal financing of large parts of the NSA budget (hundreds of thousands of dollars annually). These federal agencies have included the Department of State, Office of Education, Office of Economic Opportunity, National Institutes of Health, and possibly others. Taxpapers also subsidize many tax-exempt foundations which, in turn, give grants to NSA, totaling hundreds of thousands of dollars annually.

NSA AND THE RADICAL STUDENT MOVEMENT

Surprisingly to some, NSA's thin veil of legitimacy disappears as soon as one enters the outer office of the national headquarters in Washington. Just inside the front door is a sign which reads, "F—the Draft" and one entire wall is devoted to an outstanding rendition of the phrase, "Bull Shit"!

An "ordinary" student is appalled by the filth and litter covering the floors and carpeting, the slovenly mode of dress of staff members and the general lack of an efficient, functioning office atmosphere one would expect from a well financed enterprise run by young "representative" collegiates. Such is the real surface image of the National Student Association.

Below that surface, it is difficult to determine just how involved NSA is with the more radical "student power" movements which continue to test their strength around the country. According to *Life* magazine (October 20, 1967) the 1967 annual Congress of NSA mapped out ways "to bring any university which won't cooperate with our desires to a grinding halt."

Later that Fall, NSA held its first National Student Power Conference at the University of Minnesota. NSA President, Ed Schwartz, presented a "working paper" which summarized the tactics for campus revolution. (See the following reprint by Edith Kermit Roosevelt, "What's Behind Student Riots.")

At the conclusion of the 21st NSA Congress (1968) Schwartz, the then outgoing NSA president, "predicted that there would be trouble on any campus visited by Republican nominee Richard Nixon, or Vice President Hubert Humphrey." ("The New Left", memorandum prepared for the Committee on the Judiciary, U.S. Senate, 1968, pg. 99.)

NSA AND THE FRATERNITY SYSTEM

In keeping with its policy of general antipathy to traditional American values and institutions, NSA has taken a militantly anti-Greek stand. The Association's anti-Greek nature has not, however, escaped the attention of fraternity and sorority leaders throughout the United States, nor does it represent an innovation in NSA policy. Thus, the 1952–53 NSA President Richard J. Murphy was able to tell the delegates to the 1953 NSA Congress that the National Pan-Hellenic Council was one of the principal opponents of NSA. Murphy said: "For six years the Pan-Hellenic Council, i.e., the adult council, has not approved of the Association." He accused the Pan-Hellenic Council of circulating "poison pen letters" against the National Student Association. "This is the type of propaganda to which the Association and its officers have been subjected. Such attacks are insidious. Despite the Association's efforts to clear up the situation, no cooperation has been extended by the Council. I have become convinced that these people do not want to become enlightened." (*Minutes*, Sixth National Student Congress, August 1953, pg. 24.)

Eventually widespread criticism of the Association's anti-Greek policies forced NSA to candidly solicit the support of the Greeks. Typical of this subterfuge was a resolution adopted by the delegates to the 11th National Student Congress which consented to recognize "the contribution made by fraternal organizations to campus leadership" and urged a "closer relationship" between such groups and NSA. (*Codification of Policy, 1964–65*, by USNSA, pg. 106). However, NSA defined the type of fraternity it would like to promote on the college campus in its Basic Policy Declaration (BPD) on "Model Educational Practices Standards" under the section dealing with "Restrictive Clauses in Student Social Organizations". The resolution says:

"No incoming group shall be allowed on campus which contains in its constitution and/or by-laws discriminatory clauses with regard to race, color, religion, creed, political belief, or national origin. In the case of existing organizations which do discriminate, the institution and student body should make every reasonable effort to obtain the elimination of such discriminatory practices as rapidly as possible." (*Codification of Policy, 1964–65*, by USNSA, pg. 42.)

In the summer of 1965, a resolution entitled "Discrimination in Membership Selection and Pledge Abuse in Campus Fraternal Organizations" was introduced at the 18th National Student Congress. Once again, the resolution recognized the contributions which the Greeks have made to the American student community, but the "Fact" section also said, ". . . instances of personal degradation by fraternal organizations across the United States continue to prove harmful to the university atmosphere." The Mandate section of the resolution directed the Association's National Affairs Vice President to conduct surveys of fraternal discrimination, methods utilized to investigate complaints of such practices, and "help given by college and university administrations to chapters of national fraternal organizations which become local organizations". The resolution also directed the NAVP to send copies of the surveys, in the form of a report, to NSA member schools to assist them in establishing "a review date" after which "recognition would be withdrawn from those chapters which have affiliated with national organizations which have discriminatory membership selection". (*Policy Calendar*, 18th National Student Congress, 165, item 485/1–2.) Fearing the reaction that such a directive would initiate among the Greeks, the Congress deleted the Mandate and passed the remainder of the resolution, but the resolution's sponsors then called for a reconsideration of the remaining portions of the proposition whereupon it was defeated. However, much of the resolution that was defeated in 1965 was already contained in a Program Resolution (PR) which was adopted by the delegates to the 1964 NSA Congress entitled "Discrimination in Membership Selection in Campus Fraternal Organizations". The Mandate of the 1964 resolution made almost exactly the same provisions for "review dates", etc. as the aforementioned resolution and was passed by a substantial margin at the 17th NSA Congress. (*Codification of Policy, 1964–65*, by USNSA, pg. 99.)

At the Eighteenth Congress in 1965 NSA urged the "Office of Education in the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare and any other division of the Federal Government involved in the administering and granting of federal funds to write specific regulations implementing nondiscriminatory compliance and coverage under Title VI (Civil Rights Act of 1964) for the following:

1. Off-campus housing approved by any institution of higher learning.
2. Accommodations in houses and dormitories occupied by fraternal organizations.
3. Membership in any fraternal, social, professional, or business organization, club, association, group, committee, which is approved by a college or university."

Prior to and following such regulations by the Office of Education and other appropriate agencies, USNSA urged students to institute research groups into University operations and to serve as "monitors" for infractions of Federal law.

This shocking attempt to interfere into all private groups is strictly forbidden by the Higher Education Act of 1965.

"SEC. 804 (a) Nothing contained in this Act shall be construed to authorize any department, agency, officer, or employee of the United States to exercise any direction, supervision, or control over the curriculum, program of instruction, administration, or personnel of any educational institution, or over the selection of library resources by any educational institution.

"(b) Nothing contained in this Act or any other Act shall be construed to authorize any Department, agency, officer, or employee of the United States to exercise any direction, supervision, or control over the membership practices or internal operations of any fraternal organization, fraternity, sorority, private club or religious organization at an institution of higher education (other than a service academy or the Coast Guard Academy which is financed exclusively by funds derived from private sources and whose facilities are not owned by such institution.)"

WHAT GREEKS SAY ABOUT NSA

For many years fraternity and sorority leaders have patiently abstained from any overt hostility to NSA, hoping that with maturity NSA would return to the mainstream of American student consensus and abandon its anti-Greek policies. However, time has indicated conclusively that NSA is firm in its determination to destroy the American Fraternity System. Greek leaders have finally resolved to speak out; to point out to members of fraternal groups on the campuses the true nature of NSA and to urge them to work to disassociate their campuses from NSA.

"The Stop-NSA Committee is to be wholeheartedly commended for its constructive and aggressive activity in uncovering the insidious Un-American program of the National Student Association. The NSA is misrepresenting in a most unwholesome manner the true character and aspirations of the majority of America's young citizenry."—Mrs. C. M. Jansky, Past Grand President, Alpha Gamma Delta Sorority.

"The use of front organizations purporting to espouse worthy and idealistic objectives is a technique often employed to further the sinister ends of atheistic communism. On the surface, NSA, to the unwary, might appear to be what its name implies, a voluntary association of college students, national in scope, conducted by its members and delegates in truly representative fashion. However, those who have looked behind its facade of respectability have found strange hands directing it under cover of darkness toward collectivist mastery of group action, sometimes to the exact opposite of expressed desires and plans of the collegians themselves. Without right or power, it pretends to represent those whom it degrades. It falsely denies to fraternities the freedom of association it so loudly proclaims for itself. NSA does not and cannot promote the cause of liberty, for actually it is an implement of slavery."—Sherwood Blue, Past National President, Theta Chi Fraternity.

"It is my firm belief that the principles and programs advocated by NSA are inimical to the best interests of the country and to the fraternity system, and should not be supported by fraternities and sororities."—Beatrice H. Wittenberg, NPC Delegate, Gamma Phi Beta.

"Where specific inquiries have been made from the Chapters, we have advised that they oppose membership in NSA by voting against either gaining or continuing membership in this organization."—Roy C. Clark, Executive Secretary, Acacia Fraternity.

"Once I had hopes that true representatives of the Fraternity System might be able to guide NSA into channels that would make it better represent the majority of the substantial number of students it contended it did represent. I urged fraternity men and women to do this but was disappointed. For many years I have not approved many NSA policies and procedures and see no reason now to change my mind."—Francis S. Van Derbur, Chairman, Interfraternity Research and Advisory Council, Past President, Kappa Sigma Fraternity.

"It is my observation that one of the aims of the NSA is to destroy the American fraternity system. I personally have derived great benefit from membership in my fraternity. To my personal knowledge, many, many others have similarly benefited. In token payment for the benefits derived, I shall continue to serve and fight for the American fraternity system against all its enemies, including NSA. I hope that the undergraduate members of my fraternity will join me in our fight for survival."—John E. Scott, President, Board of Trustees, Fraternity of Phi Gamma Delta.

"In very few specific instances, if any, have I found the aims and objectives of the National Student Association to coincide with those of the American College Greek Letter Fraternity system. After observing the NSA for a number of years I have no hope for a realignment of its activities to more closely coincide with the American College Greek Letter Fraternity system. In every instance wherein my opinion is requested I suggest that the NSA be removed from a campus, or in the instance of a vote for initial acceptance of the NSA my counsel is for a negative vote."—Durward Owen, Executive Secretary, The Pi Kappa Phi Fraternity.

"The more we learn of NSA, the more we realize that it does not really represent the students of America, and that it is strongly influenced by people and organizations whose ideals run contrary to the American free enterprise system. I know of no national fraternity or sorority leaders who support NSA today."—Haldon C. Dick, Assistant Executive Secretary, Phi Kappa Psi Fraternity.

"It has been my observation and experience that NSA does not serve the best interests of fraternities and sororities, nor does it adequately or effectively represent the student body. I would urge strongly that you vote against affiliation with the NSA."—Stewart D. Daniels, Alpha Tau Omega Foundation.

"In the past, NSA has concerned itself with fraternity membership selection and other matters with which it has no authority to deal. A careful investigation of the operations of NSA in the past several years will show that many prominent campuses throughout the country have consistently declined to affiliate with it."—William Forester, Executive Secretary, Kappa Alpha.

"As a national fraternity we would like to ask that you encourage our members not to vote in favor of the referendum. We have found through past experience that the National Student Association does not function for the benefit of college students. All activities engaged in by the Association are and have been in the past for the benefit of certain select individuals. The American college student is merely being used as a front."—Elmer Blumenkamp, Executive Secretary, Theta Xi.

"The organization is controlled by a select group and is not representative of the membership in the organization, and the controlling group is more politically minded than is proper. The group which issues statements in behalf of the organization is self-perpetuating to a large degree and does not reflect the attitude and opinion of the general membership. There is, of course, question as to the democratic nature of the organization. I know that many schools have withdrawn from the organization recently for the above reasons. My recommendation to you would be to oppose the affiliation."—Jack L. Anson, National Secretary, Phi Kappa Tau.

"Most fraternity and sorority leaders oppose affiliation and with good reason. I think the motives of the organization and the quality and direction of its leadership is extremely suspect. I would urge you to give most careful consideration to this question. NSA has proved to be a most disruptive influence with very little to recommend it."—Mrs. Russell Strickland, National Panhellenic Delegate, Delta Gamma.

"This organization is divisive and does not truly work for the best interests of the students in many cases."—Bruce Melchert, Executive Secretary, Tau Kappa Epsilon.

"Alpha Phi believes that the National Student Association as presently constituted is anti-democratic in character and is unrepresentative of the majority of the students in the United States. We are opposed to this organization in its present form."—LaVerne Harvey, Executive Secretary, Alpha Phi.

"I strongly object to not only the National Student Association but any other group or organization interfering with what I call the personal and civil rights of fraternities and sororities which are voluntary membership societies. We don't interfere with the manner which NSA selects or discriminates in connection with its membership, and the NSA should not interfere with the internal policies of fraternities and sororities."—Harold Jacobsen, Editor, the Emerald Sigma Pi, Sigma Pi Fraternity.

"During my 12 years of active national fraternity leadership, I watched closely the activities of NSA, and none of the faults of NSA which I recognized at the outset were corrected during that period.

"One of our young alumnae was among the students who organized NSA. She was amazed to learn recently from authentic reports of its current activities and how far afield it had gone from the purposes and needs which prompted its formation in 1947.

"In my opinion, NSA has by its adoption of policy statements on 'restrictive membership clauses in student social organizations' disregarded the privacy to which voluntary social associations are entitled by our Federal Constitution. The NSA statements seem to deny freedom of choice in membership selection by social groups on the one hand while professing belief in this freedom on the other. Further, it seems to me that NSA is not as interested in representing the ideas of its student membership as it is in trying to direct and control them.

"In view of the many resolutions passed by NSA which favor the extreme leftists elements of this country and the world, I am convinced that NSA is inimical to the existence of private voluntary groups such as fraternities. The freedom for such groups to exist is denied in Communistic, Socialistic, or Totalitarian societies. It is for this reason that I felt during my tenure of office that it was important to alert our membership, both collegiate and alumnae, to the nature of NSA. I have not changed my mind since that time.

"It has been very encouraging to learn of the increasing number of student bodies which we have rejected affiliation with NSA."—Mrs. Robert W. Preston, Past President, Delta Gamma Sorority.

"Nothing that I have read or heard about the United States National Student Association has suggested that it is a healthy, qualified, student organization. Rather, NSA appears constantly to agitate for interference in the affairs of other student organizations. This has been particularly true with regard to American fraternities and sororities, whose freedom of membership selection has been constantly under attack by NSA.

"NSA does not represent a majority of the students in the United States. Its wide range of resolutions, covering nearly all the controversial political questions of the day, brand it as a radical organization, clearly unrepresentative of thinking American students. NSA leaders could more profitably spend their time attending to their daily academic studies and leave the world's problems to those more qualified to solve them."—Julia Fuqua Ober, Past National President, Kappa Delta.

"We have long regarded NSA as an enemy of fraternities and have consistently advised our collegate chapters to oppose NSA affiliation."—Richard R. Fletcher, Executive Secretary, Sigma Nu Fraternity.

"On the basis of careful consideration of the policies endorsed by the United States National Student Association over a period of years, I have become increasingly convinced that this organization does not represent the thinking of the majority of United States students. Judging by the number of schools whose students have voted to withdraw from or not to affiliate with NSA, it appears that students on many campuses share this view.

In my opinion, NSA's recent statement regarding fraternities is indicative of an ambition to interfere with the right of voluntary association guaranteed to us by our Constitution and Bill of Rights, and that in striving to prevent NSA's entrance to a campus or to effect its withdrawal from a campus, fraternity members will be working to preserve not only the Fraternity system, but the whole concept of a free society."—Louise L. Moore, Past National President, Phi Mu Sorority.

"Where student governments are affiliated with NSA, the college administrations seem unaware that they are arbitrarily billing all students for NSA dues and fees. Activity fees are charged on bills sent to the students or to their parents along with tuition charges, etc. A portion of the activity fee goes to the student council and thence as dues to NSA. Administrations do not realize they are forcing students to pay union dues. (NSA describes itself as a union of students). It seems to me that those students who do not wish to be represented in or by NSA could request a refund from the college for amounts involuntarily paid for NSA."—Mrs. George G. Rudolph, NPC Delegate, Delta Delta Delta.

"I was in attendance at the National Association of Deans of Women and Counselors in Philadelphia when the National and International presidents of NSA presented their program and five goals. At that time their third goal was the 'elimination of sororities and fraternities.' "—Violet Whitfield, Past President, Delta Zeta.

"My predecessor in C.F.S.A., Mr. Lewis Bacon, said 'I feel that it is the unanimous sentiment of members of the College Fraternities Secretaries Association that the National Student Association has in the past proved itself not in support of the best interests of fraternities and sororities.' I wholeheartedly agree."—Rex A. Smith, Executive Secretary, Sigma Alpha Epsilon, President, College, Fraternity Secretaries Association.

"We Greeks help our friends and oppose our enemies. The NSA is certainly no friend."—Pete Wacker, Executive Secretary, Delta Sigma Phi.

"I do not like NSA for a number of reasons. One, I think they are liars. They continually try to impress the American public that they represent 'all American men and women college students.'

"I was shocked last year when I learned that SMU had been suckered into becoming a member of NSA. If this is the kind of representation you want—then go ahead and have it. I would check out the current NSA president. Enough said. I wouldn't begin to put on paper what is known about him in the halls of Congress and in other areas here in Washington, D.C." —William S. Zerman, Executive Secretary, Phi Gamma Delta.

"I have never been told by a concerned fraternity member or college administrator that NSA membership was desirable for their institution."—Burton W. Fulsom, General Secretary, Beta Theta Pi.

"If I were a member of the student body at Southern Methodist University, not only would I vote against continued membership in NSA, but I would work actively to get other students to vote against membership in NSA. I could cite numerous resolutions and policy statements of the NSA as my reasons for acting in this manner."—Robert J. Miller, Executive Secretary, Phi Delta Theta.

"It is our impression that USNSA is not truly representative of the majority of the college students in America."—William P. Schwartz, Executive Secretary, Sigma Alpha Mu.

"We can see nothing good about the Association, and most universities are withdrawing from it."—William T. Bringham, Executive Secretary, Sigma Chi.

"My predecessor, Mr. Harold Buchanan, not too long ago said, 'We have been unable to learn of any benefit that would accrue to the members of fraternal organizations by virtue of the affiliation of the student body with NSA.' I concur in this sentiment."—F. Kenneth Brasted, Executive Secretary, Delta Chi.

[A special reprint from the April 1967 issue of the New Guard]

CIA/NSA: THE CENTRAL ISSUE

In all the sound and fury following the revelation that the Central Intelligence Agency has been funding the National Student Association, the central issue has become obscured, sidetracked, clouded. It is not found on the spiderweb conspiracy charts—outlining the tangled relationships between CIA foundations, conduits, and recipients—that have absorbed so much of the attention of the press. Nor is it the CIA's working assumptions, followed since its formation, that the best way to fight communism around the world is through "democratic socialism"—though that is a vitally important second consideration. The central issue and cause for concern is that the Central Intelligence Agency has been meddling in domestic American politics, using its considerable finances and influence to support particular political factions over others.

And that's no way to run a democratic Republic.

The CIA and its apologists in the Administration, the Congress and the communications media have done their best to obscure that fact by constant repetition of the litany that "all the money went for student trips abroad," or variations of that theme. It simply isn't so. The evidence is that the Central Intelligence Agency was not subsidizing individual students, it was subsidizing an entire organization—an organization as involved in national affairs as in international affairs.

We have, to begin with, the admission of the present National Supervisory Board of the National Student Association. After several days of hearing private testimony from present and past officers of the Association, the National Supervisory Board issued on February 17 a detailed statement outlining its relationship to the CIA.

On financial support, it stated: "During the past fifteen years the Association has received considerable funds from the Central Intelligence Agency, which at one point provided as much as 80 percent of NSA's budget. . . ."

We doubt that anyone, after looking over NSA's budgets and operations, would try to maintain that anywhere near 80 percent of NSA's budget, personnel, and effort is devoted to overseas operations. More than half of the current annual NSA budget of $825,000 is devoted to domestic activities such as civil rights projects and conferences on student government.

The National Supervisory Board's statement goes on to admit that in addition to strictly international projects, "*General support was also provided*, including administrative grants and occasional donations to cover NSA budgetary deficits incurred by *both* the National and International departments of the Association" (emphasis added).

That confirms the charges in *Ramparts*—which first blew the cover off the NSA/CIA relationship—that NSA's major conduit for CIA funds, the Foundation for Youth and Student Affairs of New York City, "provided a general administrative grant of up to $120,000 per year and funded projects such as NSA's magazine, *The American Student* . . ."; that "In addition, FYSA could be relied upon to pick up any operating deficit that NSA incurred during the year"; and, again, that "any year-end operating deficits were quickly picked up by FYSA or some other foundation."

The Washington *Evening Star* of February 20 elaborated on one such deficit—a very domestic one—erased by the CIA. It occurred when some University of Chicago undergraduates duped the NSA into buying their nationwide chain of cooperative bookstores, operating in competition with commercial stores. NSA apparently did so without a look at the operation's financial condition, which was very precarious indeed. (The *Star* quotes one person involved as saying that "The accountant didn't know double-entry bookkeeping. He kept all his financial records on the backs of envelopes.") When NSA did learn what it had bought, it found itself faced with a deficit of more than 100 grand.

Most organizations would have had to curtail their other activities in order to pay for such folly, but the NSA had an easier solution. As the *Star* relates: "Faced with the possibility of a huge financial loss, the NSA officers turned to their principal benefactors—the Central Intelligence Agency—and the CIA came up with a needed $140,000 to pay off debts."

That's not all, folks. Only the top officers of NSA, generally, knew that the CIA was the source of their funds. Some explanation of how the deficit was met had to be given to the other members of NSA's National Supervisory Board, and *that* part of the tale confirms what many have long suspected about the mental prowess of NSA leaders.

Again according to the *Star:*

"At the board's next semi-annual meeting, the NSA president explained that he had undertaken some rugged fund raising and managed to pay off all the debts.

"He listed the support he'd gotten from foundations—all CIA fronts—but the total he gave was still $25,000 short of the total needed. The supervisory board members questioned him as to how he got the final $25,000.

"It was all very simple, he explained. One day, while on a train from Philadelphia to Boston, he struck up a conversation with a wealthy Greek rug merchant.

"By the time the train had reached Boston, the rug merchant was so impressed with NSA's work that he simply wrote out a check for $25,000, the president said.

"Nobody questioned the explanation."

Though the NSA's economic wizards were taken in by the University of Chicago undergraduates, they apparently were quite adept in other aspects of the fine art of bookkeeping. *Washington Post* staff writer Andrew J. Glass reported in the February 16 issue of that newspaper that "A source within the NSA hierarchy said CIA funds, funneled to his group through the Foundation, were sometimes diverted from international accounts and used for such domestic student activities as civil rights. Travel allowances for trips abroad were also juggled in order to finance NSA's domestic activities through the CIA's indirect contributions, the source said.

"Most commonly, the NSA's source said administrative funds that came from the CIA were diverted for domestic programs, it was explained."

In speculating over the apparent lack of budgetary supervision by the CIA, it would be wise to remember that by the late 1950's most of the CIA agents acting as liaison with the NSA were themselves former officers of the National Student Association.

The inescapable conclusion is that when a subsidy is given an organization rather than individuals—and a political organization, moreover, with extensive activities both domestic and foreign—it is impossible to separate the subsidy into two different components, labeled "here" and "there." Several final examples should suffice:

The subsidy that came in the form of NSA's handsome four-story headquarters at 2115 S St., N.W., in Washington, D.C. Thanks to the generosity of the Independence Foundation of Boston, a CIA foundation, NSA has a 15-year lease on the building free of rent. In addition, NSA received $20,000 to furnish the building when the lease was signed. The building, of course, serves as headquarters for NSA's national as well as international operations.

The effect an organization's international activities have on its domestic success. Many a college joined NSA because of its wide range of international activities, which could not be matched by other organizations not enjoying the tidy government subsidy. But when those colleges joined, their dues went for NSA's domestic activities too. More importantly, their presence helped NSA perpetrate the fraud that it somehow represented American students. Small wonder, then, that W. Dennis Shaul, NSA president in 1962–63, defended his acceptance of CIA money in part "because it would have a good effect on domestic politics."

The draft deferments, which freed NSA's officers and top staffers not only for international work, but for domestic politics as well.

Ironically, and sadly, the Central Intelligence Agency continued its life-giving subsidy to the NSA at the very time that American students were rejecting the undemocratic, radical organization. As noted in the October, 1966, issue of this magazine, NSA's own convention program last year admitted that "At present about 280 of the 1700 eligible schools belong to [NSA]. This number represents a significant drop in membership from 1961, when about 350 schools belonged to the organization."

We knew we were fighting many policies of the federal government, but few of us suspected how directly we were fighting the government. Somehow we were under the illusion that in America student politics belonged to the students.

[A special reprint from the April 1967 issue of the New Guard]

FLY AWAY WITH THE CIA

(By Phillip Abbott Luce)

(NOTE.—Phillip Abbott Luce was one of the leaders of the New Left until his split with it in January, 1965. He had been editor of Progressive Labor, the monthly magazine of the Maoist group with the same name. In defiance of State Department bans, he organized several student trips to Cuba. He outlines the history of the New Left and his reasons for leaving it in his book, "The New Left.")

The recent revelations regarding the connections established between the Central Intelligence Agency and the National Student Association may cause future generations to believe that all concerned were spiking their coffee with sugar cubes containing LSD. Appropriately enough, this whole happening happened when that monthly magazine of psychedelia, *Ramparts*, blew the whistle on a cozy arrangement whereby the CIA was funding as much as 80 percent of NSA's budget.

With the advent of the Cold War, our State Department decided that it was necessary to engage the "uncommitted youth" wherever possible. State believed that it was inopportune for them to operate as directly as their Communist counterparts, and so they did not openly send young Americans abroad to engage in the propaganda war for men's minds. Instead, State chose the CIA to act as its business agent in this matter. The CIA, in turn, created a group called "Independent Research Service," which was to serve as the spokesman for American youth festivals and meetings taking place in Europe, Asia and Africa.

Unfortunately, the people who were placed in charge of Independent Research were either members of the NSA or equally-inept types. In sponsoring both the NSA and the IRS, the CIA showed strange judgment.

Abroad, the IRS acted as an arm of NSA, and was less than effective in combatting the Communists. At the World Youth Festivals, which are giant Communist circuses, the Independent Research people spent as much time knocking the United States as they did in discounting the propaganda of the Communists. In fact, according to people who saw them in operation at the festivals, they were often about as left-wing as the young Communists they were there supposedly to battle. They were not only often left-wing but almost universally inept.

During hearings before the House Committee on Un-American Activities, held on February 4, 1960, Mr. Charles Wiley had this to say about the IRS and NSA participants at the Vienna Festival.

"I think you can best describe the majority of the non-Communist delegates as boys who were sent to do a man's job. Some of them had read a little of Marx, they knew a certain amount of theory—and I should stress this here—there were notable exceptions, but by and large they knew some Communist theory, they knew nothing of Leninist tactics, and when they were put up against a trained, organized Communist machine they were simply rolled over. The Communists knew the parliamentary tricks, they knew every dirty trick in the book, and these American kids were just completely unable to cope with it."

Mr. Wiley, who is a specialist on communism and has written and lectured extensively on the subject, gives this frightening description of what he saw in Vienna:

"By and large there was a tendency throughout among the American delegates, best covered by the phrase often used, 'Let's not rock the boat,' because everything that was said in defense of the United States of America or the Western way of life was attacked as anti-festival, and the Communist strategy was to call anyone who defended our position, call them disrupters, and therefore most of the Americans let them get away with it."

The congressional investigations of the so-called World Youth Festivals have shown beyond a doubt that they were organized and controlled by the Communists, with the intent of propagandizing the world's youth. These same hearings have also established that the "official" American delegations were controlled by the Communist Party, U.S.A. The top officials of the "recognized" American delegations included such known Communists as Mike Myerson, Jake Rosen, Fred Jerome and Marvin Markman.

Interestingly enough, the young Communists were not allowed to make many of the decisions regarding the "youth festivals." Prior to the 1959 Vienna Festival, the United States was represented at the "International Preparatory Committee"—the organization charged with the preparation for the festival—by Holland Roberts, who was then over 60 years old. Roberts has long been identified with Communist causes.

Still—and this is bizarre—at the Helsinki 1962 Festival, which was the last held to date, the CIA not only sent people from Independent Research, but also allowed various representatives of the NSA to participate actively in the United States Festival Committee. The U.S. Festival Committee was the "official" organizing committee and was headed by Michael Myerson, who was designated chairman and executive secretary. The Federal Bureau of Investigation has since identified Myerson as a member of the Communist Party, U.S.A. And on the letterhead of the U.S. Festival Committee we find these names as part of a "national advisory board."

Kenneth Cloke, National Student Association delegate at the Berkeley campus of the University of California.

Jeffrey Segal, president of the Roosevelt University student body; NSA delegate; chairman of the Student Activities Board.

Mitchell Vogel, NSA delegate; chairman, Students for Democratic Rights; member of the student government executive committee at Roosevelt University, Chicago.

Richard Prosten, NSA coordinator at Roosevelt University.

Bert Weinstein, member of two student-faculty committees, former chairman of the Student Government Civil Liberties Committee and NSA delegate at the City College of New York (CCNY).

And while Independent Research was obviously a CIA operation from its inception (anyone who didn't realize that IRS was controlled by CIA was too naive to be taking European trips), the NSA was definitely a covert operation. This, in itself, raises serious questions about CIA operations in the United States.

According to the people involved, only the very top leadership of NSA knew about the CIA funding of that organization. Leaving aside the political bias of NSA for a moment, it was hardly fair to the general membership of NSA that they be led down the merry road, only to be confronted suddenly with the fact that they have been put on for years by their own leadership. But, just as in the best tradition of the Communists, whom everyone easily castigates for duping students, the NSA leadership effectively duped their membership. No one can really feel sorry for the leadership—after all, they were young men on the make and they made it—but it is a shame that a number of intelligent and hard-working young people were lied to for years, and then suddenly confronted with the fact that they had been involved in a covert CIA operation. The outrage and indignation of the average NSA member is understandable, but there is no justification for the mock anger of some of the leadership.

The recent set of exposures have also given the Communists a field day. Every young American who has visited Europe in recent years is being branded by the Communists as an agent of the CIA. *The Worker* is filled with self-congratulations about always "knowing that the NSA was a CIA front. Danny Rubin, one of the older "students" presently on the National Committee of the CPUSA, wrote in the March 5 issue of *The Worker* that he always was aware of the CIA influence in the NSA, but that "Communists do not share the reaction of some student leaders to the revelations: to quit NSA and see it go under. . . ."

Young Americans for Freedom has long called for the demise of the NSA. The recent revelations of its CIA sponsorship only increase our desire to see those few students who still support this bankrupt organization drop out. The National Student Association is a deadletter organization. Let it be buried quietly, and let us get on with the work of building a student organization truly representative of the American student, and not the CIA, or State Department, or any other parent group.

One argument now being advanced against the NSA/CIA combine is that while the CIA might not have been the right agency to finance the NSA, it is the responsibility of someone in the federal government to do so. The argument goes something like this: "Admittedly the CIA was wrong in financing the NSA. It was too secretive in its operation, and when the truth was learned the whole thing blew up. If the State Department had done it openly, we wouldn't be faced with the same problem."

True, the same problem would not exist, but instead of secret CIA funds being involved we would simply have public State Department funds involved. The problem is not only one of secrecy but of governmental influence. It is naive to believe that the State

Department or USIA would have simply given the NSA, or anyone else, money to finance their operations without some understanding that a "policy line" would implicitly be followed. In the world of real politics, governmental agencies, secret or open, demand a return for their investments. The solution is not merely open funding, but an end to the government trying to buy off students and student organizations.

Private student groups, not responsible to or financed by either the CIA or the State Department, are our best bet, since they can be active without having to conform to governmental antics ("bridge building," etc.). Those young people who gained private funds to travel to Helsinki and Vienna to combat the Communists did a most effective job. They operated effectively because they had both an anti-Communist philosophy and experience in debating and fighting the Communists. They were not interested in being portrayed as "progressive dissenters" from the United States, but in showing a true picture of this country. They were serious anti-Communists, not left-wingers or young men and women on the make.

The Central Intelligence Agency can take care of itself. It has already weathered bigger and better storms, including such foul-ups as the Bay of Pigs fiasco and its failure to learn of the Berlin Wall plans until it was almost completed. The real losers from all of this exposure are the American people and American students in particular. We have all lost some of our freedom and democratic heritage if the CIA is involving itself in our internal politics. Students have lost because they now find themselves deceived by both the government and the National Student Association. The CIA actions recently exposed can only increase the already-heavy trend of students to "drop out" of politics and to look cynically at politics.

All of this could have been avoided had the government not tried to influence students and finance their operations. It could also have been avoided had the business community lived up to its responsibility to the youth of this country and helped to finance needy groups.

In the past weeks I have seen student anger with the NSA/CIA affair turn to resignation and then to cynicism. But the answer is not to turn to LSD, whether it is provided by the CIA or Tim Leary. It's past time we all got angry with the attempts of the government to tell us how to run our lives and our organizations, and the answer is to expand our support of those student organizations that are free from government control and are fighting to retain an independent spirit in this country.

[Reprinted from the Philadelphia Bulletin]

WHAT'S BEHIND STUDENT RIOTS?

(By Edith Kermit Roosevelt)

WASHINGTON.—The revolutionary objective of the overthrow of the American system of government is not concealed anymore in infiltrated and manipulated college and university campus groups. As an instance, instructions on revolution were presented as an objective by Ed Schwartz, president of the National Student Association, at NSA's First National Student Power Conference, at the University of Minnesota, November 17–18, 1967.

Schwartz's extraordinary "working paper" summarizes the tactics already used in virtual insurrections that have occurred at the University of California at Berkeley, San Francisco State College, the University of Wisconsin and other campuses throughout the nation. He gave the NSA president four steps leading to control of the nation's campuses by radicalized students.

1. "Gradual escalation." According to the NSA paper, this means that "Students must be weaned gradually into revolutionary fervor." The NSA president warns, "If the base of support for initial goals is too broad, as fundamental objectives become explicit, campus participation may dwindle. Once that happens, it's all over."

2. "Non-negotiable tactics." NSA instructs student revolutionaries that "the goal is to create a dialectical situation in which the administration is forced to reject seemingly reasonable requests for change in such a manner as to alienate the entire campus." The reason given for avoiding negotiations, such as would take place if reform rather than revolution was the goal of these students, is that "as soon as the first proposal appears negotiable, followers will be lost." What this adds up to is that the radicals want college administrators to become immoderate or reactionary and to alienate the entire student body. A typical "dialectic situation" was the emergence in Germany of the contending totalitarian Nazi and Communist parties with no role being allowed for such moderate groups as conservatives and liberals. This is what every revolutionary group seeks to bring about.

3. "Administration fury." NSA stresses the importance of maneuvering the president of the college or the regents into reacting angrily and slurring the character of the campus groups. The NSA president declares, "Even if your first proposal is not acceptable to many students, the administration's reactions will outweigh their reservations. A slur on the character of any student group within reasonable bounds of respectability is an indirect slap at the entire campus. That should be made clear."

4. "Campus Response." Student workshops are advised by NSA, "if the first move appears too inflammatory, the students may feel that the administration's response is justified. If you can get a few campus 'respectables' or even invulnerables like honors students and Woodrow Wilson winners, you will have a better chance of success."

The NSA paper admits frankly that the goal of revolutionary campus movements are basic changes within the universities, such as "resignation of the president, abolition of board of trustees, elimination of classes." On December 6, at San Francisco State College only 100 organized radicals out of a total student body of 18,500 succeeded in closing down the campus during riots in which fires were set and campus property destroyed.

According to Life magazine of October 20, 1967, the NSA Congress last August mapped out ways *"to bring any university which won't cooperate with our desires to a grinding halt."* At least 40 campuses were selected as targets for revolutionary fervor—including Northwestern, Columbia University, the University of Colorado and Stanford.

On the national scene, *NSA has gone on record in favor of organized resistance to the draft and for supporting "black power" which means the aims of the Stokely Carmichaels "by any means necessary," which does not exclude riot, arson and mayhem.*

There are only some 330 student governments associated with NSA, which comprises less than 15 per cent of the nation's accredited eligible colleges. But NSA members are militant and are being indoctrinated by a number of extremist faculty members and older, trained agitators outside the campuses. While the Central Intelligence Agency says it no longer supports NSA, other government agencies have stepped into the breach. According to the Washington Post of last May 7, a total of $390,000 has been given to NSA by the Office of Economic Opportunity, the Office of Education and the State Department.

Revolutionary campus activities by NSA, the Students for a Democratic Society, W.E.B. DuBois Clubs of America, Progressive Labor Party and other groups are picking up momentum because of the generally permissive attitude of school administrators. A number of administrators plead concern for student personal safety as an excuse for surrendering to intimidation by a small minority of students.

According to David A. Keene, vice president of the Young Americans for Freedom, the riots at the University of Wisconsin on October 18 grew out of the fact that the university over a period of years had *consistently permitted one campus group to impose its desires on another by force.* As an example, he said, two government officials who visited the campus to speak, were unable to complete their presentation and were booed down. The administration failed to order the disruptive students out of the room on the grounds that there would have been danger of violence if they had refused to leave voluntarily.

According to Keene, the radicals then felt sufficiently emboldened to stop the interviews on campus between Dow Chemical Co. and interested students by force if necessary. The University of Wisconsin might have avoided *grim and bloody confrontation between police and student demonstrators if the university administration had taken a stronger stand in the first place and enforced the campus rules fairly and equally.*

The lesson is plain, whether on the nation's campuses or on the streets: We are faced with a breakdown of all laws which protect the rights of each individual in his professional and political life. Administrators in government and in academic life alike must assume their obligations to protect the public.

PRESIDENT NIXON'S TRIP TO WESTERN EUROPE

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

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, I have requested this time in order that I might yield to the distinguished minority leader, the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. GERALD R. FORD).

(Mr. GERALD R. FORD asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I am grateful that the distinguished minority whip has yielded me this time to make some observations concerning the successful trip of our President to Western Europe.

It was my pleasure, along with a number of Members from the other body as well as this body, to be at Andrews Air Force Base when the President left on this mission. It was a bipartisan representation of both Houses of Congress, wishing the new President well as he embarked upon his first trip abroad on behalf of our Nation.

Sunday night a group, again from the other body as well as this body, was at Andrews Air Force Base to express a warm welcome to the new President upon his return. The distinguished Speaker was among those who were at Andrews Air Force Base to welcome the President on his arrival.

I think the fact that Members of both political parties wished him well on his departure and welcomed him on his return is a clear indication that all Americans want us as a Nation to be successful in whatever mission is undertaken by the Chief Executive on behalf of all of us.

It is my observation, based upon watching television, listening to the radio, and reading the papers, that the mission of the President was successful. New lines of communications were opened between the head of our Nation and the heads of state throughout Western Europe. The impression I gained from listening, watching, and reading is that Western European leaders and His Holiness the Pope were impressed with the President's knowledge and his willingness to listen. It seems to me we are warranted in our hope that peace will be achieved.

Mr. Speaker, we are not Democrats or Republicans when it comes to what we want done, not only for Americans, but for all mankind, in the interests of peace.

Mr. Speaker, it was vitally important that we expand our view of the world to place Europe again in the immediate circle of our attention, to bring the problems of Western Europe into fresh focus. This the President has done.

President Nixon also appears to have healed the long rupture in French-American relations, and this, too, is important to the future peace of the world.

Mr. Speaker, it seems to me that President Nixon has accomplished all of the objectives he set for himself when he departed on his ambitious West European tour. I feel certain, Mr. Speaker, that all of the American people view Mr. Nixon's trip as an unqualified success.

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, if my 1 minute has not as yet expired, I would like to add a sentence or two to what the minority leader has just said.

Like other Members of this House, I was privileged last night to be at the Andrews Air Force Base when the President of the United States returned from his trip to Western Europe. I was also there when the President left on his trip, along with other Members of this body and of the Senate.

Mr. Speaker, as I stood at Andrews Air Force Base last night I was very, very proud of the President of the United States, not as a Republican President or as a Democratic President, but as the President of the United States.

He has just returned from a valiant effort while abroad in attempting to see if it were possible somehow to cement better relationships among the nations of the world, particularly those in Western Europe. I have the feeling that our President is going to exert every effort toward returning peace and quiet in this great world of ours, so that people and nations might live together in harmony as they are supposed to live.

As we wished the President Godspeed when he left on his trip, so last night we were thankful and grateful that he safely returned from his mission abroad where he had done so much for better understandings.

Mr. Speaker, I trust all Members will cooperate as best they can in lending assistance to the President of all of us that we might have peace on earth and the kind of world that we all want for ourselves and our posterity.

PRESIDENT NIXON'S EUROPEAN TOUR

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

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Speaker, I am sure I speak for all Members on this side of the House in saying that we share the feeling of gratitude that has been expressed by our distinguished minority leader and others for the safe return of the President.

I believe the presence of our beloved Speaker at Andrews Air Force Base last night was testimonial for all of us in this House of the deep and bipartisan feeling of hope with which the trip of the President has been attended.

I am sure that every American feels as the distinguished Speaker and other Members have expressed themselves, that politics in a partisan sense in our country should stop at the water's edge when the President of the United States goes abroad about the business of advancing the interest of our country. He should go with the best wishes and prayers of all Americans.

I personally feel it is a little too early as yet to say exactly what the results of that trip have been, in a substantial way, but let us all hope and pray that they do prove to be tremendous forward steps for America and for peace among the nations. In this regard I am certain there will be no partisanship in the feelings and the prayers of all of us in this body.

THE IMPORTANCE OF PRESIDENT NIXON'S EUROPEAN TOUR

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

Mr. RHODES. Mr. Speaker, the President of the United States has just completed a very important trip to Western Europe. Whenever the incumbent of the American Presidency changes, the nations of the world quite naturally have some doubts and perhaps some fears as to what the policies of the new administration may be. It was very important, therefore, that the President personally take to the peoples of Western Europe and to the governments of Western Europe word as to his own intentions, his own philosophy, and the manner in which he looks at the relationships of our country with the rest of the world, and particularly with the nations of Western Europe.

I believe it is even more important, however, Mr. Speaker, that the President was able to take in his person a message from the people of the United States to the people of Western Europe so that those people would be assured that the concern and the feeling of brotherhood which we have always felt for them has not faded, and that we still remember the responsibilities which we have assumed toward them and which they have assumed toward us throughout the years, and that it is our intention to make sure that the ties that have bound us together do not become less, but become even more significant as time goes by.

The people of our country have been pleased with the trip conducted by the President of the United States. They have looked upon this trip as their own trip; they feel that in spirit they were there, and that whatever was accomplished was accomplished in their name. The following newspaper comment certainly seems to indicate a broad identification with and approval of this trip, and the President's actions throughout the journey:

[From the Kansas City Star, February 25, 1969]

THE NIXON POLICY FOR A SOUNDER NATO

In Brussels the President of the United States looked back over 20 years of the brilliantly successful NATO alliance and considered its future. He did not venture into soothsaying. But Richard Nixon did restate and expand on a favorite theme that East and West are "ending a period of confrontation and entering an era of negotiation." In this transition, the President assured our NATO partners, the United States will not seek to go it alone as the colossus of the free world. Instead there is to be full consultation with all other NATO nations in matters of common concern.

This assurance should have brought some relief to the governments and peoples of Western Europe—the West Germans, the British, the Italians and the others, even including the French who have drawn themselves apart from the functioning of NATO. The discussions in prospect between the Americans and the Russians might have been envisioned as a parley of nuclear giants bent on reshaping the destiny of all nations with which they are associated. Now Mr. Nixon has pledged that there will not be such a narrowing of the negotiator's concern on this country's side of the conference table. He thus undertook to dispose of the kind of fear that Charles de Gaulle has actively encouraged.

Mr. Nixon made a strong case of need for consulting with the other members of the Atlantic partnership. He candidly conceded that this course has not always been followed in the past, with the U.S. at times talking but not really listening and then making decisions unilaterally. But he also noted that relationships among the alliance's members have changed, as Europe's war-ruined economies have acquired flourishing health.

In its two decades NATO has succeeded precisely in what it set out to accomplish. As President Nixon observed, the nations that were free 20 years ago remain free today. He could have added that not one inch has been added to the overlordship of Central and Eastern Europe that was established by the Soviet Union at the end of World War II. Most important, in Mr. Nixon's words, "the ultimate crisis that would have provoked a nuclear war has been prevented."

Contributing to this prevention of holocaust has been the nuclear standoff that has come into existence between the only two major atomic powers, the United States and Russia. Now they are in the apparent position of both wanting to work out an accord on arms control to reduce the economic burdens of their weapons rivalry and to avoid its soaring into new and even costlier undertaking. At least partly this is what President Nixon had in mind when he spoke of "an era of negotiation." There may be other opportunities for agreement, too. Indeed, joint U.S.-Soviet efforts to head off another war in the Middle East have the highest possible priority. Washington, as the long-time supporter of Israel, and Moscow, as the supplier of armaments to the Arab states, both have means of applying leverage for the sake of peace in the inflamed area.

Thus there is substance for the upturn of optimism that is evident in President Nixon's address before the NATO council. The world can expect to learn more of the "wide range of issues" that will be explored with the Soviet Union. And the President's journey to Europe already has been justified by his disclosure of an American shift in the matter of consultation which other members of the Atlantic alliance have long waited to hear.

[From the Miami (Fla.) Herald, Feb. 25, 1969]

A LONG STRIDE BY MR. NIXON

The warmth of the welcome being given to President Nixon in Europe seems genuine and there is good reason for it. . . .

He is listening rather than talking. Part of his avowed aim is to start "a new era of consultation—and I mean real give-and-take consultation—between the leaders of the European-American community."

His attitude by itself should get the results he seeks. The timing of the trip and the fact that he is making it say more than words to "our European friends."

The United States is the leader of the Free World, as everyone knows. The new President might easily have invited European chiefs of state to visit him in Washington. Instead, very soon after taking office, he goes to see them in their capitals.

The physical gesture speaks for itself, eloquently.

The handful of leftists who chanted "Nixon go home" at the Brussels airport was outnumbered by several hundred Belgians who turned out to greet Mr. Nixon. Similar scenes can be expected at each stop, and will leave the President unruffled. As he has said, he is sure that 95 per cent of the people favor his journey. He is right in ignoring the noisy minority.

Mr. Nixon is taking the first long stride toward "a new spirit of confidence among our European friends and ourselves." If he can achieve it, the gains will accrue to both shores of the Atlantic and much of the rest of the planet.

[From the Chicago (Ill.) Daily News, Feb. 25, 1969]

COCKED EAR POLICY

The sensitive and sympathetic ear that President Nixon has promised Western Europe is of greater value at this stage of history than a considerable megatonnage of nuclear weapons.

For communication is the first requirement of a Western alliance weakening at the seams. And communication has lately been scarce. Lyndon Johnson made no full-dress European tour during his Presidency. It was June, 1963, when John F. Kennedy visited the continent and proclaimed *"Ich bin ein Berliner!"*

In a sense, light years have elapsed since that visit, radically changing the bargaining position of the President of the United States. Then the United States still seemed the great, invincible bastion of Western power and barrier against a world Communist hegemony.

Subsequent events have exploded the notion that two nations with enough military power could manage the world between them and in that process have signaled what Arthur Schlesinger Jr. proclaims in the current Harper's as "the end of the age of superpowers."

Even as Schlesinger (no pal of Mr. Nixon's) propounds his thesis that the most successful power of the future may well be the one that shows itself most human, the President has taken his hat in his hand and set out to woo the Europe's leaders with attentiveness and quiet good manners. He is not, of course, finding sweetness and light the universal rule on the continent. But we dare say he is doing more with molasses than he could have with vinegar or vetch.

The tests will come toward the end of the week, in West Berlin and Paris. For if the age of sweet reason is dawning for the United States and perhaps even in a vague and uncertain way for Russia, it has not yet noticeably troubled either Herr Ulbricht or Gen. de Gaulle. East Germany has heated up a fresh batch of harassments timed for maximum impression on Mr. Nixon, while de Gaulle is now disclosed as in the midst of a fresh attempt to freeze the United States out of Europe.

However vexing these factors may be, there is advantage in Mr. Nixon's seeing Europe's leaders and Europe's relationships as they are rather than behind bland false faces.

For the new President is moving into a high-stake game in which American resources have dwindled measurably since the time when this nation stood militarily and economically supreme in the world. American power still counts and so does Russian power, but Mr. Nixon must start making arrangements to preserve America's position and interests in a world of peers rather than inferiors or subordinates. If he merely gets a taste of how bafflingly different this will be for a United States accustomed to sitting at the head of the table, the trip will be worthwhile.

[From the Houston (Tex.) Chronicle, Feb. 25, 1969]

NIXON'S EUROPEAN VISIT

President Nixon is taking something of a political risk by going to Europe so early in his administration. Not that the trip isn't timely. It is indeed. The risk comes from the fact that should Mr. Nixon make a blunder during his talks with European leaders, it could cloud U.S. future relations with our European Allies before his administration had a chance to take hold.

It is a tribute to Mr. Nixon's confidence that he has embarked at so early a date on this low-key adventure in personal diplomacy.

He was wise, we think, in making this a "working" trip, free from an excess of pomp and ceremony. To underline this emphasis on work, he chose to leave Mrs. Nixon behind. He intends to make a minimum of public speeches and announcements. As he said on his Brussels stop-over: "I have come for work, not for ceremony; to inquire, not to insist; to consult, not convince; to listen and learn, and to begin what I hope will be a continuing interchange of ideas and insights."

This course is bound to leave a favorable impression on our European Allies, many of whom have begun to see the United States as too powerful militarily and economically, too obsessed with Vietnam and Asia, too unmindful of Europe, and too heavy-handed in the conduct of international diplomacy.

Obviously, it was just such criticism Mr. Nixon had in mind when he told the Council of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization that "the United States is determined to listen with new attentiveness to its NATO partners." And he assured the council that when or if the United States enters into direct talks with the Soviet Union, it will be on a basis "of full consultation and cooperation with our Allies, because we recognize that the chances for successful negotiations depend on our unity."

This eight-day trip will accomplish a number of good purposes. It not only will permit Mr. Nixon to renew acquaintances with European leaders, it also will give the people of Europe a chance to take Mr. Nixon's measure. In the past, he has not enjoyed a favorable political image in Europe. Undoubtedly it will improve—both in this country and abroad—as he practices the good judgment, candor and moderation which has characterized his first month in the White House. Mr. Nixon appears equal to the task.

[From the New York Times, Feb. 26, 1969]

NIXON'S UNASSERTIVE MANNER IMPRESSES HIS HOSTS ON TRIP

(By Max Frankel)

LONDON, February 25.—Richard M. Nixon is quoting freely from Woodrow Wilson as he follows a 50-year-old Presidential trail, around Europe and he is best known here so far for his political association with Dwight D. Eisenhower and his defeat by John F. Kennedy. But the new mold in which the new President is offering himself defies comparison with his more heroic predecessors. The skeptics among his hosts say they are impressed.

The British are impressed not only because Mr. Nixon strikes them as knowledgeable and curious but also because his openness comes as something of a pleasant surprise from his reputation as a cold warrior in the fifties and from his campaign rhetoric last year, they had expected someone less sensitive to change in the world and less flexible in his approach to the Communist nations.

After two days of talks here, Prime Minister Wilson's associates are conceding their surprise without worrying whether they had misjudged their guest to begin with or whether the responsibilities of office had altered him. They say they can share his analyses of the situation in Europe and welcome his "forthcoming" attitude toward East-West negotiations, the subject that dominated much of the conversation in London.

PROMISE IS AFFIRMED

Since many Europeans appear to have been shocked even more than Americans by the Soviet invasion of Czechoslovakia last summer, this drawing together may reflect as much change in the British Labor party as in Mr. Nixon's Grand Old Party. Either way, the President's promise of trans-Atlantic collaboration is being affirmed.

And so is Mr. Nixon's confidence in the timing and style of his journey, despite the public dispute between London and Paris about the future of Europe and the future of the Atlantic alliance and despite the absence of the emotional public tribute that other Presidents have attracted on this side of the ocean.

The President has deliberately been defying the Wilsonian tradition that brought his predecessors here with ringing assertions of New World strength and vision. Mr. Nixon says he has come because it is time for the allies to face "some hard questions" together. But his public definition of the question has been vague and most of his thoughts about the answers remain unformed.

Though skilled in the use of the surprise gesture toward a curbstone crowd or an unexpecting House of Commons, Mr. Nixon has thus far evoked more curiosity than excitement. By and large he has moved swiftly and decorously through his rounds in Brussels and London, bowing with elaborate deference at every handshake (except for today's upright greeting of the Queen) and striking a remarkably unassuming pose.

CANDID AND SYMPATHETIC

Yet up close, on more private occasions, he is described as easy and candid, unfailingly courteous, sympathetic to the difficulties of other nations and reflective about his own.

His task is made easier by the fact that he is neither seeking nor promoting policy agreements. For the moment, he is promoting only himself as a responsible custodian of the West's nuclear might, and seeking only the goodwill that he is willing to show others.

Besides the promise to consult the allies when he enters negotiations with Moscow—a promise that all of them, and particularly the West Germans, wanted very much to hear—Mr. Nixon is offering no commitments, no inspirations, no new agendas for action or even for consultation.

The President has been content to show that he understands that times have changed, that the alliance has helped to prevent nuclear war but needs a more positive function now. He has been content to show that he understands the issues behind years of debate among the allies—debate about the nature of the Soviet military threat in Europe, about the appropriate allied defense posture and about the need to adjust trans-Atlantic relationships now that Europe is prospering.

NO GRAND VISIONS OFFERED

These remain the central qeustions, Mr. Nixon says. But unlike his predecessors in the nuclear age, he has not come here to hold out grand visions or solutions.

Clearly, he shares the view of the Kennedy and Johnson Administrations that Western Europe must unite if it wishes to diminish its dependence on the United States and that it must accept dependence on the American nuclear shield as long as European energies and technologies remain divided into sovereign factions.

This is Western Europe's central difficulty, and Mr. Nixon's predecessors became exasperated with President de Gaulle because he refused to help resolve it. He seemed to favor neither European union nor dependence on the United States.

Mr. Nixon evidently believes that he can find a way around this problem by establishing a more cordial process of consultation with the general, and he is measuring his words as he approaches Paris. He is advertising a desire to let the British manage their own entry into the European Economic Community without coaching or assistance from across the sea. He plans to tell the West German's that he seeks a climate in which they will not feel pressed to "choose" between association with Paris and Washington.

Eventually Mr. Nixon may feel compelled to show his impatience with disunity among the allies and to offer his own formulas for greater cohesion. On this trip, however, he is avoiding the posture of the statesman and betting instead on the dividends of an unusually modest diplomacy.

[From the New York Times, Feb. 28, 1969]

MR. NIXON'S RECEPTIONS

The Italian Communists and their allies are old hands at staging demonstrations, and President Nixon has no reason to take personally the outbursts that followed his arrival in Rome. Nor should Americans infer that the Soviet Union sparked these actions of an Italian Communist party that has gone out of its way for years to display fierce independence of the Kremlin.

It seems obvious that the demonstrations were designed more to embarrass the buffeted center-left coalition of Premier Rumor, in office only two months, than to humiliate Mr. Nixon. Here was an excellent occasion for chiding Mr. Rumor's restless Socialist partners about their grudging support for Italy's continuing role in the NATO Alliance, and the Communists seized it.

The attitude of most Italians toward the visit by the new American President was surely expressed not in the Communist riots but in the enthusiastic welcomes Mr. Nixon received at the airport and along his motorcade route into Rome.

Earlier, an abortive attempt by left-wing students to disrupt the Nixon motorcade failed to tarnish a successful visit to West Berlin. Even with the sharp dispute between East and West Germany over the Federal Republic's plan to elect its new President in West Berlin next week, there was no need on this occasion for anything approaching John F. Kennedy's electrifying "Ich bin ein Berliner" speech in 1963.

All that was required was for the new President to restate the enduring commitment of the United States and its allies to the safety and freedom of West Berlin. This Mr. Nixon did with dignity and without provocation. He must have been gratified at the response.

[From the Newark (N.J.) Evening News, Feb. 25, 1969]

REDIRECTING NATO

President Nixon's address to the NATO Council in Brussels was in marked, and no doubt intended, contrast with what the council has been hearing from President de Gaulle. Whereas Gen. de Gaulle has stubbornly balked at participation in NATO functions that do not serve his pleasure, Mr. Nixon reaffirmed that U.S. commitment to partnership.

President Nixon took pains, in fact, to puncture two of the general's favorite excuses for chipping at the foundations of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization. To the complaint that NATO pays too much heed to Washington (and, by inference, not enough to Paris), Mr. Nixon expressed determination "to listen with new attentiveness" to what NATO partners have to say. He would also "actively seek the counsel" of these allies on questions affecting world peace and stability—including forthcoming negotiations with the Soviet Union.

President Nixon also rejected President de Gaulle's implication that NATO, which reaches its 20th anniversary this year, has outlived its usefulness. Times indeed have changed, and the military threat from the East—while not eliminated—may not be so great as in 1949. But NATO can turn to added purposes, like sharing "new ideas and new technologies to enrich the lives of our peoples." For this Mr. Nixon would pool brains just as NATO has also pooled arms.

This constructive approach is important to long-range security on both sides of the Atlantic. While it largely carries forward what his predecessors have also proclaimed, Mr. Nixon's message is a well timed reminder that there is little future in the negative, isolationist policy being promoted from Paris. It might even suggest to Gen. de Gaulle that the may find himself alone if he abandons NATO, as the treaty permits him to do after the 20th anniversary.

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

NIXON'S EUROPEAN SUCCESS

President Nixon's successful tour of Europe has opened a vital effort to unite the West for negotiations with the East. The escalating tension over Berlin, which reached a new high point yesterday, casts a darkening shadow over the prospects for broad East-West talks. But the new and more intimate kind of consultation with the NATO allies initiated by Mr. Nixon will be useful whatever the future may hold.

Only a beginning has been made, of course, in these allied discussions. Nevertheless, the progressive estrangement of the United States from its European partners has been halted and perhaps, reversed.

A full assessment of Mr. Nixon's talks with Europe's leaders must await the President's report to the nation, this week and similar accounts by his European partners. West-West as well as East-West issues were covered and here, with France again quarreling with its neighbors, results necessarily were more modest.

Talks were initiated with the Common Market Commission to head off trends toward protectionism on both sides of the Atlantic. Perennial fears in Bonn about American troop withdrawals from Germany were eased. Bonn recognizes more clearly the need for a commensurate German military effort and a long-term agreement to offset U.S. dollar costs. The next move on the international monetary front was explored everywhere.

On the major, long-recalcitrant West-West problems—such as the future structure of NATO, the political union of West Europe and Britain's admission to the Common Market—no breakthroughs were made, or even sought. General de Gaulle's disagreements with his neighbors make little progress possible on these issues at present, despite the reopening of a French-American dialogue. A new climate between Paris and Washington might help to resolve substantive questions, if not with de Gaulle, then with his successors. But two or three years of persistent effort will be needed to determine if this is possible.

Mr. Nixon's European probe confirmed almost universal support among the NATO countries for a cautious American effort at negotiation with the Soviet Union if close consultation with the NATO allies is maintained. Despite the current Berlin pressures and dismay over Czechoslovakia, Europe's leaders believe Moscow is seriously interested in a dialogue with Washington on the nuclear arms race, the Middle East and perhaps other issues.

Mr. Nixon met a disconcerting response to his thesis that delay in opening the strategic arms talks might bring political concessions from Moscow. He was asked in Bonn to link German reunification, too, to the missile talks and his spokesman had to announce that "no conditions would be placed on bilateral arms talks." But even in West Germany, Mr. Nixon found the conviction that an improved climate in Soviet-American relations would reduce the risk of general war and aid the other NATO allies in their own negotiations with Moscow.

For several years now, the West has faced the East in disarray. Bilateral contacts and negotiations have brought scores of high-level meetings between Kremlin officials and those of individual Western countries. But often leaders of other Western nations got little or no information about these talks, let alone opportunity for prior discussion. President Nixon has emphasized now that consultation must be a two-way street, the prerequisite for the unity and common purpose the West will need if broad-ranging negotiations with the Soviet Union are to become reality.

[From the Baltimore (Md.) Sun, Mar. 2, 1969]

NIXON'S TRIP

The objectives and the results of President Nixon's week-long tour in Western Europe have been kept within proper, modest proportions. Mr. Nixon has, in effect, laid the foundation for substantive foreign policy developments which can be expected later—perhaps even within the next few months. He has made two preliminary but none the less significant points: he has reaffirmed the United Staates ties with its allies in Western Europe and set up his own relationship with their leaders; and he has established himself more firmly, with respect to the American people as well as the people of Western Europe, as the new President of the United States.

Mr. Nixon thus has added to his stature and authority. He has placed himself in position to go on to the next steps and to face the difficult issues with which the world is all too plentifully supplied. An American President possesses great powers and the United States Government is a powerful force, but the confidence and respect of other governments and other peoples are also of first-rank importance.

The continuity of American policy toward NATO, West Berlin, the European Common Market and the Middle East has been reinforced by the President. The flap over President de Gaulle's remarks to the British Ambassador about a Western Europe which would include Great Britain but exclude the NATO command and the United States was kept in perspective by Mr. Nixon, so far as we can judge. At any rate, Mr. Nixon did not permit it to affect his own course in renewing our many old and deeply-rooted associations with France; it is worth noting that these associations go on despite the confusion and resentment in this country over some of General de Gaulle's maneuvers. Disagreement over policy should not be extended to personalities in this case, as both Mr. Nixon and the General tried to make clear.

Major foreign policy issues, of course, ultimately involve the relations between the United States and the Soviet Union. Among the most interested observers of the President's travels, we may be sure, are the Soviet leaders. They know, as we do, that Mr. Nixon's discussions in Western Europe look toward the prospect of negotiations with the Soviet Union on issues related to world peace—nuclear arms and defensive systems, but also such subjects as the Middle East and Berlin. It cannot be said that what Mr. Nixon has done thus far has produced solutions to these long-standing problems. But as a result of his trip he is in a stronger position to take hold of the problems, and this must be considered a net gain.

[From the Boston (Mass.) Globe, Feb. 24, 1969]

ENTER MR. NIXON, MODESTLY

President Nixon set just the right tone for his seven-day West European trip when he told American newsmen before leaving: "I am not going to Europe for the purpose of lecturing the Europeans, of telling them that we know best, and of telling them to follow us. . . . We are going there to listen to them, to exchange views, to get their best information and their best advice as to how their problems should be solved and how world problems should be solved."

For a brand new American President to have flown to Europe with some grand design for its military and political unification could well have had the reverse effect of deepening the already serious division among its member nations, notably England and France, which are currently embroiled in traumatic controversy over what Gen. de Gaulle did or did not say to the British ambassador in Paris early this month concerning European economic and military arrangements.

Mr. Nixon has made no bones, both before and since being elected, about his belief that the United States has neglected Europe badly in its preoccupation with the war in Vietnam. And he has been quite right. So his modest, fence-mending sortie makes sense. It is a mission more therapeutic than substantive, more of listening than of passing out advice.

But if skillfully carried, the President's visitations can lay the groundwork not only for ultimate settlement of intra-European differences but for closer American-European cooperation in the most urgent of all international undertaking—the search for detente between the West and Soviet Russia.

[From the Los Angeles (Calif.) Times, Feb. 26, 1969]

MR. NIXON GETS GOOD MARKS

With his arrival in Bonn today, which will be followed by an appearance in Berlin Thursday and conversations with President De Gaulle later in the week, President Nixon is entering upon the more delicate and difficult half of his week-long journey to Europe.

He does so, however, with the advantage of a favorable momentum built up by the apparent success of his "working" visits to NATO headquarters in Brussels and to London.

Mr. Nixon scored especially high marks in Brussels for his frank discussion with the assembled NATO ambassadors of such matters as the continued stationing of U.S. troops in Europe, and the effect on NATO of projected arms control talks with the Russians.

In words that were music to European ears, the President pledged "full and genuine consultation" with our NATO partners both "before and during" any such negotiations with the Soviet Union.

As he put it, the Atlantic Alliance must begin to "pool not only its arms but also its brains."

In London, Mr. Nixon walked upon more delicate ground by alluding to the "special relationship" between Americans and Britons, and by renewing the pledge of U.S. support for an enlarged Common Market including Great Britain.

While both passages went over big with his British hosts, they will not endear him to De Gaulle, whom he will see Friday and Saturday.

Two subjects are bound to dominate the President's private conversations with West German Chancellor Kurt Georg Kiesinger today: the nuclear non-proliferation treaty and the Berlin crisis.

Mr. Nixon is deliberately putting the emphasis on listening to his hosts at each stop rather than pressing his own views.

In Bonn, this may prove difficult because of the overriding importance of gaining West German accession to the nuclear non-proliferation treaty—a chief aim of which is to see that Germany never has nuclear arms.

For the reluctant Germans, the treaty is a touchy subject in this election year. It is difficult to see, however, how President Nixon can pass up the opportunity to press for early German ratification.

Whatever else happens during the remainder of the week, it is already obvious that Mr. Nixon will not succeed in one of the announced purposes of his trip: to encourage the "strengthening and revitalizing" of the North Atlantic Alliance.

De Gaulle's objective is quite the opposite —a fact which was demonstrated again by his purported maneuver to involve the British in a scheme to supplant NATO.

It would be tempting to conclude that, this being so, Mr. Nixon is going through a futile and irrelevant exercise. This would almost certainly, however, be a mistake.

No one should lose sight of the fact that the promotion of European unity was just one aim—and by no means the most important—of his journey.

The basic purpose is to touch bases with our allies before entering into fundamental negotiations with the Soviet Union—to assure them that their interests will not be neglected.

His assurances on this point apparently are being well received. Meanwhile, there are glimmerings of hope that the Soviet Union will not allow the Berlin crisis to escalate to a point which would threaten the movement toward U.S.-Soviet talks.

If the Europeans could speak with one voice, their influence on these talks would be greater. The fact that such unity is not in sight is unfortunate—but it is primarily, after all, a European problem.

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

THE PRESIDENT IN EUROPE

President Nixon has taken with him to Europe a sound, realistic point of view that should serve America well in all of his top-level talks through the coming week.

To begin with, as he told reporters before taking off, he is very conscious of how profoundly everything has changed since he first went to Europe on an official mission 22 years ago. The United States was then by far the most powerful country in the world. By way of contrast, our European friends and allies were on their backs, hungry for American help and leadership. Today, however, the script is dramatically different. The once-prostrate free nations, besides being no longer fearful of a sudden Soviet attack, are "infinitely" stronger in terms of both economic and political stability. Consequently, and happily, they do not lean upon America nearly so much as they once did.

With this immense change in mind, the President has emphasized that his visits to Brussels, London, Bonn, West Berlin, Rome and Paris will not be those of a lecturer exhorting the Europeans "to follow us." Instead, he is over there "to listen to them, to exchange views, to get their best information and their best advice" on how to deal not only with the problems they share with us—either bilaterally or multilaterally—but also with the problems that trouble the world at large, in Latin America, in Africa, in Asia, and with special urgency in the ever-explosive Middle East. The agenda is a crowded one, with Mr. Nixon's most important conversations likely to be concentrated on two items of overriding significance: (1) French President de Gaulle's efforts to shatter Anglo-American ties, scrap the Common Market and bring about NATO's dismemberment; and (2) "discussions with our European friends on the possibility and desirability" of a summit meeting with the Soviet Union on such matters as control of nuclear arms and the deployment of antiballistic missile systems.

Quite obviously these and kindred issues are much too big and complex to be dealt with definitively, or even adequately, within the limits of an eight-day round of visits. Mr. Nixon, needless to say, expects no miracle solutions all of a sudden. His objective, rather, is to get things started on promising tracks. To that end, he has undertaken the first presidential tour of its kind since John F. Kennedy's over five years ago. Indeed, for nearly a decade now, there has been no close contact between the White House and free Europe's leaders, especially so in the case of De Gaulle—a fact that has led many Europeans to suspect that America may be embracing an Asia-first or a neo-isolationist policy.

In this context, the Nixon trip is at once pertinent and timely. It marks the beginning of what he hopes will be "a new era of consultation . . . real give-and-take consultation between the European-American community." All of us, Europeans and Americans alike, have reason to share that hope.

[From the Richmond (Va.) Times-Dispatch, Feb. 25, 1969]

EIGHT DAYS IN EUROPE

To outward appearances, President Nixon's trip to Europe has gotten off to a good start.

His reception in Brussels was friendly, his address to the NATO Council was excellent, and—so far, at least—predicted mammoth demonstrations protesting his visit have failed to materialize in England.

Mr. Nixon struck exactly the right notes in his NATO remarks. He did not talk down to our allies, he did not pretend that there are no difficult internal problems plaguing the alliance, and he admitted that the United States had not always proceeded in the most diplomatic manner possible in dealing with our friends in Europe.

He described the basic purpose of his eight-day trip in terms that must have pleased both the people and the leaders of the nations on the itinerary:

"I have come for work, not for ceremony; to inquire, not to insist; to consult, not to convince; to listen and learn and to begin what I hope will be a continuing interchange of ideas and insights."

He pointed out that despite its troubles, NATO has been a "resounding success" from the standpoint of preventing a major war in Europe. He said that "those nations that were free 20 years ago are still free today." This is correct, but it is also unhappily true that on the other side of the iron curtain, efforts to gain a measure of real freedom—most recently in Czechoslovakia—have tragically failed, due to the Soviet Union's military might.

The toughest part of Mr. Nixon's trip lies ahead, as a look at the map below indicates. Tomorrow he leaves London for Bonn, and then on Thursday he flies to the hottest cold war spot in Europe, Berlin. Then it's on to Rome, to Paris, back to Rome for a Vatican visit with Pope Paul VI, and then home on Sunday.

Diplomacy will be put to the test when the U.S. chief executive faces French President Charles de Gaulle, the Western Alliance's thorn-in-the-side, the extreme nationalist whose ties to his former close allies appear to become more tenuous almost day by day.

Incredible as it seems, it may take only a slight unintentional push by the West to send Gen. de Gaulle's France into an alliance with the Soviet Union, according to New York Times foreign affairs columnist C. L. Sulzberger.

De Gaulle is a fanatic on the subject of what he imagines to be Western Europe's too great dependence on the United States. It seems fantastic to suggest that his obsession on this subject could drive him into a pact with Communist Russia, but some other things the general has done seemed unbelievable, too.

Richard Nixon, with his immense knowledge and experience in foreign affairs, may be the man who can deal successfully with the aged French leader. The success of Mr. Nixon's European tour could hinge to an important extent on the results of his meeting with Charles de Gaulle.

[From the Philadelphia (Pa.) Bulletin, Mar. 2, 1969]

OLD SLOGANS, OLD QUARRELS

In pleading as he has throughout his European trip for an end to "old slogans" and "old quarrels," President Nixon has been properly cautious to assert the role of the United States as that of a participant and not a director in these matters.

He has been properly careful, too, to avoid any suggestion of Anglo-American superiority in the issues of concern to all of Europe. In London, while citing the institutions which English-speaking people share, Mr. Nixon took pains to say that these institutions can be secure only when all nations share a relationship of trust and confidence.

These are ceremonial words, of course, but they have been well received throughout Mr. Nixon's tour.

A major accomplishment of President Nixon's European visit, in fact, has been to allow the decision-makers and others in the nations he has visited to form their own opinion of him unfiltered as it were by the rather dark image created of him by many in the communications media in the United States and abroad.

It is clear, that to a great many people the man they are seeing as President of the United States bears little resemblance to the largely political figure they have come to accept from caricatures of him in the past.

The careful planning and study that went into the President's visit has brought a complimentary reaction, as has his own obvious enjoyment and enthusiasm in his tour.

The obviously warm exchange of greetings between President Nixon and President de Gaulle of France was more than a ceremonial touch. Mr. De Gaulle, 78, and the last of the World War II giants still holding power, has previously evinced a respect for Mr. Nixon that he has not afforded to other leaders in the world today.

Part of the reason for this may be that these two men, despite the difference in their ages, have shared experiences. Each has at times faced seemingly insurmountable obstacles on their political paths. Each has managed to succeed politically after having been virtually counted out. Each has the very clear intent of being counted a greater leader in the history of his respective nation.

The outcome of Mr. Nixon's personal diplomacy will not be known for a long time to come. But it is already clear that as far as Mr. Nixon himself is concerned many of the people in Europe have already brushed aside the "old slogans" and the "old quarrels" which they previously associated with him.

[From the Washington (D.C.) Post, Mar. 1, 1969]

SUCCESS OF NIXON TRIP PROVES CRITICS WRONG

Those who said President Nixon's trip to Europe was premature, that it would be a waste of time at best and harmful at worst, are being proved wrong.

Mr. Nixon set modest goals: to improve the climate of U.S.-European relations, listen, consult and candidly answer candid questions.

He did all of these things—and more—and any time a President achieves more than he says that's good.

The chief dividends are these:

Credibility: Mr. Nixon significantly reduced the credibility gap between the United States and its NATO partners by dealing with direct questions of the NATO Council of Ministers in Brussels with unusual directness. For example, he took a strong stand for keeping U.S. forces in Europe but pointed out frankly that the cost makes political problems at home. The Europeans knew this but would Mr. Nixon admit it? He did.

Numerous NATO council members lauded the freedom with which he answered their questions and his frankness in discussing issues still unresolved within his own administration.

They appraised the President as a reliable no-nonsense spokesman of the United States. One socialist ambassador frankly said that he came to Brussels with "all the usual reservations of the European left toward the President" and departed "impressed by his knowledge and utter frankness."

This is what really improved the atmosphere of U.S.-European relations and paved the way for better cooperation.

Soviet talks: The trip was not premature; it was well timed because it is evident that wide-ranging talks with the Soviets are shaping up sooner than appeared probable, hopefully this summer.

Mr. Nixon paved the way for undertaking them under good conditions by assuring the Europeans that on any matters affecting them he would consult them before and during such negotiations. And that no Big-Power deals would be made behind their back.

The promises had been made before but the Europeans were impressed by the force of the President's commitment, especially his reference to the value of "pooling reins" as well as arms. They want the United States to negotiate with the Soviets but they want to be sure they are closely and continuously consulted. Mr. Nixon said they would be. They believed him. That alone makes the trip worthwhile.

DeGaulle and Britain: The need is to keep this flare-up between Paris and London in perspective. There is no new issue here; there is no new controversy, just an old controversy coming more clearly into the open. And the more visible it becomes, the easier it is to judge it accurately.

Bear in mind that President de Gaulle is against anything he can't dominate. He dislikes the Common Market because he can't dominate it. He took France out of NATO because he couldn't dominate it. He would like to expel all U.S. influence in Western Europe so he can dominate it. These are familiar de Gaulle attitudes and he will expound them so long as he is in office.

De Gaulle outlines his ideas to abandon the Common Market for a larger, loosely formed free trading area to which he offers to admit the British if they will help get rid of NATO and have nothing to do with the United States.

But Britain says no and de Gaulle asserts this proves that Britain is anti-European. The opposite is the truth. All the other members of the Common Market want Britain in it, want NATO, want to keep their ties with the United States. By attempting to thwart the wishes of the other Europeans it is de Gaulle who is anti-European.

Presidents Nixon and de Gaulle have talked. They disagree. So be it.

Mr. Nixon and the other European leaders have talked. They understand each other and got along well. That's good.

[From the New York Daily News, Mar. 1, 1969]

GOOD WORK, MR. PRESIDENT

President Richard M. Nixon is entering the final laps of his West European tour, but already, it appears that he has accomplished the basic purposes of his mission.

Mr. Nixon set out to mend the fabric of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization, frayed by the neglect of recent administrations.

He managed to infuse new spirit into the alliance and reassure our NATO partners that the U.S. commitment to their defense is no less strong today than it was when the pact was signed 20 years ago.

Wherever he went, the President lost no chance to extoll NATO's past role in thwarting Communist aggression in Europe and the continuing need for its existence.

The best testimonial to the treaty's success can be found in the frantic efforts of the Soviet Union to wreck it. The Reds haven't given up, as evidenced by the attempts of their young yahoos to embarrass or discredit Mr. Nixon during his stops in Rome and Paris.

Nothing would more delight the Kremlin than driving a wedge between America and its friends in advance of any U.S.-Soviet summit talks.

By first consulting with our allies, the President spiked any hopes Soviet leaders held of doing so. The unity of purpose he sought to promote already is being displayed in West Berlin where the USSR has been trying by trick and threat to balk a West German presidential election scheduled for next Tuesday.

Backed by renewed assurances from President Nixon, the Bonn government has announced it will proceed as planned to convene the electors in the Western zone of that divided city, France, Britain and the United States stand together in upholding their right to do so.

There—as elsewhere in the world—allied unity and firmness of purpose are basic to any hopes of dealing successfully with communism.

THE NIXON ADMINISTRATION ATTEMPTING TO SOLVE NATIONAL PROBLEMS

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

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, the Nixon administration currently is in the process of establishing new mechanisms to help make the efforts of volunteers and voluntary organizations more effective in their attemtps to solve national problems. Like former Gov. George Romney, now Secretary of Housing and Urban Development, I believe we will solve our greatest problems only if there is active commitment and involvement on the part of most of our citizens. Experience has shown there is no substitute for the concern of one person seeking to help another. This kind of concern can solve problems where governments fail. In that connection, Mr. Speaker, the comments on the effectiveness of voluntary action by Edgar M. Foster, executive director of United Fund and Community Services, Inc., Grand Rapids, Mich., are most appropriate and instructive. A letter I recently received from Mr. Foster may be of interest to other Members of this House. The letter follows:

JANUARY 27, 1969.

Hon. GERALD R. FORD,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR JERRY: The sweeping growth of optimism and renewal of confidence in time-proven American methods of problem solving, caused by present attitudes and actions of the Federal Administration, prompts my first letter to you since returning to your constituency. My purpose is to share with you local enthusiasm with Federal reorientation to the essential role of Voluntaryism in America; but, to also express concern about the direction in which the Federal Government may look to secure voluntary resources and strengths needed to solve today's problems of urban living.

National vibrancy and relevancy—a "can-do" approach to the challenge of an unusual proliferation of serious problems—measuring-up to crisis with positive and constructive end-results, can all stem from an effective partnership between the trilogy of Government, Business, and Voluntaryism. Any imbalance, however, in the role played by each partner can enhance chaos, perpetuate crisis, and cause destruction.

Government cannot out-legislate or even out-spend urban crisis all by itself. Business cannot be too heavily leaned upon, pushed or shamed into over-playing its role in programming and implementing sociological reforms and urban renewal. Voluntaryism cannot shrug loose of traditionalism in order to innovate all by itself to solve old "people" problems with new methods. Only a well conceived, expertly managed partnership of all three, from the community level to the national level, will result in solution and progress.

It appears now that a courageous trial and error method has revealed the shortcomings of independent efforts by Government, Business, and the Voluntary sector to resolve the urban crisis. We have learned the essential nature of joint planning, joint programming, joint financing, and centralized management of cohesive and coordinated effort toward better urban living for over two-thirds of all Americans.

"More Legislation" at any level of government is not the whole answer. "More Money" tax dollars or private funds, is not the whole answer. Considering the best of what we have now in legislation, along with the total of dollars now available, a substantial increase in recruitment and application of voluntary manpower, within the framework of a well-managed prgram, can mean most immediate progress.

And, there-in, Jerry, is my concern. I hope the present Administration will not overlook the long-established mainstream of Voluntaryism in America.

United Funds and Community Welfare Councils in every American city involve more than four million volunteers in on-going community betterment efforts. Contrary to the understanding of some, the "United Way" movement in America is not simply a fund-raising technique. It is broad-based and broad range in its approach to building a satisfying way of life for all Americans.

This massive accumulation of "people power" is inclusive of every conceivable walk of life in America. Every race, creed and national origin. United Fund and Community Welfare Council volunteers are chief executives of the most powerful corporations in America—they are professional people, neighborhood merchants, leaders and members of Labor, hourly-rated employees, housewives, unemployed and welfare recipients.

The accumulated knowledge of the causes and problems posed by the urban crisis, possessed by this army of local volunteers, is always extensive and first hand. Planning and programming is "problem solving" oriented. Implementation is carried out with experienced enthusiasm. Results are long range and far reaching.

I must, however, point out the rapidly increasing importance of professional expertise in management of voluntary affairs.

The role of the volunteer has and must continue to change to be relevant to urban problems. Voluntary time, talent, energy and means must now be properly channeled into well conceived programs and directions which will impact the priority of human need and most rapidly eliminate the cause of urban deterioration and resulting crisis . . . as against the traditional comfortable role of a volunteer as the Agency Board or committee members who maintains a good attendance record or as a successful fund-raiser. This requires highly qualified professional management, with an alertness to advancements in administrative methodology, program systems, the newer dynamics of community organization, and available technology for problem analysis and design of solution.

The nation-wide field I am proud to be a member of embraces the career-minded professional expertise required for efficient and highly productive management of voluntary effort—in close partnership with Government and Business. Our so-called "establishment", includes a reservoir of voluntary manpower more than adequate to the challenge of urban crisis. And, although each United Fund, along with Health and Welfare Planning Councils, is purposely autonomous to its own local area, there is a strong nation-wide link permitting an effective national pattern of experienced attack on urban problems. Our National Membership Association, United Community Funds and Councils of America, continuously enhances the ability of one community to dove-tail with others in best possible community betterment efforts.

The mainstream of Voluntaryism we represent is already in partnership with business at every local, regional and the national level. We look forward to an increased opportunity for a closer partnership with Government at every level.

I cannot help but point with pride to your own home town. In the opinion of many across the nation, Grand Rapids is America's proof positive that the only means and method of solving urban problems is by centralized "management" of joint Government, Business and Voluntary effort at the local level. Local (Grand Rapids) results to date and the daily impact of on-going programs, located and carried out in the heart of poverty impacted areas, are reversing the trend toward deterioration in urban living.

As you know by your personal visits and participation, our United Fund and Community Services, Inc. (UFCS) is the single coordinating and administrative body for centralized management of the broadest possible range of community affairs, including established Health and Welfare services as well as new and innovated activities which are relevant to urban conditions.

UFCS is in partnership with the Federal Government, having been designated by the city, per OEO Green Amendments, as the local Community Action Agency. We are a team with HUD in terms of grants for establishment of neighborhood centers. We are in business with HEW as the Area-wide Comprehensive Health Planning Unit. We are a working partner with State Government in Mental Health, and Local Government in the Housing Development Field as well as our Model Cities Grant. The only point in reviewing these facts with you is to emphasize that United Fund and Community Welfare Council involvement means local application of substantial voluntary forces in government funded programs—meaning assurance to contributors and taxpayers alike that public and private programs are in balance and effective, without waste.

The sum of all this, Jerry, is only that we who professionally manage the greatest voluntary forces in America are inspired to offer ourselves and available resources for what help we can be in measuring up to the urban crisis.

Cordially,

EDGAR M. FOSTER,
Executive Director.

NIXON'S ADMINISTRATION DOMESTIC LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

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

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, the distinguished American who is responsible for putting together the Nixon administration's domestic legislative program, which is just beginning to unfold, has been a trusted adviser to the President since the early days of the Eisenhower administration. I refer, of course, to Dr. Arthur F. Burns, the Counselor to the President, with whom I have had the privilege of working closely over the past 4 years in the National Republican Coordinating Committee and on other occasions. While reserving the right to differ with some details of the programs which have not yet come to us, I have the greatest admiration and respect for Dr. Burns' mature judgment and practical wisdom. For those in this body who do not know the President's right-hand man, as he has been called, as well as I do, I am placing in the RECORD several recent articles concerning his competence as an economist and contributions to Government:

[From the Christian Science Monitor, Feb. 25, 1969]

BUSINESS-CYCLE ANALYST RETURNS TO WASHINGTON IN INNER CIRCLE

(By Richard L. Strout)

WASHINGTON.—For the first time ever the United States has an official with the title Presidential Counselor—with cabinet rank—Dr. Arthur F. Burns, a noted economist born in Austria who started work at 10 as a house painter.

Dr. Burns' office is in the ancient, General Grant-style Executive Office Building, whose rococo gingerbread columns and balconies are frozen in granite on Pennsylvania Avenue.

Dr. Burns' pleasant, red-carpeted office has huge windows overlooking a quiet street. One has the feeling that its quietude is like that at the center of a hurricane. For this formidably cool figure, with rimless glasses and a striking crop of up-ended hair parted in the middle and breaking over his forehead like a waterfall, is certainly one of the most important men in the new administration, a kind of president-delegate for domestic affairs.

Mr. Nixon has given him the awesome job of coordinating, evaluating, and proposing domestic policies. It is the token of Mr. Nixon's esteem that he has turned such a task over to this cool and deliberate former professor of economics, whose job today far transcends economics: It involves the whole range of home problems that are bothering Americans—cities, race, youth alienation, poverty, taxes.

Musing the other day over where he had come from and how far he had gotten, Dr. Burns recalled that his family had settled in Bayonne, N.J., and that when there was time off from school he had helped his father paint interior, exterior. Dr. Burns proudly feels he was good painter, maybe, ultimately, better than his father. (He weighs that carefully.)

But he liked books. Should he be a painter (his father's desire) or should he strike out for the intellectual life?

He had won a scholarship for a local college. On the final day of high school, yes, June 30 or so, he repeats, he began to wonder. There was a big city across the harbor, and there was a vague report of a big university in it. Maybe he ought to go over there and find out.

So Arthur Burns went over to Columbia University to explore. Whom should he see? He found the place all right and then deliberated: Obviously the way you learn about a college is to talk to the head man—the president. The calm young man presented himself at the latter's office and told the surprised secretaries his errand.

DEAN QUIZZED

Well, the president was not there, so he was sent to the acting head who, in turn, sent him off to Dean Herbert Hawkes.

One wishes one had been there at the interview. Young Mr. Burns asked the startled dean what he had to offer. His questions were keen and his high-school record was impeccable. It was the increasingly curious Dean Hawkes who then began asking questions. One question had not occurred to young Burns before: How did he propose to support himself?

To the young man it was a mere detail. Oh, house painting; everyday jobs. . . . He had no anxiety about that! The dean took a sudden resolution. Too bad the youth had come so late. Scholarship applications were all in. If only he had come a month before; a week even. "Here, take this scholarship application form," he said, "take it home, fill it out, return it by the next mail. Understand?—the next mail. Don't get your expectations up. Return it right away."

Dr. Burns' kind-faced secretary came into his office through one of the massive oak doors with its decorated brass knob and said she had given the visitor an extra 10 minutes and now, really—

Five minutes more, said Dr. Burns. He got a $250 scholarship, and since tuition was only $260 he was all right. He supported himself by whatever job came along—painting, working in the library, anything. No difficulty; he waved it off.

ACCOUNT PIECED TOGETHER

Dr. Burns is reluctant to tell another dramatic story in his past, but it can be but together from the writings of no less a figure than Richard M. Nixon, plus a couple of editorial deductions.

As a student of cycles Dr. Burns was of course conversant with the use of government powers to control the swings of the economy. On Aug. 8, 1953, he became chairman of the Eisenhower Council of Economic Advisers, whose task was to advise the new administration on just such problems.

Dr. Burns is loyal to General Eisenhower, whose service he left in 1956. One can only speculate on the confrontations with rock-ribbed conservative George M. Humphrey, the Ex-Secretary of the Treasury, whose influence on President Eisenhower was so strong.

Some of the mystery is penetrated in "Six Crises," Mr. Nixon's own book. By 1960 Vice-President Nixon was pretty sure of being nominated by the Republicans. Dr. Burns had gone back to New York. Mr. Nixon writes that early in March Dr. Burns called on him. Mr. Nixon says that in January "virtually all economists in the country had been bullish about the prospects of the economy throughout 1960," but not Dr. Burns.

RECESSION FORECAST

In New York Dr. Burns had been watching his mysterious charts as they affected the political prospects of his friends in Washington.

Now he had reached the conclusion that a recession was ahead unless, as Mr. Nixon puts it, "some decisive government action were taken."

Mr. Nixon says he took it up immediately with President Eisenhower and it was thoroughly discussed at the next Cabinet meeting.

Vice-Presidents (as Hubert H. Humphrey was to discover) have limited power in Washington. The Burns recommendations did not prevail, according to the Nixon book, because (A) "several of the administration's economic experts . . . did not share his bearish prognosis" and (B) "there was strong sentiment against using the spending and credit powers of the federal government to affect the economy" short of clear indications of a "major recession."

The sentence above is packed with dynamite. There is not a word of reproach in Mr. Nixon's comment, but President Eisenhower was, in effect, rejecting what now is generally accepted by modern economists. Robert B. Anderson had succeeded the bluff Mr. Humphrey as Secretary of the Treasury—a somewhat more subtle but equally positive personality with the same influence on the President.

Mr. Nixon says he knew "from bitter experience" how "in both 1954 and 1958, slumps which hit bottom in October" had resulted in Republican political losses.

The reporter gets up and goes out of the quiet room, which is a sort of innovative and coordinating lobe of the administration's thinking. Rolled over to the side is a television set; Dr. Burns rarely looks at it, but his staff feels it is a kind of status symbol.

The reporter finds the final chapter of the story in Mr. Nixon's book.

"Unfortunately," Mr. Nixon writes, "Arthur Burns turned out to be a good prophet. The bottom of the 1960 dip did come in October. . . . Jobless rolls increased by 452,000." And he adds laconically, "All the speeches, television broadcasts, and precinct work in the world could not counteract that one hard fact."

Exit GOP hopes. And, as much as anything, that tells why old friend Burns—scholarly, unexcitable, and competent—is installed today in the ancient room on Pennsylvania Avenue.

[From the New York Times, Jan. 24, 1969]

NIXON NAMES AIDE TO HELP OVERSEE DOMESTIC AFFAIRS

(By Walter Rugaber)

WASHINGTON, January 23.—President Nixon announced today the appointment of Dr. Arthur F. Burns, "a long-time friend and trusted adviser," as Counsellor to the President with major responsibilities for domestic programs.

Dr. Burns, who served as chairman of the President's Council of Economic Advisers during the Eisenhower Administration, has undertaken several advisory assignments for Mr. Nixon. As John Bates Professor of Economic Research at Columbia University and chairman of the National Bureau of Economic Research, he made a fact-finding tour of five European financial capitals for the President last fall.

The appointment, which carries Cabinet rank and therefore makes Dr. Burns the ranking member of the White House staff, came toward the end of a day in which the President concentrated on the nation's urban problems.

A series of developments made it clear that Mr. Nixon was hoping to get off to a fast start in domestic affairs. There were indications that several of President Johnson's Great Society programs might be reorganized.

Dr. Burns said at a news conference that he had submitted reports to the President recommending legislative or executive action in 18 domestic areas.

SINGLE PACKAGE CONSIDERED

Whether the President's domestic proposals will ultimately be submitted to Congress in a single package is undecided, Dr. Burns said.

The question continues in part, he continued, on whether Mr. Nixon delivers a State of the Union Message. If he decides to do so, Dr. Burns said, it will come 30 to 40 days from now.

Earlier today, Daniel Patrick Moynihan, Assistant to the President for Urban Affairs, suggested that a number of major urban programs were under close scrutiny and that some activities now handled by the Office of Economic Opportunity might be transferred to the Cabinet departments.

The White House concentration on urban affairs began with the President's signing of an Executive order to create his Council for Urban Affairs, a formal advisory group made up of Vice President Agnew and seven Cabinet secretaries.

The seven named in the order were John N. Mitchell, the Attorney General; Clifford Hardin, Secretary of Agriculture; Maurice H. Stans, Secretary of Commerce; George P. Shultz, Secretary of Labor; Robert H. Finch, the Secretary of Health, Education and Welfare; George Romney, Secretary of Housing and Urban Development, and John A. Volpe, Secretary of Transportation.

It was the first time Mr. Nixon had used a number of different fountain pens so that the Cabinet members could have them as souvenirs. He wrote small parts of his name with successive pens.

"This is going to be a most unusual signature," the President quipped. "I'm a scrawler." Mr. Finch remarked that the resulting signature looked like Mr. Nixon's first frank as a Congressman.

The President charged in a statement made at the signing that the Government had "responded to urban concerns in a haphazard, fragmented, and often woefully shortsighted manner." He continued:

"What we have never had is a policy: coherent, consistent positions as to what the national Government would hope to see happen; what it will encourage, what it will discourage."

The Urban Affairs Council represents Mr. Nixon's effort to establish a formal channel for domestic advice. It has been compared to the National Security Council's function in foreign policy.

ISSUES DESIGNATED

The new unit's immediate direction was suggested by the issues assigned to 10 subcommittees that were set up during a two-hour, 10-minute session of the council. Dr. Moynihan outlined the smaller groups and their chairmen as follows:

The future of the poverty program and the Office of Economic Opportunity, Mr. Finch.

The model cities program, Mr. Romney.

Minority business enterprise, which embraces, Mr. Nixon's campaign idea of giving Negroes "a piece of the action" through "black capitalism," Mr. Stans.

Welfare, Mr. Finch.

Crime, "the general area," Mr. Mitchell.

Voluntary action, which means coordinating the efforts of agencies such as churches and labor unions, Mr. Romney.

Internal migration, which includes the movement from rural areas to the cities and "possibly" the efforts of Negroes to leave urban slums, Mr. Hardin.

Surplus food programs and nutrition, Mr. Hardin.

Mass transportation, Mr. Volpe.

The tenth subcommittee, assigned to "the transition of the peacetime economy at the end of the Vietnam hostilities," will work, on "standing arrangements" for the reallocation of Government funds in the event of an Asian settlement, Dr. Moynihan said. It will be a "staff committee" headed by Robert P. Mayo, the Budget Bureau director.

Dr. Moynihan said the President has made it plain that the areas with which the subcommittees will deal did not constitute "an exclusive list of concerns" but only the "near-term" issues.

For example, he said, there have been a number of suggestions that aspects of the poverty program be taken out of the O.E.O. The Head Start program might be shifted to the Department of Health, Education and Welfare, he said, and various job programs might go to the Labor Department.

"There has clearly arisen a present disposition in favor of locating in the on-going, established departments those activities which have been developed in O.E.O. and proven successful and can most usefully be moved to the perhaps more peaceful environs of a permanent department," Dr. Moynihan said.

NEW ROLE FOR BURNS: NIXON'S COUNSELOR MAY EMERGE AS SUPER POWER IN DOMESTIC PROGRAMS

(By John Herbers)

WASHINGTON, January 24.—President Nixon seems to have set up a Rube Goldberg contraption in the While House to make sense out of the bigger Rube Goldberg device former Presidents and Congress have created in the domestic departments and agencies. The people in the departments are watching with fascination to see how, or whether, it will work. There is considerable speculation that, in the process, Dr. Arthur F. Burns, named yesterday as Counselor to the President, may emerge as a super power in the Government's vast array of social and economic programs.

Dr. Burns, chairman of the Council of Economic Advisers in the Eisenhower Administration and a long-time friend and adviser to Mr. Nixon, was superimposed on the Council for Urban Affairs that the President set up earlier to oversee programs affecting the cities and to help the President formulate policy in this area.

MANDATE IS BROAD

The council is composed of Vice President Agnew and seven Cabinet members with Mr. Nixon presiding over meetings and Daniel Patrick Moynihan, assistant to the President for urban affairs, as executive secretary.

At its first meeting yesterday, 10 subcommittees were set up to study specific problems such as the poverty program and crime. Earlier, Mr. Nixon said that Mr. Agnew would have broad responsibilities in the area of creating better relations between the Federal and local governments.

Under Mr. Nixon's Executive Order formally authorizing the council, the body was given a broad mandate, including the development of a national urban policy, coordinating Federal programs and fostering decentralization.

According to White House spokesmen, Dr. Burns will be concerned with all these matters and the entire range of domestic problems. He had already been filling this role, it was disclosed, by interpreting and funneling to the President an array of study group reports that Mr. Nixon ordered last year.

A COMPLICATED STRUCTURE

The new White House apparatus presents a number of contrasts. Dr. Moynihan is a former Assistant Secretary of Labor in the Kennedy and Johnson Administrations and has set up a staff dominated by bright young liberal Republicans. Dr. Burns is 64 years old and is generally regarded in Washington as a conservative.

The explanation for so complicated a structure so early in the new Administration lies partly in the advice Mr. Nixon has been getting since he was elected.

One of his study groups reported that one of the main problems the new President would face was what to do about the more than 400 Federal grant-in-aid programs. Congress and previous Administrations, it said, never came to grips with how to coordinate these to eliminate waste and duplication.

The study group, said that Congress had charged the Office of Economic Opportunity, the antipoverty agency, with coordinating programs for the poor, but the agency had become so bogged down with troubles in its own programs that it had never carried out this function, nor had the White House staff.

QUESTION FOR ROMNEY

"The new Administration must endeavor to rationalize this confusion as one of its first orders of business," the group advised the President. It recommended that the role of coordinating be carried out in some manner from the Office of the President.

Senator Edmund S. Muskie, Democrat of Maine, an authority on Federal-state relations, asked George Romney, the new Secretary of Housing and Urban Development, the other day if Mr. Moynihan would be riding herd on the departments and agencies to make them cooperate in carrying out White House priorities, rather than pursuing their own interests.

Mr. Romney said he did not know but seemed to bristle at the idea of Cabinet members' taking orders from Mr. Moynihan. a Democrat with free-wheeling ideas.

Robert H. Finch, Secretary of Health, Education and Welfare, has been mentioned as the possible "czar" of domestic programs under Mr. Nixon because he is so close to the new President and because his department handles such a large scale of the programs involved. But he has said on numerous occasions that running his great sprawling department would be all that he could handle.

It was not clear whether Dr. Burns would assume this overseeing role, but it was clear that he would be in a better position to do so than Dr. Moynihan or any of the Cabinet members. His age and experience and the fact that he is an "in" member of the Nixon team give him the advantage in what is a very tough job for anyone.

From the Nixon point of view, the new domestic White House apparatus was strengthened in both coordinating services and instituting policy, with Dr. Burns acquiring a dominant role in it.

A SCHOLARLY COUNSELOR: ARTHUR FRANK BURNS

WASHINGTON, February 5—The man who will keep tabs on the entire domestic program of the Government for President Nixon could easily be taken at first glance as the epitome of the absent-minded professor. Arthur Frank Burns, whose job bears the new title of Counselor to the President, is 64 years old, gray-haired, pipe-smoking, reflective, carefully spoken, and intellectual. While he has been a professor for about half of his working life, he is not notably absent-minded, and although one's first impression accurately reflects his manner, it does not necessarily reveal his nature or character.

Mr. Burns got where he is not because of his background, which is that of a scholarly economist, but because fate happened to make him swim first into the ken, and then win the confidence and respect of Richard M. Nixon. A relationship that began in 1953 has lasted and flowered.

The President has shown himself strongly drawn toward men he knows well for major positions, other examples being the Secretary of State, William P. Rogers, and the Attorney General, John W. Mitchell.

Arthur Burns is widely respected for his professional competence as an economist but he is not universally beloved as a man.

FAVORS THE LONG VIEW

Some former associates in New York are said to have found him "difficult" to work with. Others who have worked with him frankly dislike him. But of course still others, obviously including Mr. Nixon, think highly of him.

The two men came together in the early days of the Eisenhower Administration. Mr. Burns, then chairman of the Council of Economic Advisers, was impressed with the young Vice President, and Mr. Nixon appreciated the time Mr. Burns was willing to give him.

In those days Mr. Burns—a conservative by most tests—seemed to be almost a flaming liberal in the company of such men as Secretary of the Treasury George M. Humphrey.

The puzzling aspect of the new Burns role is that he is not by experience a manager or expediter, and he is not by inclination an activist. He himself says he is most interested in longer-term questions rather than daily decisions.

"Arthur Burns likes to study things," a friend said recently. "He raises questions. Some people think he is downright ponderous."

This attitude may be reflected in the Nixon "style" as it has emerged so far—a series of directives to Cabinet heads to study various things. A complex system of committees and subcommittees has been erected.

While this may guarantee thoughtful consideration, it is not normally a prescription for rapid action. This is presumably just what the new President wants, though he had pledged to submit a legislative program to Congress in time for action at this session.

CAPABLE OF SWIFT ACTION

Mr. Burns has conceded that his job ranges all the way to helping the President in crisis situations, such as possible riots. How the extra-careful scholar will react in such a situation is one of the great unknowns of the new Administration.

However, Mr. Burns is no Hamlet. He showed in the Eisenhower years that he was capable of action—or at least of advising prompt action—during times of economic difficulty. And he can be a dogged and vigorous defender of his viewpoints.

What no outsider can possibly know, at least not yet, is how much Mr. Burns' personal views will influence the President's decisions on the almost infinite variety of domestic questions. This issue—the role and importance of the White House staff—is a puzzle in every Presidency.

Mr. Burns was born in 1904 in Stanislau, Austria. His family emigrated to the United States when he was a boy and lived in Bayonne, N.J. He worked his way through Columbia and eventually taught at Columbia and Rutgers.

His main fame came, however, from his work at the National Bureau of Economic Research, where he worked with the late Wesley Mitchell on the history of business cycles in the United States. For a long time he was a registered Democrat, though he voted for General Eisenhower in 1952.

He was married in 1930 to the former Helen Bernstein and they have two grown sons, David and Joseph.

Ironically, Arthur Burns found his first tour in Washington during the Eisenhower Administration exausting and often frustrating.

At times he worked on economic problems and reports until three or four in the morning, forgetting everything else, including such hobbies as detective stories and the sports pages.

He became annoyed about the processes of Government, complaining sometimes that decisions were always becoming unstuck. Fifteen years ago he was already complaining that the grind was too much for a man "getting on in years." Now he is at it again.

[From Time magazine, Feb. 7, 1969]

THE ADMINISTRATION

MINISTER WITHOUT PORTFOLIO

Arthur Frank Burns was chairman of Eisenhower's Council of Economic Advisers when he first met Richard Nixon in 1953. Burns made no secret of his admiration for the then Vice President. In March of 1960, after he had returned to his old professorial post at Columbia University, Burns went down to Washington to alert Nixon to his own reading of the economy—based on his knowledge as a top expert on the business cycle. His warning: a recession was under way, and would reach its nadir in October, just before the presidential elections. "Unfortunately," Nixon later wrote in *Six Crises*, "Arthur Burns turned out to be a good prophet. The bottom of the 1960 dip did come in October. All the speeches, television broadcasts and precinct work in the world could not counteract that one hard fact."

Their mutual respect has grown ever since, and now Nixon has given Burns, 64, a job without peer or precedent on the White House staff. As "Counsellor to the President," he will be the only Nixon staffer with Cabinet rank, assuming broad responsibility for shaping the President's legislative program. Burns' mandate reaches into every cranny of domestic policy. He describes the job as an American equivalent of the European minister without portfolio: that is, a top-ranking government official liberated from the bureaucratic burdens of a specific departmental command.

DIDACTIC EVENNESS

Taking over the reports of Nixon's 21 post-election task forces, Burns prepared a fat book analyzing their recommendations. He returned his summary the day after the new President took office. "Nixon was eager to get the machinery started so he could move ahead a little faster once he assumed the reins of government," Burns explains. His next most urgent task is to frame the first proposals that will be sent from the White House up to Capitol Hill for congressional action. In large measure, Burns could thus set the tone of the Nixon presidency.

The responsibility is well placed, for Burns is known as a trenchant economic analyst and a man of formidable composure. His powers of concentration are legendary, his manners ineradicably professorial. His pewter grey hair is parted down the middle. His brown eyes squint slightly through rimless glasses. His voice is somewhat reedy, worn to didactic evenness by 40 years of lecturing. "I regard myself primarily as a scholar interested in government," he says, teeth clenching one of the hundred or more pipes he owns.

FEW CLUES

Politically, Burns characterizes himself as "a moderate Republican," though he was once registered as a Democrat in New York City in order to vote in important primaries. His role on the CEA was essentially apolitical; while he was deeply involved in policymaking. He remained in the background as a confidential adviser to Eisenhower. He is unlikely to be much more visible in his new post.

There are few precise clues to his views, but in the past he has been critical of excess government spending on agricultural price supports, the space program and public works. He is undoctrinaire and skeptical of extreme positions, whether they appear in the "new economics" of Harvard's John Kenneth Galbraith or in the budget-balancing rigidity of traditional Republican economic policy. Though he thinks the present moment is not right for it, he favors a long-term policy of tax reduction.

HEATED DISCUSSIONS

Burns was born in Austrian Poland, came to the U.S. at the age of ten, learned his father's housepainting trade while still a schoolboy in Bayonne, N.J. He toyed with becoming an architect before deciding on economics in his third year at Columbia; his Ph.D. thesis on U.S. production trends began his lifelong study of the business cycle. He is still an amateur architect: he built a garage on his Lake Fairlee, Vt., acreage that also serves as living room, recreation room and studio for his creditable dabbling in oils. He also built a sizable cabin in the woods, "out of shouting distance" from the house, says Wife Helen, so he can be free to work totally undisturbed. One summer neighbor is an old friend and former student, Chicago Professor Milton Friedman, a leader among conservative, anti-Keynesian economists. They often get together for evenings before the fire in what Burns says are "very long, very heated—but friendly—discussions."

Though Burns is primarily an economist, his wider charter at the White House fits his own idea of coordinated government action. "Important though fiscal policy is," he said in a 1965 lecture at the Carnegie Institute of Technology, "it must still be fitted in with other matters of large governmental concern—that is, policies involving gold, the labor market, corporate mergers, education, defense, foreign trade, and so on." As to his new responsibilities, he reflected last week: "I'm a man of reason who looks to the evidence, and I expect every man in the Cabinet to do the same. This is the White House. It will all work—imperfectly."

[From Business Week, Feb. 1, 1969]

AT NIXON'S RIGHT HAND: ECONOMIST ARTHUR BURNS, AS COUNSELLOR TO PRESIDENT NIXON, IS LIKELY TO BE TOUGH, JUDICIOUS, AND METICULOUS—THEIR CLOSENESS DATES BACK TO EARLY EISENHOWER DAYS

In a conversion just after John F. Kennedy was elected to the Presidency, Arthur F. Burns expressed a wistful longing for a "Democratic Party with some understanding of finance or a Republican Party with some imagination."

Now, almost a decade later, Burns has been officially designated as counsellor to a Republican President. Obviously, he is in a position to do something at least about his own party's stance.

There is little question of the closeness between Richard M. Nixon and the first man ever to be officially designated as counsellor to the President. Along with Secretary of State William P. Rogers, Burns is one of a handful of men whose loyalty to Nixon has never wavered. And like Rogers, Burns is a man to whom Nixon has often turned in crises.

Long loyalty. Burns has earned Nixon's trust over a long period stretching back to 1953, when the Columbia University economist was appointed chairman of President Eisenhower's Council of Economic Advisers. In the early Eisenhower days, Nixon was taken lightly by most of the established men in Eisenhower's inner circle. But the scholarly Burns was impressed by the young Vice-President's intelligence, and he made no secret of it—either within the Administration or in the intellectual community.

Nixon has turned to Burns for advice ever since. The most dramatic instance: in 1960, when Nixon broke openly with the Eisenhower Administration and came out for a tax cut to combat the slowdown that turned into the 1960–61 recession. The most recent instance: Burns was Nixon's principal economic adviser during his campaigns for the Republican nomination and for the Presidency.

Stickler for detail. The pipe-smoking Burns brings toughness and judiciousness to his new job. Intellectually, he is known chiefly for his painstaking work on the business cycle, carried on at New York's National Bureau of Economic Research during the 1930s and 1940s. His toughness was celebrated during the Eisenhower years in a series of fights over fiscal policy with George M. Humphrey, Eisenhower's conservative first Treasury Secretary.

If economists fault Burns, it is for a certain ponderousness. In his later years at the NBER, critics say, he failed to give an effective direction to new research beyond traditional business cycle and national income studies. He dropped the reins at NBER in 1957 and moved up to the post of honorary chairman.

Burns' calm, unexcitable approach to the world has come back into style at the White House. Burns knew his staffers at the NBER often became restive with the lengthy review to which their work was subjected. But when charged with this, he replied that "men whose scientific bent is stronger than their conceit realize that their insight is clarified by being compelled to look at their problems from many angles, uncomfortable as the experience is."

This kind of care is appreciated by Nixon. And ever since the 1968 campaign began, the Nixon approach—particularly on domestic problems—has shown the influence of Burns.

Conflicts? Because Burns will be the only White House adviser with Cabinet rank, his appointment has raised many questions about the pecking order in Nixon's policy hierarchy. There has been talk, for example, of potential conflict between Burns and CEA Chairman Paul W. McCracken.

However, these two men are likely to work together harmoniously. For one thing, as Nixon has indicated, McCracken is Burns's personal choice to head the CEA. Even more important is an essential identity of views between the two in the area of most direct concern to the council: keeping the domestic economy on a path of healthy growth. Like McCracken, Burns has been critical of overly expansive fiscal and monetary policy since 1965.

Less certain is the way Burns and Treasury Secretary David M. Kennedy will work together. Although Burns has never come out for changing the price of gold, he has often said that the alternative to controlling inflation "promptly" is "devaluation of the dollar."

During his first press conference, Kennedy had made his noncommittal statement on the usually sacrosanct $35 gold price only at the behest of Nixon's other economic advisers. He was relieved when he could finally state officially that "there was neither need nor reason" for a price change.

For this reason, Kennedy's second gold statement is widely viewed as a defeat for Burns. Yet the conflict between the two men may spring only from the difference between an economist and a banker. As an economics professor, Burns in the past has stressed the search for alternatives to the present monetary mechanism. As a banker, Kennedy has sought to calm markets.

For the future. The final question over Burns is whether Nixon views the post of counsellor as permanent, or essentially a holding operation. The possibility that Burns will succeed William McC. Martin, Jr., as chairman of the Federal Reserve Board has been widely discussed in the Administration, in Wall Street, and at the Fed itself. This, of course, is the kind of decision a President won't even whisper in advance—even if it has been made. So one of the puzzles over Burns won't be solved until Martin retires—January, 1970, at the latest.

[From the Washington (D.C.) Post, Feb. 13, 1969]

NIXON CAMPAIGN PLEDGE, PLAY BIGGER ROLE THAN REALIZED

(By Don Oberdorfer)

On Dec. 12, the morning after they were introduced live and in color on national television, each member of the Nixon Cabinet was given two books of campaign speeches and statements by the man who chose them for their jobs. What Mr. Nixon said in the campaign, they were told, would be the starting point for the policies of his Administration. They were urged to study the details and plan accordingly.

Those who recall the famous FDR pledge in 1932 to balance the budget, and the LBJ promise in 1964 to let Asian boys fight their own wars may be surprised by this recent display of attention to campaign promises. Despite examples to the contrary, thought, promises do count in politics. In this early stage of the Nixon Presidency, the promises of last fall are playing a more important role than is generally realized.

Just about the time the Cabinet was named, Mr. Nixon asked his old friend and adviser, Arthur Burns, to prepare a domestic program for the new Administration. Burns' first move was to study the campaign documents, a 291-page book titled "Nixon Speaks Out" and a 194-page volume titled "Nixon on the Issues," extracting and recording every pledge he could find. He also consulted the Republican National Platform and, as they were received, the confidential reports of the 22 Nixon task forces set up to study specific problems.

On Jan. 6, the day Mr. Nixon had marked on his calendar to begin work on his Inaugural Address, Burns presented him with a blue-covered notebook containing summaries of those domestic proposals that Burns felt deserved early attention. On Jan. 21, Burns placed additional recommendations in the notebook, bringing to more than 100 the proposals for presidential consideration.

Day by day over the past two weeks, Mr. Nixon has plucked these proposals from his notebook to be the basis for directives to his Cabinet officers and principal White House staff advisers. Each directive calls for study and a report back to the President, usually within 60 days.

So far 48 directives have been dispatched, and another 30 or so are under presidential consideration. Taken together, these items are the core of Mr. Nixon's domestic programs, as far ahead as his advisers can see.

About half the directives to date arose from pledges or declarations during the fall campaign. By and large, they call for reorganizing and reordering the work of the Government, with a heavy emphasis on returning money and decision-making powers to the states and the private sector. Early deadlines could bring quick action on specific and modest proposals—for example, the student tutoring corps, the computer job bank, the proposed law against mailing dirty books to children. More deliberate consideration is likely for such costly and complex proposals as tax sharing with the states, urged for quick action, yesterday by Gov. Nelson Rockefeller. At present, the Government does not have the money.

After full consideration, Mr. Nixon may yet abandon some of his campaign proposals—there is already doubt about the plan to provide automatic cost-of-living hikes in Social Security, for example—but the effort to honor the pledges is worthy of note. When and if redeemed by action, the Nixon platform could serve as a small bridge across the credibility gap about politics and government which is so worrisome to some in the new Administration.

To a reporter who traveled America behind Mr. Nixon last fall, the number and extent of his public promises come as something of a surprise. There did not seem too many of much importance at the time.

Most of the attention then went to Mr. Nixon's crowd-pleasing appeals to headlines, his vague if well-remembered pledges to end the war, stop the rise in crime and put millions more on payrolls instead of welfare rolls. Less notice was given the more thoughtful radio speeches and the blizzard of written statements on subjects ranging from cattle to merchant ships. As it turns out, these wide-ranging if sometimes contradictory and sketchy promises are the fine print in the contract that the candidate drew up with the voters last fall. At least, Mr. Nixon appears to think so, and is acting accordingly.

NATIONAL ECONOMIC CONVERSION COMMISSION

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

Mr. BINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, as the American people look with renewed hope toward a peaceful settlement of the tragic struggle in Vietnam, we must begin to plan now to cope with the economic consequences of that settlement. It is for this reason that I have today joined with my distinguished colleague from Massachusetts, BRAD MORSE, and 48 other Members, in introducing a bill designed to provide a framework for broadly based conversion planning. An identical bill is being introduced today in the Senate, also on a bipartisan basis, with Senator MCGOVERN and Senator HATFIELD as the principal sponsors, and with 25 cosponsors.

Three times since World War II, Mr. Speaker, we have seen defense expenditures drop: precipitately after World War II, moderately after Korea, and only slightly in the early 1960's. On each of these occasions, changes in the international situation sooner or later reversed the trend, and military budgets went back up to new highs. This has been most recently the case because of Vietnam, which has pushed total spending in the Department of Defense budget alone from $49.5 billion in 1965 to $81.5 billion projected for the coming fiscal year.

This enormous investment in national security has come, inevitably, at the expense of other priorities. There is still hunger in America. There are still millions of Americans who lack decent homes. There is still an inexcusable lack of equal opportunity for many Americans who are poor or from minority groups. We still all too often breathe polluted air, live in ill-planned cities, send our children to inadequate schools, endure unsatisfactory transportation, and suffer our countryside to be despoiled—while 41 percent of Federal expenditures are devoted to defense. How can the cycle be broken? How can some part of these resources now committed to military purposes be redirected to the urgent needs of our domestic society or to bridging the rapidly widening gap between rich and poor nations in the world?

An opportunity to effect this shift may be rapidly approaching. A settlement in Vietnam which would permit withdrawal of a substantial portion of the American military force now present there will free as much as $19 billion in Federal resources within 30 months. If we can insure that these resources—and the additional resources which come from the steady expansion of our total economy—are not simply absorbed by new defense programs, we may finally succeed in breaking the cycle of ever-growing national security expenditures and arrive at a more rational ordering of our national priorities.

If we are to achieve this goal, however, we must begin planning now so that the alternatives are clearly spelled out before the resources become available. For the military-industrial juggernaut has the great advantage which inertia of motion offers to so large a mass traveling at so rapid a pace. In policy terms, heavy expenditures on national security have been with us for so long that it will require a major rethinking of our view of the world, and of the strategic choices before us, if we are to accept their scaling down. In economic terms, too many industries and localities have lived for too long on the relatively simple contract arrangements which defense procurement offers. It is hard for them to contemplate with equanimity a shift in production and markets. They often have exaggerated fears about the possible consequences of a cutback in defense-related spending because they have never been faced with the necessity of examining the alternatives open to them. They thus constitute a powerful lobby for continued high levels of military expenditures, even though more careful study of their options might lead them to even greater prosperity through producing for nonmilitary markets.

The legislation which we are today proposing would help to stimulate just such careful study. Hopefully, it thereby would banish many of the vague fears which currently inhibit meaningful discussion of the alternatives that can become available with a shift of resources away from defense-related production. It would also fill a broader function by continuing the work previously done, in 1965 and 1968, by two distinguished Presidential commissions which sought to define and recommend national policies for a period of conversion from a wartime to a peacetime economy. Finally, it would help attract national attention to the urgency of planning now in this vital area, so that we shall not be caught unprepared for reasoned decisionmaking when the moment of transition is upon us.

The importance of this planning effort has been widely recognized. Two commissions established by President Johnson worked in this area, and President Nixon in his inaugural address promised that—

> We shall plan now for the day when our wealth can be transferred from the destruction of war abroad to the urgent needs of our people at home.

To fulfill that pledge, he has already designated a subcommittee of the new Council for Economic Policy "to advise the President on what, if any, standing arrangements for this transition should be made." A number of studies of conversions problems have been undertaken by the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency, and the Office of Economic Adjustment in the Department of Defense has been dealing since 1961 with the specific economic impact associated with closings of defense installations and other major changes in military outlays.

These are encouraging steps, but they have taken place almost exclusively within the Federal Government. It is now essential that a means be devised to involve State and local governments, and labor and management, in the overall effort of planning for the transition to a peacetime economy. Several States and localities—including my own State of New York—have already begun to plan for conversion to a peacetime economy. Others, and some industries, have become involved through ACDA studies or by having to face a particular local problem. Now the vast majority who have not yet joined in such planning must be encouraged to do so. For only through broadly based collaboration can conversion planning be made fully effective—and only in this way can the consequences of conversion be made fully evident to every American who will be affected.

Mr. Speaker, the legislation which we have today introduced would provide the necessary framework for this planning effort. This proposed National Economic Conversion Act would establish a National Economic Conversion Commission in the Executive Office of the President. The Secretary of Commerce would serve as its Chairman. Eleven other Cabinet officers and agency heads would be designated as members, and the 12 original members would be authorized to add up to six more members at their discretion. These could be chosen either within or outside the Government, and would thus allow the scope of the Commission to be broadened if the designated members should judge this to be desirable.

The Commission, under the terms of the bill, would have five principal tasks:

First, it would be charged with defining appropriate Federal Government policies in the economic conversion field, and with making recommendations on this subject to the President and to the Congress within 1 year.

Second, the Commission would be required to convene a National Conference on Industrial Conversion and Growth, again within 1 year from the date of its creation.

Third, the Commission would consult with the Governors of the States to encourage State, local, and regional studies on economic conversion. To lend weight to its encouragement, the Commission would be authorized to pay up to half the cost of State, local, and regional studies or conferences on this problem.

Fourth, the Commission would bring workers and businessmen into the planning process by consulting with trade and industry associations, labor unions, and professional organizations.

Fifth, the Commission would help to guide conversion planning by defense contractors to insure that the individual firms most directly concerned will be fully involved in preparing for their own economic future. Through these activities, the Commission should be able to attract national attention to the urgency of planning for economic conversion and to help chart a path for the Nation to follow in this vital area.

Members may recall, Mr. Speaker, that a similar proposal for a National Economic Conversion Commission was laid before the Congress in 1963, when it appeared that defense budgets might be turning downward. Hearings were held by the Senate Commerce Committee, at which time a number of specific suggestions were made for changes in the original bill. Many of these recommendations are incorporated in the draft legislation which we are presenting today to the two Houses of Congress. The turnabout in the rate of defense-related expenditures occasioned by our growing commitment in Vietnam sidetracked the bill in its initial incarnation. It is now reborn, to meet a resurgent need.

It may be well to examine in greater detail the role which defense-related spending plays in the economy of the United States. For if we are to beat a significant number of our swords into ploughshares, a major portion of our economy will be directly affected. Federal expenditures on the combined defense, space, and atomic energy programs have accounted for about 9 to 10 percent of the gross national product during the past decade. Defense-related work has absorbed about 10 percent of our total employment.

Even these figures, impressive as they are, partially conceal the impact of defense spending on the economy in some areas of the country. For defense spending has an uneven geographic distribution. In States with a high concentration of military facilities, wages and salaries paid by the major defense-related industries and by the Federal defense agencies have ranged as high as 20 to 25 percent of total statewide personal income. In defense-related activities, two-thirds of total payrolls have tended to concentrate in about a dozen States. And in these and other States, there is further concentration in specific cities or counties, which may be more heavily dependent on the size of the military budget than broader-gage statistics suggest. In such areas, conversion could have a severe impact if there has been no prior planning to meet the consequences of transition.

My own State of New York provides a perfect example of the concentration of defense contracts in a few localities within a State. During the Vietnam buildup, the State's prime defense contracts have increased from $2.2 to $3.5 billion, making New York the second largest defense supplier in the Nation. About 265,000 workers are directly or indirectly involved in defense work. Yet only 25 of the State's 62 counties have defense employment which exceeds 5 percent of their overall factory employment or 3 percent of their total employment; the remaining 37 counties are relatively unaffected by defense spending. One two-county area—Nassau and Suffolk Counties, on Long Island just outside New York City—nevertheless had close to 35 percent of total factory employment and 8.5 percent of total employment in all categories directly involved in defense work. And not only metropolitan areas are involved. Another three-county area, comprising Delaware, Chenango, and Otsego Counties, has only one town with a population which exceeded 10,000 at the last decennial census. Yet 26 percent of its factory employment, and over 13 percent of its total employment, depend directly on defense contracts.

As I noted earlier, New York is also, fortunately, an example of a State where planning has already begun on meeting the problems of conversion. A post-Vietnam planning committee appointed by Governor Rockefeller completed an initial report last December on plans to meet the economic consequences of peace. The committee did pioneering work in gathering data, such as that presented above, on the dimensions of the problem. They stimulated local and regional authorities, as well as the industries directly concerned, to devote serious attention to the question of conversion. And they made specific recommendations for State and local actions both to further the planning process and to prepare for an actual shift in resources away from defense expenditures.

Clearly, Mr. Speaker, there are many other areas throughout the country where this kind of planning effort is sorely needed. The executive agencies which deal with the problem today are equipped to offer only minimal assistance. Thus, new machinery is required. The Commission we have proposed today would offer to State, local, and regional authorities, as well as to the workers and businessmen directly concerned, a much-needed stimulus to, and support for, planning at the level where the impact of conversion is potentially most severe.

The Commission would also, of course, continue the equally vital task of examining at a national level the alternatives which will be open to us when resources are freed by the end of our military commitment in Vietnam. As I noted before, the Cabinet Coordinating Committee which reported to President Johnson last December estimated that a peace settlement which permitted a full withdrawal of troops could lead within 30 months to a drop of $19 billion in the use of real resources for defense purposes. There will inevitably by many claimants for these freshly liberated resources. We will hear proposals for tax reductions, for new defense procurement programs, for reduction in the national debt, and for meeting the urgent needs of our domestic society.

Based on past experience, those of us who would like to see the emphasis placed on improving the quality of life in this country will be hard put to compete with proponents of new military hardware. After all, they will argue, the savings are coming out of the defense budget. Why should not we have the first claim on these resources? And the programs are already there. An ABM system, at a cost of $5 to $10 billion for a "thin" system and between $50 and $100 billion for a "thick" defense—either one of dubious utility at best. An advanced manned strategic aircraft, with a price tag between $8 and $12 billion. Bigger and better offensive missiles; a new generation of tactical aircraft; new types of nuclear submarines and surface vessels. The list is nearly endless, and the budget requirements astronomical.

The Commission which this bill proposes to establish would not make for us the hard decisions on allocation of national resources in the years to come. But it would help greatly in defining the alternatives and in helping to demonstrate to labor and management, to State and local governments, that a shift away from defense spending can produce a better and more prosperous society for us all. It will then be up to us in the Congress, to the President, and to all the American people to reallocate a substantial part of our available resources from instruments of human destruction to programs for human betterment.

I urge my colleagues to give this legislation their careful consideration and their wholehearted support.

Such support has already been demonstrated by a number of my colleagues who have joined with us today in cosponsoring this proposed legislation. They are Representatives BROCK ADAMS, EDWARD P. BOLAND, JOHN BRADEMAS, GEORGE E. BROWN, JR., PHILLIP BURTON, DANIEL E. BUTTON, JEFFERY COHELAN, SILVIO O. CONTE, JOHN CONYERS, JR., JOHN R. DELLENBACK, DON EDWARDS, MARVIN L. ESCH, LEONARD FARBSTEIN, DONALD M. FRASER, SAMUEL N. FRIEDEL, JAMES G. FULTON, JACOB GILBERT, WILLIAM J. GREEN, GILBERT GUDE, SEYMOUR HALPERN, AUGUSTUS F. HAWKINS, KEN HECHLER, HENRY HELSTOSKI, FRANK HORTON, EDWARD I. KOCH, ROBERT L. LEGGETT, RICHARD D. MCCARTHY, PAUL N. MCCLOSKEY, ABNER J. MIKVA, JOSEPH G. MINISH, PATSY MINK, JOHN S. MONAGAN, WILLIAM S. MOORHEAD, RICHARD L. OTTINGER, CLAUDE PEPPER, HOWARD W. POLLOCK, THOMAS M. REES, OGDEN R. REID, BENJAMIN S. ROSENTHAL, EDWARD R. ROYBAL, WILLIAM F. RYAN, HERMAN T. SCHNEEBELI, JAMES H. SCHEUER, FRED SCHWENGEL, JAMES W. SYMINGTON, FRANK THOMPSON, JR., LIONEL VAN DEERLIN, and CHARLES W. WHALEN, JR.

The text of the National Economic Conversion Act, which we have today introduced, is as follows:

H.R. 8042

A bill to establish a National Economic Conversion Commission, and for other purposes

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That this Act may be cited as the "National Economic Conversion Act."

DECLARATION OF PURPOSE

SEC. 2. The Congress finds and declares that the United States has during the past two decades made heavy economic, scientific and technical commitments for defense; that careful preparation and study is necessary if wise decisions on future allocations of such resources are to be possible; that the economic ability of the Nation and of management, labor and capital to adjust to changing security needs is consistent with the general welfare of the United States; and that the economic conversion and diversification required by changing defense needs presents a great challenge and opportunity to the American people.

It is the purpose of this Act to provide the means through which the United States can determine the public policies which will best allow such economic conversion.

ESTABLISHMENT OF THE COMMISSION

SEC. 3. (a) There is hereby established, in the Executive Office of the President, the National Economic Conversion Commission (hereafter referred to as the "Commission"), which shall be composed of—

(1) The Secretary of Defense;

(2) The Secretary of Agriculture;

(3) The Secretary of Interior;

(4) The Secretary of Commerce, who shall be chairman of the Commission;

(5) The Secretary of Labor;

(6) The Secretary of Health, Education and Welfare;

(7) The Secretary of Housing and Urban Development;

(8) The Secretary of Transportation;

(9) The Chairman of the Atomic Energy Commission;

(10) The Administrator of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration;

(11) The Director of the United States Arms Control and Disarmament Agency; and

(12) The Chairman of the Council of Economic Advisers.

(b) The Secretary of Commerce shall preside over meetings of the Commission; except that in his unavoidable absence he may designate a member of the Commission to preside in his place.

(c) The Commission may invite additional persons to serve as members of the Commission, either on a temporary or permanent basis, so long as the overall size of the Commission shall in no case exceed 18 members.

(d) The Commission shall have a staff to be headed by an executive secretary who shall be appointed by the President and who shall be compensated at the rate provided for Grade 18 of the General Schedule.

(e) Members of the Commission who are officers or employees of the Federal Government shall receive no additional compensation by virtue of membership on the Commission. Other members of the Commission shall receive compensation at the rate of not to exceed $100 per diem when engaged in the performance of duties for the Commission. Each member of the Commission shall be reimbursed, as authorized by law (5 U.S.C. 73b–2), for travel and subsistence and other necessary expenses incurred by him in the performance of his duties for the Commission.

DUTIES OF THE COMMISSION

SEC. 4. It shall be the duty of the Commission to—

(a) define appropriate policies and programs to be carried out by departments and agencies of the Federal Government for economic conversion capability, which shall include possible schedules of civilian public and private investment, including education and retraining for occupational conversion, associated with various degrees of economic conversion, and the anticipated effects thereof upon income and employment, and to report to the President and the Congress on such policies and programs within one year of the enactment of this Act;

(b) convene a National Conference on Industrial Conversion and Growth, within one year after the enactment of this Act, to consider the problems arising from a conversion to a civilian economy, and to encourage appropriate planning and programing by all sectors of the economy to facilitate the Nation's economic conversion capability;

(c) consult with the Governors of the States to encourage appropriate studies and conferences at the State, local and regional level, in support of a coordinated effort to improve the Nation's economic conversion capability, and make available to the Governors of the States such funds as shall constitute not more than 50 per centum of the total costs associated with the preparation of such studies or the holding of such conferences;

(d) consult with trade and industry associations, labor unions and professional societies, to encourage and enlist their support for a coordinated effort to improve the Nation's economic conversion capability;

(e) promulgate such regulations for the appropriate departments and agencies of the Federal Government as may be necessary for the implementation of section 5 of this Act; and

(f) make such recommendations to the President and to the Congress as will further the purposes of this Act.

INDUSTRIAL CONVERSION CAPABILITY

SEC. 5. (a) Under such regulations as the Commission shall prescribe, each defense contract or grant hereafter entered into by the Department of Defense or any military department thereof, or by the Atomic Energy Commission, shall contain provisions effective to require the contractor to define his capability for converting manpower, facilities, and any other resources now used for specific military products or purposes, to civilian uses.

(b) The Commission shall encourage trade and industry associations, labor unions and professional organizations to make appropriate studies and plans to further the conversion capabilities of their membership.

(c) As used in this section the term "defense contract or grant" means any contract or grant to business firms, government agencies, universities and other non-profit organizations,

(1) which involves—

(A) the research, development, production, maintenance, or storage of any weapons systems, arms, armament, ammunition, implements of war, parts or ingredients of such articles or supplies, or plans for the use thereof; or

(B) the construction, reconstruction, repair, or installation of a building, plant, structure, or facility which the Secretary of Defense or his designee, or the Chairman of the Atomic Energy Commission or his designee, certifies to be necessary to the national defense;

(2) which requires that the number of employees engaged in work under such defense contract or grant, together with employees engaged in work under any other such contract or grant, exceeds 49 employees or 25 per centum of the total number of employees, whichever is greater, at any establishment operated by the contractor awarded such contract or grant; and

(3) which requires at least one year to complete.

POWERS OF THE COMMISSION

SEC. 6. (a) The Commission shall have the power to appoint and fix compensation of such personnel as it deems advisable in accordance with the applicable provisions of title 5, United States Code. The Commission may also procure temporary and intermittent services to the same extent as authorized for the departments by section 3109 of title 5, United States Code.

(b) The Commission is authorized to secure directly from any executive department, bureau, agency, board, commission, office, independent establishment or instrumentality, information, suggestions, estimates, and statistics for the purpose of this Act, and each department, bureau, agency, board, commission, office, independent establishment or instrumentality, is authorized and directed to furnish such information, suggestions, estimates, and statistics directly to the Commission upon request made by the Chairman.

AUTHORIZATION FOR APPROPRIATIONS

SEC. 7. Such sums as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this Act are hereby authorized to be appropriated.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. Speaker, today 48 Members and 26 Senators introduced a bill to create the National Economic Conversion Commission last introduced by 25 Members in 1964. It is our hope that the legislation we support will gear up needed long-range planning which will enable our economy to shift smoothly into peacetime production when the conflict in Vietnam is concluded.

The dimensions of our economic dependence on the huge Military Establishment is now generally recognized. When between 9 and 10 percent of our gross national product, approximately 9 percent of our total labor force, 41 percent of our Federal budget, and about 60 percent of our scientists and engineers are directly or indirectly engaged in defense or defense-related activities, there is a potentially drastic economic problem on the horizon.

I was heartened when President Nixon stated, in his inaugural address:

> We shall plan now for the day when our wealth can be transferred from the destruction of war abroad to the urgent needs of our people at home.

I was even more gratified when the President created a Council for Economic Policy Subcommittee to be chaired by Dr. Herbert Stein, one of whose responsibilities is to initiate policy planning for the conversion of our economy to a peacetime basis.

In a statement delivered on the floor of the House on January 20, 1964, I said:

> Any significant changes in the quantity of character of these expenditures would have an important and potentially unsettling impact on our economy. Yet despite the constantly changing nature of our defense requirements, the rapidly shifting patterns in world politics, and the tremendous growth of our technology, we have devoted very little attention to concrete planning for our long-range economic health.

Two Commissions appointed by President Johnson did some initial work in this area since those words were recorded. However, the Commission we propose would have a broader purpose; drawing on the 11 Cabinet officers and the Chairman, the Secretary of Commerce, it would be charged with making recommendations to the President and the Congress on programs and policies in the field of economic conversion. Furthermore, it would be created to involve participation by the Nation's Governors and labor leaders, as well as industry leaders and associations in planning and discussions of conversion and the consequences of economic change.

Government cannot solve this problem alone, a fact recognized by the Chamber of Commerce of the United States which, in March of 1968 published a useful study prepared by a distinguished panel of business leaders entitled "After Vietnam." They conclude, and quite rightly I think, that unless plans are made now by all parties concerned: our Federal Government, States, localities and the business community, our economy would be needlessly distorted by disengagement.

The complexity of the conversion process is increasingly apparent. We must look not only at the number of military installations, defense contractors, and employees affected, but also at the multiplier effect on our economy as a whole. Housing and service industries will be affected; local requirements for education and health needs; State unemployment compensation systems, all must be reexamined. If we are to attack this problem realistically we need the involvement of every element in our society, which can contribute experience, knowledge, and imagination.

Economic transition is not an abstract intellectual concept, it is a reality for thousands of workers whose jobs would be jeopardized. The Federal Government is deeply involved in the prosperity of many of our communities today and we need to recognize its responsibilities for the predictable and potentially painful transition process which will occur. We can and must assert this responsibility without extending control over the private sector of the economy.

The basic decisions about conversion must be made by the individual business firm, but government has an important role to play in enabling businessmen to make informed, intelligent decisions. By thoughtful preparation we can create conditions which would help them move from economic dependence upon the Federal Government to the economic independence which has traditionally given our economy strength and vitality.

Conversion will involve taking a hard look at the problems confronting our people which require solution. The areas that urgently need the Nation's attentions are manifold: improved transportation systems and facilities, ways of solving urban decay and housing needs, expanded research efforts in health and medical technology, meaningful control of air and water pollution, and development of new sources of power, to name a few.

A number of years ago I proposed that the United States utilize the demonstrated capacity of systems management techniques, initially developed in defense-related industries, in the solution of nondefense, nonspace public problems. I have urged, for example, that the Merrimack River, which flows through the district, which I am privileged to represent, to be regarded as a system, that the solution for its abuse and neglect will only come when the States, communities, industry, and citizens who use it can conceptualize that fact, that it is a system and requires solutions which take into account the diverse uses and needs that the river fulfills.

There are a variety of other problems facing our society which in my view, will be solved only when we take advantage of the successful experience that has been developed by some defense industries. The opportunity for conversion is unlimited.

The Ackley committee report of July 1965, summarized the work that still needed to be done at that time: to improve specific adjustment programs; to improve the coordination of those programs to particular communities; to increase the awareness of the impact of defense activity on the economy; and to find and stimulate new proposals for meeting the opportunities created by the changes in defense needs.

The report of the successor committee established in 1967 by President Johnson also emphasized the demanding task that will confront fiscal and monetary policies when demobilization is undertaken.

The two committees have made a significant contribution to the dialog which has been generated on the conversion problem since the introduction of my bill in 1964. Those efforts illustrate the need for a much broader involvement by industries, organizations, and associations who have a direct interest and vital concern. The bill that is being jointly introduced today does take this approach. It makes every effort to get the people who may be affected involved, and by so doing, to broaden the base of the knowledge and interest which must be applied to solve the problem.

The bill states that the Commission shall encourage trade associations, labor unions, industry associations and professional societies to make plans and engage in studies which would further the conversion capabilities of their respective organizations.

The legislation also requires the Commission to prescribe that the contract entered into by the Department of Defense or any military department, or the Atomic Energy Commission contain a definition by the contractor of his capability for converting his various resources to civilian uses. This concept that is treated here is fundamental to the need which must be faced at the time of conversion. It gives expression to the idea that industry does not want to be dependent upon the Defense Establishment, and subject to its inevitable fluctuations.

In a 1965 report published by Litton Industries I noticed that they are making every effort to reduce their percentage of defense contracting. At that time they had reduced their dependence from its original 100 percent to less than 40 percent. In their last fiscal year they had further reduced this figure to 27 percent of their total business. This business was done by their defense and marine systems branch. This example is an important lesson.

Some efforts have been undertaken in the direction of conversion in the past, but each time since the Second World War that we have begun to grapple with the issue, new military spending has occurred. We are coming to the crossroad again. The long-awaited solution to the Vietnam conflict will place this country in the enviable position among its world neighbors of actually having the resources, the technology and the ability to solve the pressing human problems of its citizens and the environment in which they live.

The possibility of impending peace poses two questions: whether we have the foresight to plan a rational and effective utilization of the resources to become available, and whether we have the will to do so.

We have made extraordinary technological progress in the past decade. Not only has our ability to communicate and to solve problems developed extensively, but our gathering of data has also improved enough to indicate how far we do have to go.

Mr. Speaker, I would urge that economic conversion is of the utmost concern at this time. The time and effort must be undertaken now to have any meaningful effect within this Congress. More is at stake here than a few hundred jobs or a handful of industries. It is time for new directions and new solutions to the problems in 1969. We do not have the pentup consumer demand of the forties credited by some experts for offsetting the predictions that the United States would go into a depression following World War II.

The proper climate must and can be created for a peacetime conversion that will establish new goals and initiatives. The 1960's has been a time for discovery of many wishes and desires unknown but a few years ago. The voyage of the Apollo 8 last Christmas clearly dramatized American technological achievement and potential.

I find it unacceptable that we cannot take the same sort of enterprise and ability and apply it to man's age-old problems of creating a healthy environment, educating his young, and eradicating hunger and disease. The drama and excitement of America is that we have the resources to make the conversion a success, and that the opportunity may soon present itself to begin the task.

Mr. ROSENTHAL. Mr. Speaker, I join today with many colleagues in the House and Senate to introduce a bill to create a National Economic Conversion Commission to stimulate planning for the shift in national resources from the wartime economy caused by Vietnam to a productive peacetime economy when that tragic conflict ends.

To assist in the consideration of this important proposal, I include below the important section of President Johnson's economic report of 1969, released in January, on "Economic Planning for the End of Vietnam Hostilities":

REPORT TO THE PRESIDENT FROM THE CABINET COORDINATING COMMITTEE ON ECONOMIC PLANNING FOR THE END OF VIETNAM HOSTILITIES

In March 1967 you asked the Secretaries of Treasury, Defense, Commerce, and Labor; the Director of the Bureau of the Budget; and the Chairman of the Council of Economic Advisers to form a committee to coordinate the economic planning for the end of hostilities in Vietnam.

As initial terms of reference, you instructed the Committee to

—*consider possibilities and priorities for tax adjustment*

—*prepare, with the Federal Reserve Board, plans for quick adjustments of monetary and financial policies*

—*determine which high priority programs can be quickly expanded*

—*determine priorities for the longer range expansion of programs to meet the needs of the American people, both through new and existing programs*

—*study and evaluate the future direction of Federal financial support to our States and local governments*

—*examine ways in which the transition to peace can be smoothed for the workers, companies, and communities now engaged in supplying our defense needs, and for the men released from our armed forces.*

Vietnam hostilities first became a significant economic influence in the summer of 1965, at a time when the economy was remarkably well-balanced and was in the midst of the longest peacetime expansion in history. The increase in the military budget required for Vietnam complicated the tasks of fiscal-monetary policies. The economy was subjected to inflationary strains. Although the American economic system demonstrated the strength and adaptability necessary to carry the extra load without major disruption and without jeopardizing its fundamental health, the cost of war has been a load for the economy to carry—*not* a supporting "prop." Prosperity has not depended on the defense buildup and will not need high military spending to support it in peacetime. On the contrary, peace will provide the Nation with welcome opportunities to channel into civilian use manpower and material resources now being devoted to war.

SUMMARY OF FINDINGS

A self-contained summary of the findings of the Committee is presented initially under three major hearings. It is followed by more detailed discussion of each major section.

Fiscal monetary policies during demobilization

Sustaining prosperity during the demobilization and seizing the welcome opportunities of peacetime will depend upon the careful and forward-looking management of fiscal and monetary policies. If demobilization should produce a major and rapid decline in defense spending, and if policies were not adjusted, the Federal budget would have an excessively restrictive effect on the economy.

An illustrative pattern of demobilization was developed on the assumption that within 6 months after cessation of hostilities, a genuine peace would be secured and a full withdrawal of troops could be initiated. In such a rapid demobilization, the use of real resources for defense purposes would drop by $16 billion (annual rate in 1968 prices) below the previously planned path over a period of six quarters following the truce and, ultimately, by $19 billion at the end of 10 quarters. If there were no compensating fiscal-monetary policy actions, the Nation could be threatened with a recession similar to that at the end of Korean hostilities.

The magnitude and the timing of the policy adjustment best suited to promote steady and healthy economic growth will depend on the strength of private demand at the time peace arrives and on the specific profile of the defense cutback. The best possible projections of these elements will be needed in order to guide fiscal-monetary policy.

A number of possible compensating measures can be foreseen now. If the current 10 percent income tax surcharge is still in effect when hostilities end, its early expiration (or phasing out) could provide a major offsetting element. A detailed plan to speed up expenditures on established high priority projects should be available for the President's consideration. If further stimulus is appropriate, new program initiatives could be launched. The objectives of the compensating fiscal action should receive the support of monetary policy, but credit conditions probably should not be pushed into a posture of aggressive ease. Meanwhile, the objectives of an improved price-cost performance and balance-of-payments equilibrium should be pursued intensively.

Resources and priorities

The choices among alternative fiscal adjustments during the demobilization period should be guided by longer run priorities. Such priorities should be weighed in advance so that the Nation will be ready to take full advantage of any opportunities to launch important new programs, to strengthen high-priority existing programs, or to reduce taxes.

As revenues expand in a growing peacetime economy, the elbow room in the budget increases. But about one-half of the growth in revenues is preempted by essentially built-in commitments of existing expenditure programs to meet the needs of a growing population and an expanding economy. These commitments are reflected in the estimated "baseline" budget for both defense and nondefense expenditures in fiscal 1972. These estimates assume that the transition to peace is essentially completed by 1972, and that the current 10 percent income tax surcharge and certain excise taxes have expired by that time.

According to the illustrative calculations, the "peace-and-growth dividend"—available for Federal programs above the baseline or for tax reduction—would amount to $22 billion by fiscal 1972, and would increase $7 to $8 billion a year thereafter. The peace-and-growth dividend must be used in order to maintain healthy economic growth, and it can be used constructively.

Some possible uses of the dividend are set forth to illustrate the considerable pressures, demands, and opportunities for Federal efforts in the years ahead. Some liberalization of social insurance and other cash benefits—in part, to keep up with the cost of living—is viewed as a significant claim on the dividend. In addition, the full funding of existing civilian programs to authorized levels would cost $6 billion a year.

Beyond that, a variety of major expansions in existing programs and of new programs are highly eligible claimants. A selection of such items, based largely on proposals which have been made by experts or study groups, adds up to $40 billion a year. And other more ambitious, new proposals, which are currently receiving widespread public discussion must also be recognized. Furthermore, tax reduction merits consideration as an effective way to share part of the dividend broadly among Americans.

It is clear that the Nation cannot carry out all these activities—funding existing programs, undertaking new program initiatives, and reducing taxes—in the next few years from the peace-and-growth dividend;

difficult choices based on a careful determination of priorities will be necessary. But for those objectives placed at the top of society's priority list, progress can be made in a peaceful environment of prosperity and reasonable price stability.

As noted above, our calculations allow for expiration of temporary taxes now in effect. In view of the urgent needs of the public sector, the Committee would not recommend further large-scale Federal tax reductions in the years immediately following the end of Vietnam hostilities.

Policies to assist particular communities and individuals

The economic impact of the war has been broadly diffused among all States and most industries. Only a relatively small number of areas and industries are likely to be specially affected by the demobilization or to encounter significant transitional problems. The Committee recommends certain measures to aid people in those areas and industries, including: community redevelopment assistance, homeowner assistance, and—most importantly—the strengthening of job placement and training.

We also recommend the early establishment of a coordinating group, which might be called the Readjustment Operations Committee, to assume responsibility for detailed planning of Federal readjustment assistance, to work with State and local authorities responsible for demobilization planning, and to coordinate Federal readjustment programs during demobilization.

The steps we propose for readjustment assistance are limited and relatively inexpensive, reflecting our conviction that the maintenance of general prosperity is far and away the major part of the economic problem of the transition. In our dynamic and flexible free market economy, most areas and industries should be able to make a prompt and healthy adjustment so long as the Federal Government promotes noninflationary prosperity.

Looking forward to peace

We also wish to stress the importance of a responsible and responsive fiscal policy during the remaining period of hostilities. Only in recent months, through the enactment of the 1968 program of fiscal restraint, have our Nation's finances become adequately adjusted to the defense emergency situation. Maintenance of appropriate fiscal and monetary policy is absolutely essential both to preserve prosperity and to minimize the problem of transition at the end of hostilities.

FISCAL-MONETARY POLICIES DURING DEMOBILIZATION

Peace may "break out" in any number of ways. For example, hostilities may decline gradually, accompanied by reduced expenditures on armament and manpower. Alternatively, there could be a lengthy armed truce which would permit no significant reduction in our forces in Southeast Asia.

Demobilization scenario

In the calculations underlying this report, defense activities in Vietnam are assumed to continue at essentially present levels until hostilities cease. It is furthermore assumed that, within 6 months after a truce, there will be a genuine assurance of peace and hence the beginnings of a full withdrawal of troops from Vietnam with accompanying cutbacks in other outlays.

An illustrative demobilization scenario developed by the Department of Defense points to the reductions in manpower, materials, and outlays described below. These are the amounts by which defense activities would fall short of the path that they would have followed had hostilities continued.

1. The armed services would decline by about 800,000 persons, averaging 200,000 a quarter starting in the third quarter following the truce and terminating after the sixth quarter.

2. Civilian personnel in the Department of Defense would be reduced by 170,000, also declining smoothly between the third and sixth quarters.

3. As a result of the manpower reduction, military and civilian compensation would be reduced by $7 billion (annual rate) at 1968 pay rates by the end of the sixth quarter.

4. Other operating expenditures (annual rate in 1968 prices) would decline by $4 billion over a slightly longer period.

5. Expenditures for procurement would be reduced by $8 billion over an interval of 10 quarters. This reduction would take longer in order to rebuild inventories held by the Department of Defense.

6. Total real defense spending (annual rate in 1968 prices) would thus be reduced by $8 billion at the end of four quarters, $16 billion at the end of six quarters, and $19 billion at the end of 10 quarters.

This is a rapid demobilization—probably the most rapid that could realistically be assumed. Demobilization may in fact turn out to be smaller or more gradual as a result of any one of at least three developments:

1. A gradual decline in military activity prior to the truce,

2. A long period of uncertainty between the attainment of the truce and the decision for redeployment, or

3. The need to maintain significant residual forces in Vietnam, even in peacetime.

The rapid pattern of demobilization is assumed because it represents the sharpest test of the Nation's ability to adapt to peace—not because it appears most probable. If the Nation is ready to meet the challenge of rapid demobilization, the lesser challenge of a more gradual transition can surely be handled.

The estimated decline in defense expenditures is significantly less than the $20 billion a year currently estimated as the cost of the war. Of resources currently used for Vietnam, $10 billion would be required in other military uses in peacetime.

The reduction in Vietnam outlays during the demobilization will appear as a shortfall from an otherwise increasing path of defense spending. If hostilities were to continue with undiminished intensity, the total defense budget would probably continue to rise at least enough to cover increases in military pay scales and gradual advances in prices paid for defense goods.

A *hypothetical* example is presented in Chart 3 to illustrate the relationship between the paths of defense spending with and without the demobilization. In this illustration, defense purchases are assumed to be $80 billion initially and to be rising at the rate of $1 billion a quarter to cover price and pay increases and to provide for a very modest real growth. In the absence of peace, defense purchases would reach $86 billion after six quarters and $90 billion after 10 quarters. The demobilization scenario above implies that defense purchases would be pulled below this rising path by about $16 billion six quarters after the cessation of hostilities, and by about $19 billion after 10 quarters. The absolute decline from the initial level of $80 billion would be considerably less, reaching $10 billion at the end of six quarters.

Economic impact

The economic impact of the demobilization (and the required fiscal-monetary adjustment) can be most readily appraised by supposing that the fiscal program had been appropriately designed initially under the assumption of continuing hostilities, to promote a balance between aggregate demand and the economy's supply capabilities. In this situation, a major policy adjustment would be required to offset the shortfall resulting from demobilization.

The impact of demobilization on the balance between aggregate demand and the economy's productive capacity has three aspects.

1. The reduced use of resources by the Federal Government, reflected in the decline of defense spending described above.

2. The short-run downward adjustments of inventories by defense suppliers as their production is adjusted to declining orders and falls below deliveries to the Government. The economic impact would occur even before Federal expenditures declined, and would remain significant for only about four quarters after the truce.

3. An increase in the Nation's potential output resulting from the potential additional employment of released military personnel in civilian jobs, where productivity is substantially greater. Some women will withdraw from the labor force when their husbands return to civilian life, and some veterans will return to school before entering the civilian labor force. After allowing for these elements, the cumulative net induced increase in the private labor force is estimated at about 600,000 after six quarters.

This shift toward higher productivity would add about $4 or $5 billion to potential GNP. To absorb this increment, action would be required to add nearly $2 billion directly to total demand. The resulting additional incomes could be expected to generate the necessary additional $2 to $3 billion increment in demand.

With no policy offset whatsoever, the direct shortfall of demand by the sixth quarter following the truce could amount to $18 billion: $16 billion for the real decline in military spending and $2 billion for the direct increment in demand needed to make use of the addition to potential output.

Shifts in the strength of private demand might either reduce or add to this gap, but they would be unlikely to change the picture dramatically. Without compensatory stabilization action, the gap would be multiplied through induced further cutbacks in demand that spread through the private sector. Eight quarters after the truce, the total multiplied shortfall below the potential output of the economy could reach $40 billion. Inaction would thus threaten a recession similar to the 1953–54 experience following the Korean hostilities.

Fiscal-monetary adjustment

The instruments of fiscal and monetary policy must be available for prompt and decisive use to promote noninflationary prosperity and economic growth. These instruments are clearly capable, in principle, of offsetting the restrictive fiscal impact of demobilization. Indeed, an excessive or premature stimulative fiscal-monetary program could overdo the job and generate an inflationary boom. A major challenge will be to determine and carry out a policy adjustment of proper size and timing.

Determining the Magnitude

The above projections merely suggest the general magnitude of the policy requirements during a rapid demobilization. The specific dimensions can only be appraised when peace comes and much more is known about the prospects for private demand, the budget, and the time-path of the military cutback. Nevertheless, some important guides can be provided to the problems and procedures involved in determining the magnitude of the compensating actions.

1. When peace comes, the President and the Congress will need advice based on detailed projections of the GNP, prices, unemployment, and the balance of international payments. Despite the inherent limitations of projections, prudent reliance on quantitative forecasts—carefully weighed and interpreted—is preferable to a policy of wait-and-see, a resort to predetermined rules of policy adjustment, or a simple extrapolation of existing economic conditions.

2. Efforts should begin now to strengthen the quality of statistical information about

the economy's performance—such as those improvements recommended in the budget program for fiscal 1969. Information of this type may be critical in determining the appropriateness of policy during the demobilization.

3. For the same reasons, the Department of Defense should continue intensive efforts to improve projections of military orders and outlays so as to aid economic policy during demobilization. Assessing the time-path of the military cutback will be subject to uncertainties similar to those that were encountered in appraising the initial defense buildup in Vietnam.

4. Flexibility of fiscal and monetary policy decisions will be important to the success of adjustment. Even with the best efforts, gauging private demand and defense outlays will be difficult. During the demobilization, prediction of private spending will be complicated by the substantial psychological impacts of peace on private decisionmakers. It is a safe judgment that Americans will be delighted by peace, but it does not follow that they will therefore spend more, or alternatively that they will save more. Hence a successful transition program—marked by steadiness and stability in the growth, employment, and price performance of the Nation—may require continuing adjustments in the budgetary balance and in the behavior of monetary and credit flows.

5. Fiscal-monetary policies for the transition should take into account the initial economic situation. If the economy is advancing too rapidly when peace comes, the restrictive effect of demobilization should not be entirely offset. If the economy is initially sluggish, the adjustment of stabilization policies should more than compensate for the impact of demobilization.

Types of Compensatory Action

In the event of a rapid demobilization, the required policy adjustment may be large. This extraordinary "dividend" would be fully available to provide for "controllable" expenditures or tax reductions, unlike the normal fiscal dividend from growing tax revenues which must, in part, finance the built-in growth of Federal expenditures. The various types of action which might be undertaken should be considered in advance.

1. If the cessation of hostilities occurs while the income tax surcharge is still in effect, its early expiration (or phasing out) could provide a major element in the required fiscal offset. Acceleration of the currently scheduled reductions in excise taxes on automobiles and telephone service could serve as another element in the fiscal adjustment.

2. There should be available, for the President's consideration, a program of accelerated expenditures that could be initiated on short notice following the cessation of hostilities. These should be confined to high-priority public expenditures which, in any event, would be made in the near future. It is currently estimated that such a program could add to Federal expenditures (at annual rates) by as much as $3 billion in 6 months and $7.5 billion in 12 months following its activation.

3. Decisions on Federal expenditures, as part of the program of fiscal adjustment, should be made in light of the promptness with which various types of outlays will add to total demand. For example, according to our staff studies, some—although not all—Federal grant programs to States and localities involve a significant lag between the expenditure of the funds by the Federal Government and their translation into additional purchases by the recipients. Programs with long lags are not ideal for supporting demand during the transition. In contrast, other Federal programs generate orders or contracts to the private sector which would increase employment and economic activity promptly even before expenditures are incurred by the Federal Government.

4. While the precise assignment of responsibilities between fiscal and monetary policies should be made in full light of the circumstances associated with peace, monetary policy should be expected to play a supportive role to the fiscal program. Credit policies can undoubtedly help significantly to ensure an adequate supply of mortgage credit to meet the needs for additional housing. But placing a heavy readjustment burden on monetary policy would be inadvisable; it probably should not shift toward extreme ease to provide a maximum economic stimulant. For one thing, balance-of-payments considerations are likely to limit, to some degree, the easing of credit. Also, the flexibility inherent in monetary policy makes it a useful instrument to hold in reserve as a means of compensating for deficiencies or excesses that might develop in the fiscal program or for unforeseen developments in private demand.

5. In general, fiscal policy adjustments during the transition should advance longer range national objectives. One basic choice will concern the relative importance in the fiscal program of tax reduction and of increased Federal expenditures. This decision should not be governed by considerations of economic stabilization; various mixes of increased spending and reduced taxes can be equally satisfactory from that standpoint. Rather the choice should depend upon the extent to which the Nation wishes to channel resources from defense uses into the other areas of the public sector. Given the allocation between tax cuts and increased civilian programs, further choices will be required to set priorities among various existing programs and possible new programs. These priorities should be established in advance.

6. In the event that the Administration plans to initiate, during the transition, any new programs which would require major legislation, such legislation might be submitted to the Congress in the near future for discussion and debate and perhaps even for enactment on a standby basis. Thus these programs could be ready when needed.

Other Objectives

In addition to the objective of steady and sustainable growth at high employment, policies during the transition should be directed at the price performance of the economy and the balance of payments.

1. During the transition period, efforts should be redoubled to combat the troublesome inflationary tendencies of a high-employment economy. The efforts could include various measures which have been explored recently by the Cabinet Committee on Price Stability: to strengthen manpower programs, to improve the price performance of particularly troublesome sectors such as construction and medical care, to increase the efficiency of the private economy generally, to minimize any inflationary effects of the Federal Government's own activities, and to achieve, through cooperative efforts, patterns of collective bargaining and of business price determination that are consistent with over-all price stability.

2. Intensive efforts should be made to take full advantage of the opportunities that peace may bring for improvement in the U.S. balance of payments. The direct foreign exchange cost of our military presence in Southeast Asia is now about $1.6 billion a year higher than in 1965. Reduction in this outflow could be reinforced by other measures to yield a more comprehensive solution to our lingering international payments problem.

RESOURCES AND PRIORITIES

Many of the choices that will have to be made during transition should be guided by a longer range view. To build the best bridge to peacetime prosperity, we should know in advance where we want to go when we cross that bridge. The following projections are intended to provide an indication of the resources that will become available in the next few years, and to serve as an aid in making critical choices about the uses of these resources.

The projections are focused on fiscal 1972. They are based on the assumption that the transition will be essentially completed by that time, an assumption that is reasonably consistent with the demobilization scenario if a truce occurs during calendar 1969.

Projections of the private economy

Underlying the post-demobilization outlook are some fairly detailed economic projections prepared by our staff. While the projections are surely not to be regarded as precise forecasts of economic conditions, they provide useful rough indications, on the basis of reasonable assumptions, of what the economic situation might be.

The economic framework was based on an unemployment rate of 3.8 percent and an over-all rate of price increase which gradually declines to about 2 percent a year by 1972. These assumptions represent neither a forecast nor a judgment that these rates will necessarily be feasible or appropriate. Lower unemployment would result in a higher GNP and increased budgetary resources. Greater price stability would also be highly desirable. What combination of price stability and high employment will prove feasible depends upon the success of measures to help reconcile these two objectives.

The time-path of real GNP was estimated, using labor force, employment, and productivity projections supplied by the Bureau of Labor Statistics. On the basis of the projected path of the over-all price index of GNP, the estimated GNP (in current dollars) for fiscal 1972 is $1,100 billion (Table 1).

TABLE 1.—ILLUSTRATIVE PROJECTIONS FOR FISCAL YEAR 1972 AND RECENT EXPERIENCE

[Billions of dollars]

Item	Calendar year 1968, second half [1]	Fiscal year 1972 projected
Gross national product	879	1,100
Federal receipts	185	226
Federal expenditures and dividend	186	222
Baseline expenditures	186	200
Defense purchases	80	73
Other expenditures	106	127
Peace-and-growth dividend		22
Federal surplus or deficit (—)	—1	4

[1] Seasonally adjusted annual rates; preliminary.

Note.—Federal receipts, expenditures, and surplus or deficit are the concepts used in the Federal Government sector of the national income and product accounts.

Detail will not necessarily add to totals because of rounding.

Sources: Department of Commerce and Council of Economic Advisers.

This GNP estimate served as the basis for projecting anticipated Federal revenue in 1972, in line with the assumed growth of incomes. Projected revenues are augmented by scheduled increases in social security taxes, and reduced by the assumed expiration of the current 10 percent income tax surcharge and of excise taxes on telephone service and automobiles. The net result of these calculations is an estimate of Federal receipts in fiscal 1972 of $226 billion.

Next the various components of private demand were projected, allowing for the effect of tax payments on private incomes and assuming that the indicated GNP was in fact achieved. Specific allowances for the impact of the Housing Act of 1968 were incorporated into the projection of residential construction activity. Additional estimates were also made for anticipated State and local government expenditures.

Baseline Federal expenditures

A baseline level of Federal expenditures was then projected.

Defense

Baseline defense expenditures for fiscal 1972 are calculated on the assumption that non-Vietnam programs now funded or approved will be carried out on schedule with no stretchout or cancellation. No allowance is made for possible *new* defense programs. These baseline defense expenditures are consistent with the demobilization scenario outlined earlier. The estimate for defense purchases is $73 billion in fiscal 1972, compared to $80 billion in the second half of calendar 1968. The $7 billion decline is the result of the reduction in spending associated with Vietnam (which amounts to $19 billion at 1968 prices), offset in part by allowances for higher pay scales, some upcreep in prices paid for defense items, and program adjustments following the end of the war.

In constant prices, the baseline estimate for fiscal 1972 is nearly 20 percent below current *real* defense outlays. Compared with the pre-Vietnam average level of 1960–64, *real* baseline expenditures for fiscal year 1972 are roughly 15 percent higher. The calculations of cost increases are necessarily imprecise because the character of defense equipment and programs change markedly over time. After 1972, baseline defense expenditures would move up slowly, mainly to keep pace with rising costs.

Nondefense

Baseline Federal nondefense expenditures rise over time for several reasons. Some gradual increases must be expected in the prices of the things the Government buys, and the pay of civilian Government employees must be raised about in pace with wages and salaries elsewhere. More veterans become eligible for pensions; more Government employees qualify for retirement benefits; a growing population increases the workload of many Government agencies, such as the Post Office Department and the National Park Service; and so on. Social security benefits rise even with an unchanged benefit formula, as more persons become eligible for benefits and as the average past income of applicants rises. As a result, baseline nondefense expenditures will rise nearly $7 billion per year to reach $127 billion in fiscal 1972.

The peace-and-growth dividend

The peace-and-growth dividend may be defined as the additional total demand—over and above normal private demand and baseline Federal expenditures—needed to achieve the specified GNP target. Estimated total demand for goods and services—including that in the baseline Federal budget—adds up to $1,078 billion for fiscal 1972. The difference of $22 billion between the target GNP of $1,100 billion and estimated total demand is the peace-and-growth dividend. It represents the additional total demand that would have to be forthcoming to achieve the GNP target.

For the years following 1972, the annual peace-and-growth dividend may be expected to grow $7 or $8 billion a year, as annual Federal revenues expand by roughly $15 billion and baseline expenditures absorb about half of that growth.

The peace-and-growth dividend can be viewed in another way. Between now and fiscal 1972, the $19 billion decline in defense expenditures resulting from peace in combination with normal revenue growth provides sufficient Federal budgetary resources to cover built-in defense and nondefense commitments, to permit removal of the surcharge, and to allow for a further $22 billion addition to total demand through expansionary policy actions.

The peace-and-growth dividend is thus a rough measure of the resources available for expansionary action. A dollar of this dividend may be "used up" either by a dollar of increased Federal purchases or by a dollar of additional private purchases. The latter could be induced by a reduction in taxes, an increase in Federal transfer payments, or an easing of monetary policy.

An increase in transfer payments or a reduction in taxes of one dollar will generally not increase private spending by a full dollar; to the extent that these instruments are used, the total expansionary fiscal action can be somewhat greater than the peace-and-growth dividend.

The projections implicity assume certain monetary conditions and interest rates. The appropriate Federal Reserve policy may be either more restrictive or more stimulative than assumed, thus affecting fiscal policy requirements.

The appropriated budget deficit or surplus in any given year is determined by the fiscal action needed to support private demand in light of monetary conditions. The above calculations imply a $4 billion surplus (national income accounts basis) in fiscal 1972. Private demand may be either weaker or stronger than assumed, thereby calling for a different budgetary policy. If private demand is weaker, smaller surpluses (or possibly deficits) will be needed, and the peace-and-growth dividend in fiscal 1972 will be larger than $22 billion. Conversely, if private demand is stronger, larger surpluses will be needed and the dividend will be smaller.

Alternative uses of the dividend

The peace-and-growth dividend *must* be used in some fashion if the growth and employment targets are to be achieved. And it surely can be used productively by strengthening valuable Federal programs, enacting tax reduction, and easing monetary policy. Indeed, the problem will be to choose among many worthy alternatives.

There is no limit to the portion of the peace-and-growth dividend that could, in principle, take the form of a lighter tax burden on individuals and businesses. This use of the dividend would contribute effectively to achieving the growth and employment targets. Our national experience from 1962 to 1965 demonstrates the effectiveness of the stimulus from a markedly lightened Federal tax burden. But the use of the dividend to reduce Federal taxes must compete with compelling needs for strengthened and new public expenditure programs. The ultimate national decisions on priorities must focus on the allocation of the dividend between these two basic routes.

Some of the possible increases in Federal expenditures are spelled out below. Two areas of expenditure that would appear to have a significant claim are: increases in benefits needed to maintain standards under social security and related Federal programs, and the full funding of existing programs which are currently operating below authorized levels.

Maintain Standards Under Cash Benefit Programs

The baseline expenditure projections allow for growth in social security and other transfer benefits resulting from an increased *number* of recipients and an increase in the *lifetime earnings* of recipients under the present benefit formula. But they make no allowance for statutory liberalization of benefit formulas under Old Age and Survivor's Insurance, unemployment insurance, Federal retirement, railroad retirement, veterans benefits, and public assistance programs. If, in fact, there were no legislative liberalization, social insurance trust funds would accumulate a substantial surplus, while benefits would shrink in terms of purchasing power. A legislated increase of $4 billion by fiscal 1972 in these benefit formulas would ensure that benefits at least keep pace with assumed increases in the cost of living.

Full Funding of Existing Programs

Several Federal programs, particularly ones adopted recently, are operating below levels authorized by the Congress. To fund these programs fully, thus making appropriations match authorizations, would cost about $6 billion a year as distributed in Table 2. These programs are already making important contributions to the solution of major social and environmental problems, and increasing their appropriations to authorized levels would probably command high priority. Nevertheless, in establishing priorities, the relative value of each of these programs should be weighed against those of new or expanded programs and of tax reduction.

TABLE 2.—*Estimated gap between amounts currently authorized and funded*

[In billions of dollars per year]

Total full cost	6.0
Elementary and secondary education	2.0
Higher education	1.3
Housing and community development	.6
Water and air pollution control	.5
Crime control and prevention	.2
Area redevelopment	.5
Health training and research, etc	.4
Agricultural conservation and adjustment	.5

Source: Bureau of the Budget.

New Efforts in Civilian Programs

A variety of new efforts—entirely new programs or major expansions of existing civilian programs—are also eligible claimants for a share of the peace-and-growth dividend. A review of recent recommendations by task forces or study groups indicates the possible desirability of new domestic programs in the fields of education, health, job and manpower training, social insurance, welfare, urban development, crime prevention, air and water pollution control, natural resource development, transportation, space technology, and science.

Table 3 contains a list of programs that have been prominently and generally discussed recently as desirable to meet the needs of the Nation during the next several years. The table is presented for illustrative purposes only and does not indicate any program priorities. It sets forth quantitative estimates of the expenditures that might take place in each of these programs during fiscal 1972. In many instances, the dollar amounts shown in the table are considerably below the recommendations of recent task forces or study groups. By many standards, the list is incomplete and inadequate. Yet, it totals $40 billion—nearly double the entire estimated peace-and-growth dividend for that year. The clear lesson emerging from this table—and the reason for its inclusion in this report—is that some very difficult choices will have to be made.

New Defense Programs

Depending upon international developments affecting our national security and upon technological changes in weapon systems, added expenditures on new defense programs may be needed. If these are essential to our national security, they must be given a top priority claim on the peace-and-growth dividend. At the same time, it is clear that the possibilities for expansion in the defense area are virtually unlimited, and that utmost efficiency will continue to be needed in budgeting for defense. For illustrative purposes, the staff of the Department of Defense has assembled a package of $6½ billion (annual rate) of expenditures on new DOD programs which may come up for consideration in the next few years. The major elements in the package are expenditures of $2 billion for aircraft development and modernization in connection with major new programs, $0.8 billion for the construction of defense installations and family housing projects, $0.7 billion for shipbuilding and modernization of naval forces, and $2 billion for advanced strategic and general purpose weapon systems.

Major New Initiatives

The proposals listed in Table 3 essentially expand or build upon existing programs. More elaborate proposals have also been advanced as alternatives to this piecemeal approach.

A comprehensive income maintenance plan, such as the "negative income tax," has been widely discussed as a simple and equitable device to assist the poor. A negative income tax that succeeded in making major inroads on poverty while preserving work incentives might cost as much as $15 to $20 billion a year. Such a program would protect people against the ravages of poverty, but it would still need to be reinforced by efforts in housing, health, education, and job training aimed at the long-run sources and causes of poverty.

TABLE 3.—*Illustrative new programs or major expansions of existing Federal civilian programs, fiscal year 1972 (derived from proposals of task forces and study groups)*

[In millions of dollars]

Total expenditures	39.7
Education	7.0
Preschool	1.0
Elementary and secondary	2.5
Higher	3.0
Vocational	.5
Health	3.8
Kiddie-care	.5
Medicare for disabled	1.8
Comprehensive health centers	1.0
Hospital construction and modernization	.5
Nutrition	1.0
Community service programs	.8
Jobs and manpower	2.5
Public jobs	1.8
Manpower Development Training Act	.5
Employment service	.2
Social security and income support	9.5
Unemployment insurance	2.0
Public assistance	4.0
Social security improvements	3.5
Veterans	.3
Economic, area, and other special development programs	2.2
Entrepreneurial aid	.5
Area redevelopment	.5
Rural development	1.0
Indian assistance	.2
Crime, delinquency, and riots	1.0
Violence and riot prevention	.1
Safe streets programs	.3
Rehabilitation of offenders and delinquents	.3
Prevention of delinquency and crime by special measures for delinquency-prone youth	.3
Quality of environment	1.7
Air pollution prevention and control	.1
Public water supply construction programs	.3
Water pollution control and sewage treatment	1.0
Solid waste disposal	.1
Natural beautification, envrionmental protection, and recreational development	.2
Natural resource development and utilization	1.4
Land and forest conservation	.2
Water resources and related programs	.5
Mineral and energy (excluding hydroelectric) development	.2
Natural environmental development	.5
Urban development	5.5
New cities	.5
Land acquisition and financial planning (suburban)	.5
Urban mass transportation	.5
Model cities	2.0
Other urban facilities and renewal	2.0
Transportation	1.0
Airway and airport modernization	.4
Rapid interurban ground transit	.1
Modernization of merchant marine	.2
Motor vehicle and transportation safety research and safety grants	.3
Science and space exploration	1.0
Post-Apollo space program	.5
Scientific research in oceanography, communications, social and behavioral sciences, and natural sciences	.5
Foreign economic aid	1.0

NOTES

Education. The preschool program, an extension of Head Start, would provide full-time preschool education for about 500,000 children. The elementary and secondary education funds would about double the Federal support in that area. The funds proposed for higher education would more than double current Federal support. The vocational education funds would raise Federal support about halfway toward the recommendation of the 1968 Advisory Council on Vocational Education.

Health. The "kiddie-care" proposal would provide health care for needy mothers and infants. Medicare offered to beneficiaries of social security disability insurance on a contributory basis would potentially reach 2.2 million persons in 1972. About 350 additional comprehensive neighborhood health care centers a year could be established for the amount shown. The added funds for health facilities would enable the Federal Government to double the rate of output of such facilities, in line with estimates of national needs.

Nutrition. Nutritional supplements for needy pregnant women, nursing mothers, and small infants account for about $200 million, while the remainder would allow a doubling of existing food assistance programs.

Community service programs. This would provide for expanded daycare centers for children of needy working mothers and for expansion of coordinated services through neighborhood centers.

Jobs and manpower. The funds for jobs in the public sector would permit expansion of about 500,000 jobs to provide public service employment for the chronically disadvantaged; this program would reinforce expansion in education, health services, and urban and area redevelopment. The increase in MDTA training would support expansion of the JOBS program and would reinforce efforts to lower unemployment while improving the Nation's price performance. It would also provide trained manpower for construction. The growth in employment service operations envisions strengthening, decentralizing, and computerizing manpower activities; developing a rural manpower service; and enlarging services to the disadvantaged.

Social security and income support. The unemployment insurance funds would provide for higher benefits, extended benefits during recessions, and aid to the unemployed through retraining and mobility assistance. The public assistance funds could permit revision of benefit standards and extended coverage, or the adoption of a modest new program of income aid with objective standards. The added expenditure could fill as much as 40 percent of the current poverty income gap. Expansion of the WIN program would provide more job and training opportunities for welfare recipients. The social security expenditure could provide a higher minimum benefit for those dependent on social insurance benefits as the main source of income, and liberalization of eligibility requirements for disability insurance, as well as some general improvement in benefit levels.

Veterans. The higher priority recommendations made by the Veterans' Advisory Commission in March 1968 could be instituted with these funds.

Economic, area, and other special development programs. The entrepreneurial assistance program could help minority groups—so-called "black capitalism." Area redevelopment programs would assist growth centers in less populated areas, while rural redevelopment programs would concentrate on small communities, providing community facility development, special housing, and family farm assistance.

Crime, delinquency, and riots. Federal aid to State and local governments could be provided to help prevent violence and riots and permit a higher degree of Federal readiness to cope with such emergencies. The safe streets program funds would be used to work towards the objectives of the National Crime Commission with respect to strengthening the police and courts. Rehabilitation of offenders and delinquents would be pursued by intensive retraining and other services.

Quality of environment. Federal funds for pollution abatement may be required to enforce standards, investigate claims, or abate pollution caused by government or not readily attributable to particular private individuals. Assistance in expanding the Nation's water supply system would provide a small fraction of the $2.5 billion annual requirement over the next 10 years. Provision of more recreational areas near population centers would be made possible.

Natural resource development and utilization. Department of the Interior, Corps of Engineers, and Department of Agriculture programs relating to land, mineral, energy, forest, recreational, and other fields have large backlogs of useful projects, many already planned and authorized but held back for budgetary reasons.

Urban development. Metropolitan development assistance would support improved planning and coordinated advance land acquisition. Each of the programs emphasizes these requirements, whether in new communities, suburbs, or older central cities. The allowances represent only a fractional contribution to the reconstruction and development of the cities.

Transportation. Such expanded investments in the improvement of the principal elements of the Nation's transportation system would serve the objectives of economic development, safety, and national defense.

Science and space exploration. The allowances would permit the science and space agenices to fund some of the research opportunities not covered in the stringent budgets of recent years.

Foreign economic aid. This additional amount would help to meet growth targets in Southeast Asia and under the Alliance for Progress as well as to cover other aid requirements. Even this increase would leave our foreign assistance program below levels of a few years back.

Source: Bureau of the Budget.

An alternative major program initiative would provide guaranteed employment opportunities for persons willing and able to work but unable to find jobs. Depending on eligibility criteria and the techniques of implementation, such a program might cost $2 to $10 billion a year.

Another area of mounting public concern is the financial pressure on State and local governments. As a means of reducing the relative importance of the more onerous State and local taxes, the Federal Government might adopt some general scheme of revenue sharing—such as a return of some personal tax revenues to the States (or localities) or a Federal tax credit for State income taxes. Some suggested plans would cost $5 to $10 billion a year. A specific but more limited proposal along these lines would be the establishment of a trust fund to finance a generalized Model Cities program.

Another major proposal that has much support is the establishment of an Urban Development Bank, which would raise its funds in the private capital market. This institution would lend to State and local governments at reduced cost, thereby relieving the pressure on the market for tax-exempt securities. It would place only a minimal burden on the Federal budget since the interest subsidies would be offset, at least in part, by increased Treasury receipts from reduced use of the tax exemption. But the charge against national resources—and therefore against the peace-and-growth dividend—would be substantial, depending upon the extent to which the Bank finances projects that would not otherwise have been undertaken.

There have also been proposals for replacing the present military draft with a more equitable and efficient method of obtaining the manpower needed for national defense. One such proposal, which might cost $5 to $10 billion a year, would be the adoption of a fully volunteer army. Another would be the establishment of a National Service Corps, in which every young person would be expected to give at least 2 years of service to the Nation either as a member of the Armed Forces or in a civilian assignment that would contribute to the solution of important national problems.

Conclusion

The problems of poverty, human resource development, and the pressing need to improve our physical environment will impose very heavy demands on the Federal budget in the years ahead. The end of the struggle in Vietnam, together with increased tax revenues resulting from economic growth, will make a sizable volume of real resources available to deal with these problems. But, for years and years ahead, the peace-and-growth dividend is dwarfed by the magnitude of the needs. Difficult choices must be made—choices between increased expenditures and tax reductions, between defense spending and nondefense programs, and among competing civilian programs. The above calculations allow for tax reduction from present rate levels through the expiration of the 10 percent surcharge and certain excise taxes. These funds would permit the private sector to engage in extra private consumption or investment above the normal growth of private demand. But in view of the vast and urgent needs for services that can best be supplied through the public sector, we would not recommend further large-scale Federal tax reductions in the years immediately following the end of Vietnam hostilities.

POLICIES TO ASSIST PARTICULAR COMMUNITIES AND INDIVIDUALS

Demobilization will require some shifts in employment patterns—from the Armed Forces to civilian jobs, from defense industries to those producing civilian goods and services, and from one community or area to another. Shifts in the composition of activity will not be new or unusual. They are a regular feature of the highly mobile and dynamic U.S. economy. As technology and the pattern of demand evolve, the free choices of businesses, workers, and consumers operate through markets to shift resources among industries and geographic areas. These movements are largely self-adjusting and do not usually pose major problems either to workers or communities. When support is needed, various Federal agencies stand ready to assist through community development activities, job information and manpower training. The Office of Economic Adjustment in the Department of Defense has been dealing since 1961 with the specific economic impact associated with closings of defense installations and other major changes in military outlays.

The experience of these activities provides a guide for policies to assist in the adjustment problems of those communities and individuals likely to be severely affected by demobilization. Measures to assist in specific adjustments can complement fiscal-monetary policy in producing a smooth, non-inflationary transition.

The magnitude of the readjustment

Under the particularly rapid demobilization scenario assumed above, an estimated 600,000 persons would be added to the private labor force during the six quarters following the truce. In addition, as many as 750,000 civilian employees could be required to shift jobs as defense purchases from private businesses decline. Altogether, an additional 1.3 million workers may seek new civilian employment over a period of six quarters—an average of about 75,000 job shifts a month over and above those normally taking place. The shifts would be unevenly spaced during the period and might exceed 100,000 in some months.

This is a significant—but not enormous—addition to the normal amount of job shifting. To provide perspective, in 1966–67 the average number of layoffs per month in manufacturing alone was about 250,000, and voluntary separations averaged about 470,000 a month, while manufacturing workers were hired at an average monthly rate of 730,000 in 1966 and 640,000 in 1967. While no comparable data exist for nonmanufacturing sectors, layoffs and hirings for the total economy must be far larger.

The figures indicate the dynamism and the normal adaptations of the labor market. While specific problems of dislocation in certain areas will occur, the figures do indicate that the magnitude of the demobilization problem should be manageable if fiscal-monetary policies ensure that overall demand remains strong.

Particular measures to facilitate the structural transitions of demobilization should include community redevelopment assistance, homeowner assistance, and, most importantly, the strengthening of job placement and job training. Efficient planning and implementation of these measures will require the establishment of a coordinating committee.

Readjustment operations committee

A Readjustment Operations Committee should be established in the near future to assume responsibility for detailed planning of Federal readjustment assistance and to work closely with State and local authorities. The Committee should include the Secretaries of Defense, Commerce, and Labor; the Director of the Bureau of the Budget; the Chairman of the Council of Economic Advisers; and the Director of the Office of Emergency Preparedness.

Prior to demobilization, the Committee should be responsible for:

1. Planning for demobilization, including frequent updating of the estimated expenditures required for adjustment assistance,

2. Undertaking and supporting research on characteristics of individual communities likely to require special readjustment assistance and in particular developing a system of "early warning,"

3. Providing technical advice and information for State and local government demobilization planning authorities, and

4. Coordinating an inventory by the Departments of Defense, Commerce, and Labor of the skills and training of defense industry workers and armed services personnel, and of the skill requirements of potential sources of employment in defense-dependent areas.

During the demobilization period, the Readjustment Operations Committee should be responsible for: (1) Coordinating Federal assistance programs to communities and individuals with severe readjustment problems, (2) Identifying areas experiencing, or likely to experience, high unemployment during demobilization, through advance notification by the Department of Defense of impending contract cancellations and military base closings, and through a careful monitoring of economic developments in key areas by the Departments of Labor and Commerce, and (3) Determining, in cooperation with State and local governments, the appropriate size and mix of Federal assistance programs, and recommending specific programs and budget allocations for dealing with the problems of severely disrupted areas.

Funding readjustment programs

The activities to assist a smooth transition will rely mainly on existing programs designed to aid communities faced with structural adjustments or to help workers gain new skills. How much these programs must be expanded will depend upon many factors which cannot be estimated precisely, but the approximate initial size of the programs is shown in Table 4.

TABLE 4.—ESTIMATED 1ST-YEAR COST OF READJUSTMENT PROGRAMS

[Millions of dollars]

Program	Estimated 1st-year cost: Low	Estimated 1st-year cost: High
Total cost	120	288
EDA community development assistance	20	50
SBA loans	5	10
HUD homeowner emergency loans	1	3
MDTA training	53	140
Employment service	7	20
Relocation assistance	4	15
Veterans assistance	30	50

Note.—Abbreviations used in this table represent the following: EDA (Economic Development Administration), SBA (Small Business Administration), HUD (Department of Housing and Urban Development), and MDTA (Manpower Development and Training Act).

Source: Bureau of the Budget.

Once hostilities cease or prospects for demobilization appear, supplemental appropriations for readjustment purposes should be sought promptly. All expenditures from special appropriations should be coordinated by the Readjustment Opreations Committee.

When demobilization plans are definitely known, more exact program expenditures should be determined by the Readjustment Operations Committee. Initial appropriations should be at the low end of the estimated range with the understanding that additional funds may be needed. These program supplements should be reserved for uses directly related to the post-Vietnam transition. In addition, funds should be requested to provide returning servicemen with veterans benefits under existing programs and to assist State unemployment insurance programs in cases of high localized unemployment.

Even before demobilization, important permanent improvements should be made in some existing institutions to make them more effective both in the transition to peace and in the long run. The Unemployment Insurance program should be strengthened by increasing coverage, raising benefits, lengthening the possible duration of payments, and improving the financial base of the system.

And minimum standards of vesting of private pension plans should be established, so that as the economy shifts to a peacetime footing, workers can change jobs without losing their benefits.

Assisting defense-dependent areas

One major measure to be coordinated by the Readjustment Operations Committee is Federal assistance for communities that will experience a major decline in employment opportunities due to the closing or curtailment of a defense plant or military base. The possible scope of this task is suggested by the growth in defense employment during the buildup for Vietnam. From 1965 to 1967, 38 local areas experienced increases in defense employment exceeding 5 percent of their total work force. A few of these localities are moderately large metropolitan areas, but some are predominantly rural counties with no urban center exceeding 12,000 population; these rural areas may be especially vulnerable to defense cutbacks during demobilization.

The Federal Government can assist severely affected communities with redevelopment potential to reorient their economies through programs of the Economic Development Administration and the Small Business Administration. Initial-year funds required for these specific purposes might range from $20 to $50 million for the Economic Development Administration and from $5 to $10 million for the Small Business Administration.

These agencies would help defense-dependent communities modernize public facilities, develop industrial sites, convert defense installations to other uses, and otherwise make themselves attractive to new industry.

Assisting displaced individuals

While most of the individuals who lose defense jobs or who are released from military service will be readily employable, some will not possess the required skills, while others will be geographically isolated from job opportunities. Federal programs should be undertaken to ease the impact of demobilization upon the most seriously affected individuals.

Strengthening the Federal Employment Service

Demobilization will greatly enlarge demands on the resources of the Federal-State Employment Service. Prior to demobilization, plans should be made for expanding the staff of the Employment Services offices: to ensure their capacity for handling veterans and laid-off defense workers, to improve the flow of information about job opportunities outside the local labor market, and to station staff temporarily at locations convenient to military personnel about to be discharged. The employment Service may require $7 to $20 million in the first year to provide these activities.

Expanding Manpower Training

Some individuals dislocated from defense employment will need retraining. The preliminary estimate is that $53 million will be needed to prepare about 26,000 servicemen for civilian employment through Project Transition and to train about 20,000 enrollees in other MDTA programs. Further appropriations of up to $140 million may be required for the two programs.

Providing Relocation Assistance

A relocation assistance fund should be established to help low-and middle-income workers move out of defense-dependent communities with inadequate reemployment opportunities. The programs should be administered by the Department of Labor, which should develop general policy on relocation assistance—including eligibility criteria—in cooperation with the Readjustment Operations Committee. The program should provide full grant assistance for workers taking low-income jobs, and a mix of loans and grants for those obtaining higher paying jobs.

Relocation assistance should be available only to individuals directly affected by cutbacks in specified defense-dependent communities. The number assisted could range between 10,000 and 30,000 families, requiring expenditures between $4 and $15 million.

Funding Veterans Assistance

Current programs available to veterans are generally adequate to cover the needs of returning servicemen; however, the accelerated separations associated with demobilization will require additional appropriations for these programs—especially employment consultation services and the educational assistance program. Adequate financing of veterans programs may cost $30 to $50 million a year during demobilization.

Providing Homeowner Assistance

The Federal Government should undertake to prevent a widespread loss of homes in areas suffering temporary unemployment during demobilization. The Department of Housing and Urban Development should establish a program to encourage private lenders to declare moratoria on mortgage payments on homes owned and occupied by individuals dislocated by a defense cutback. When an extension of mortgage payments cannot be obtained, the Department of Housing and Urban Development should be authorized to lend the homeowner funds at a reasonable interest rate to cover mortgage payments. Expenditures of about $2 million should be ample for this program.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. BINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to extend their remarks on the subject of my special order.

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

There was no objection.

PROPOSED AMENDMENT TO ADMINISTRATIVE PROCEDURE ACT

The SPEAKER. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. FEIGHAN) is recognized for 20 minutes.

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Speaker, I have introduced a bill—H.R. 1776—to amend the Administrative Procedure Act in order to fill a long-neglected void and greatly to improve the rulemaking process of Government agencies.

Fundamental to wise administrative rulemaking is the provision of an opportunity for the participation therein of persons whose interests may be affected.

This was recognized as a basic precept of the Administrative Procedure Act from the very inception of that seminal, vital legislation. Accordingly that act provides, in section 553, that Government agencies must give public notice of a proposed rule and afford an opportunity to interested persons to participate in the rulemaking process by submitting information and argument concerning the proposed rule. Such persons also are guaranteed the right to petition for the adoption, amendment, or repeal of rules.

Pursuant to that provision organized consumers, and business, commercial, and professional interests of our Nation have been able aggressively to participate in rulemaking. Through their own staffs or through attorneys or lobbyists retained for the purpose they are able systematically to scan the Federal Register for notices of proposed rules that may affect their interests and to present to Government agencies information and argument essential to wise government. The opportunity thus afforded these great interests is our most effective protection against arbitrary dictatorship by uninformed administrative agencies in our increasingly complex Government.

Yet, much rulemaking of our Federal departments, officials, and agencies has a direct impact on persons—notably the indigent—who are quite unable to maintain staffs or to retain lawyers or lobbyists to protect their interests.

For those masses there is no voice in the rulemaking process. For such rulemaking the basic precept of the Administrative Procedure Act has never been carried out.

That is the void that must be filled.

For those voiceless masses—the poor, the deprived, the underprivileged—a voice must be provided. Until that is done, the Administrative Procedure Act is but an imperfect guarantee of liberty. It protects only the strong.

There are numerous agencies whose actions directly affect the rights of the less fortunate members of our society. The Department of Health, Education, and Welfare promulgates regulations pertaining to the administration of public assistance programs. Regulations are myriad in this area and of critical interest to the poor. Included in the public assistance programs are aid to families with dependent children, old age assistance, aid to the totally and permanently disabled, and aid to the blind. There have been several recent examples of the Department issuing rules which vitally affect the indigent. For example, the Department has issued regulations pertaining to the use of declaration forms during the application process for public assistance, pertaining to the assistance of counsel at hearings including the suspension or termination of grants or the denial of an application, and pertaining to the provision of continued assistance during such time as a hearing before the State agency is pending. Last summer, HEW adopted a regulation prohibiting all States from including in their State plans certain types of "man-in-the-house" rules. This regulation was the result of the Supreme Court's ruling in King against Smith. Further, HEW has issued many regulations under the 1967 amendments to the Social Security Act, particularly with regard to the compulsory work program for public assistance recipients which was prescribed by Congress for mothers receiving benefits under the aid to families with dependent children.

Moreover, HEW is charged with the responsibility of promulgating regulations relating to the administration of the social security program, the medicare program, and the medicaid program. Finally, HEW produces school desegregation guidelines and rules for the administration of educational programs in special impact areas where the schools are in whole or in substantial part federally funded.

All of these programs are of critical interest to the poor; yet there is no one who is able to spend adequate time scrutinizing the numerous regulations which have been promulgated with respect to such programs.

Congress established a compulsory work-referral program for categorical assistance recipients in the 1967 amendments to the Social Security Act. The Department of Labor is presently in the process of preparing an elaborate set of regulations dealing with the implementation of this compulsory program. A number of issues critical to poor people are involved in these regulations. There are questions such as to what extent the Department of Labor will prescribe suitable standards for the types of jobs to which individuals are referred, to what extent the Department of Labor will establish satisfactory standards for hearings to determine whether a recipient has refused to accept employment for good cause, and to what extent the Department will establish satisfactory standards for the definition of good cause—refusal to accept a job. An advocate for the poor should be involved deeply in the regulations that have already been suggested in draft form.

The Department of Labor is responsible for adopting guidelines for the enforcement and coverage of the Fair Labor Standards Act, including compliance with Federal minimum wage requirements and overtime requirements. Labor also is responsible for adopting policies with respect to the Manpower Development and Training Act programs which have been funded in virtually every State of the Union for the training of the chronically unemployed.

Recently, the Department of Transportation proposed regulations relating to affording hearings to communities affected by design and location of federally-financed highways. These regulations providing hearings to individuals and groups affected by Federal highway construction, have been opposed by States, construction interests, and certain planners. Few spoke for the interests of the poor at the hearings on the proposed regulations held by the Department of Transportation. However, the neighborhood legal services program in Washington, D.C., made an attempt to protect the interests of the poor, even though they actually lacked the needed time and manpower to fully analyze the proposed regulations. They did prepare an exceedingly impressive letter to Lowell Bridwell, Federal Highway Administration of the Department of Transportation concerning the regulations. A representative of Neighborhood Legal Services also testified at the hearings on the regulations. I consider this an excellent example of the high quality effort on the part of legal aid that commonly could be expected as a result of enactment of H.R. 1776. Unfortunately, the limited budget and exceedingly busy workload do not permit participation in rulemaking on a regular basis.

The Department of Housing and Urban Development administers several programs that affect the poor. HUD establishes model cities standards, Federal Housing Act interpretations and rulings with regard to federally funded public housing across the country, and standards for designation of urban renewal areas, including policies relating to displacement of the poor from urban renewal areas. HUD is charged with administering section 221(d)(3) and rent supplement housing programs. These programs are designed to increase the supply of low-income housing which are purchased through federally insured mortgages of below market rate interest or to subsidize individuals who would be paying more than 25 percent of their income for rent. They have allegedly been stymied in their implementation by purportedly unrealistic criteria imposed by HUD as to "financial responsibility." Of a similar nature, Small Business Administration practices and regulations relating to loans to small businesses in marginal or ghetto communities could be analyzed by an advocate for the poor.

The Department of Agriculture promulgates regulations pertaining to the food stamp programs, and school lunch programs. Their rules have been the subject of criticism by advocates of the poor who allege that certain indexes for the price of food stamps in many rural areas seem unrelated to the family's average expenditures for food. Thus, the poor contend that many families cannot participate in the food stamp program because the price of food stamps is too high and exceeds what they would normally spend for food. Recent liberalizations of the rules have been made but it is necessary for a poor people's advocate to amass considerable empirical evidence to persuade the Department that its standards are still too rigid. Barely explored have been Department of Agriculture policies which affect sharecroppers and small farmers in the South. It has been asserted that Agriculture stabilization boards which at the local level perform Federal regulatory functions relating to the purchase of surplus commodities in Southern States are dominated by planter interests or by officials sympathetic to such interests. The plight of the impoverished small farmer in the South and his relation to Department of Agriculture policy concerning low interest loans to farmers' cooperatives and crop acreage limitations has barely been broadened.

The Office of Economic Opportunity formulates regulations relating to the eligibility for OEO funded programs and activities of community action program employees. OEO recently, for example, extended coverage of the Hatch Act to community action program employees. OEO has made significant changes with regard to the eligibility of program beneficiaries.

The Bureau of Indian Affairs engages in rulemaking which affects the American Indian—a group falling primarily within the range of the Nation's poor.

The Civil Service Commission is charged with a number of functions involving the poor. For instance, it is charged with developing flexible job descriptions in the civil service grades 1, 2, and 3, so that high school dropouts and other long-term or chronic unemployed might be able to perform useful tasks.

This list is not all inclusive, but it serves to show the variety of areas in which rules and decisions are commonly made by administrative agencies without participation of the poor—rules and decisions which directly affect their lives. I believe it is imperative that the indigent be given a voice in protecting their interest.

Accordingly the bill I have introduced, H.R. 1776, would amend the rulemaking section of the Administrative Procedure Act by directing the Attorney General to enter into contracts with, or to make grants subject to appropriate conditions to, the National Legal Aid and Defender Association—or such similar bodies as he may find appropriate from time to time—whereby such an organization with Federal funding to provide for the necessary staff and facilities, may participate in rulemaking on behalf of the poor in a way approximating the participation enjoyed by the great business and other organized interests of our society. Those interests, through their trade associations, their Washington offices, and otherwise, are, in very truth, a part of Government. And so they should be in a democracy. The time has come to assure that the poor man also becomes a part of Government.

In selecting the NLADA for special mention in my bill without excluding the possibility that the Attorney General might select other bodies also to supplement the NLADA's efforts—I have been mindful of the established position of that organization in our national life. For a half century it has been diligent in protecting the rights of the poor. In the face, often, of great adversity it has remained true to its mission. The NLADA includes virtually all legal aid groups, which are traditionally controlled on a local level by a board of trustees composed of attorneys who are members of the local bar association and of local law firms. The NLADA's close ties with national organizations of the bar and its cordial support from many segments of our people give assurance that it can be depended on to assume this additional role with the distinction and the vigor that have characterized so notably its great service to the poor of our Nation for many decades in the past.

I have considered, before introducing this bill, whether it is not possible to depend upon private contributions to provide the requisite funds to the National Legal Aid and Defender Association. But that simply is not feasible. Commendably, private contributions from the bar and from corporate business pay for the present activities of the NLADA in its great legal aid work throughout the Nation. But increasingly the demands for legal aid strain its resources. Never could it secure the means, save from government itself, to carry out the vital function that it would have to serve in order to fill the void in our rulemaking process.

I have considered also the possibility that the void might be filled by some Government office. But no Government agency can provide the aggressive advocacy that is needed. What is needed are the initiative and the independence of a private body, dedicated solely to the interests of the poor. No Government bureau can do the job as efficiently and with the freedom that is essential to courageous, persistent, singleminded devotion to the interests of the poor.

As a full-time employee of the U.S. Government, an agency is likely to become a captive of the bureaucracy, out of touch with the poor, docile, and ineffective.

Moreover, a basic precept of the American legal tradition is the adversary system. Certainly, it would be difficult for one branch of the Federal Establishment to vehemently assert itself against another branch.

The poor people would unquestionably lack sufficient confidence in a representative which is a part of the Government when these people are opposed to action by that very Government. The validity of this statement is particularly evident in the more militant segments of the society. The poor have traditionally had a basic distrust of the Government.

Finally, a Government agency would lack the freedom to innovate and experiment. This has been a constant problem with new programs.

The Administrative Conference of the United States, an independent Federal agency established in 1964 to develop improvements in the Federal administrative process, recently has recommended that a People's Counsel be authorized by statute as a quasi-private corporation modeled after the Public Broadcasting Corporation.

Such an organization would be slightly less objectionable than a Government agency; however, the preceding criticism would still be applicable.

The major advantage of the NLADA approach is its natural broad base for information gathering. Legal aid societies are abundant in each region of the country. They are members of the NLADA. Attorneys, social workers, and community workers employed by the various legal aid societies deal with the problems of the poor daily. It would be an easy matter for these individuals to relay the information to NLADA. Moreover, the local legal aid groups could supply the central office with additional information such as a weakness in Federal enforcement policy or violation of Federal standards in a local jurisdiction.

To establish a vast network for gathering the information requisite for adequately representing the poor, a Peoples' Counsel Corporation would be forced to set up subsidiary offices throughout the country in addition to a central office in Washington. NLADA already has this network. Moreover, NLADA member organiations have the staffs with expertise in the problems of the poor.

Legal aid societies frequently have law reform divisions. Information is funneled from the neighborhood attorneys, social workers, and community workers to the law reform staff. The law reform section eventually makes recommendations to cities, State legislatures, and the U.S. Congress on changes they deem are necessary in the law.

Enactment of H.R. 1776 would merely result in the enlargement of the law reform function presently conducted by the various legal aid groups on a local level. When a proposed rule appeared in the Federal Register, for instance, NLADA would elicit information from member legal aid programs. They, in turn, would contact the staff attorneys and other staff members who work with the poor directly.

It is also logical for the NLADA to represent the poor since, on a local level, generalized knowledge of the interest of the poor can best be determined from an evaluation of a great number of individual cases and problems. This is the inductive method of logic which is commonly recognized by science as the most desirable method of arriving at valid general propositions. The member organizations of NLADA function primarily on an ad hoc individual problem basis. Through the wide exposure of member groups in every poverty area of the country, in contact with local poverty groups NLADA is in a position to establish a general principle concerning the interest of the poor.

In permitting NLADA to represent the poor, one need not even discuss the question of whether it would be closely tied to and identified with the problems of the poor. NLADA has proven itself to be so already. Member organizations are well respected. The typical urban legal services program has contact with thousands of prospective clients each year. Local poverty area residents trust and depend on legal aid societies. Neighborhood offices established in poverty areas have become integral parts of the local community.

For these many reasons, I do not feel a Government or a quasi-private organization could represent the poor as adequately as the NLADA. NLADA and its member organizations already have the necessary diversified structure, a staff with great experience and expertise in the problems of the poor, the confidence of all segments of local communities, a proven ability to protect the poor, and a mechanism for gathering appropriate information reflecting all significant views. Consequently, I must conclude H.R. 1776 is the desired approach. It would indeed be an unfortunate occurrence if another bureaucracy were established to perform this vital function.

To some it might seem that my proposal is novel, even revolutionary. There are, I confess, elements in it of the revolutionary. It is as revolutionary as the spirit of '76.

Our Revolution of '76 was the product of attempted government without the participation of those whose interests were affected. It was an ill-advised King of England and a smug Parliament composed of the landed gentry and the rich merchants of Britain who sought to arrogate to themselves the right to tax the Colonies without affording those Colonies a voice in the decision. Their arrogance fired revolution from the yeomanry of Massachusetts to the planters of South Carolina. And our Nation was born.

May the fiery spirit of '76 never flag in our land. And may we who govern never be guilty of the blindness of those in London who sought to impose big brotherism in the Colonies.

The poor people came to Washington to make it clear that that spirit still inspires. When all is said, the essence of the poor peoples' campaign has been the simple assertion that they, the poor, will be heard in the councils of government. They, no less than the National Manufacturers Association, will play a part in the Government.

And they have the right to be heard.

But that right can be realized only if we heed, and provide the means and machinery to make their participation possible.

It was want of means and machinery that led Sam Adams and the people of Boston to take to the streets in the years before 1776 until Revolution came. Surely, we who inherit the blessings of that Revolution, have the wisdom to provide for the poor man's right to participate in the rulemaking of his Government today. Surely we have the wisdom, lacking in an indifferent British King and a shortsighted British Parliament, to understand that there is a better way than to compel people to take to the streets to voice their aspirations for a better life.

My bill would provide the better way.

FIGURES PROVE CONGRESS HAS BEEN GENEROUS WITH TAXPAYERS' MONEY

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

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, it is fashionable in some quarters to depict Congressmen as pinchpennies, skinflints, misers, scrooges, and tightwads, no matter how much money we authorize or appropriate for governmental programs. Whenever it is suggested that we show a bit of fiscal restraint and display a little financial responsibility, the cries of anguish from the ranks of the spenders would bring tears to the eyes of the stoniest-hearted nickel-nurser in all the land.

This afternoon I want to answer the people who have accused us of being parsimonious and callous. I have some interesting statistics that I am going to insert in the RECORD where all my colleagues can see them. These figures prove that we have been mighty generous with the taxpayers' money.

I have carefully studied the budget that President Johnson submitted shortly before he left office and find that the Federal Government is spending over $5 billion annually on education alone, not counting programs that the Veterans' Administration operates for the benefit of former servicemen.

These programs cover just about every conceivable type of education—prekindergarten, kindergarten, elementary, secondary, college and university, and postgraduate. They include, among other things, vocational education, bilingual education, cooperative education, public service education, consumer and homemaking education, adult education, and teacher education.

They provide funds for construction, remodeling, maintenance and operation, college housing, equipment, libraries, administration, planning, evaluation, guidance and counseling, testing, statistical surveys, scholarships and fellowships, research, curriculum development, educational broadcasting facilities, films, teacher recruitment, and interest payments.

Mr. Speaker, I am sure that a great deal of duplication and overlapping can be found in this field. If we are going to balance the budget for fiscal 1970, we must weed out such duplication and overlapping and save as many millions as possible. I am confident that substantial amounts can be saved without depriving anyone of the needed education.

The tabulation follows:

[In thousands]

	1968 actual	1969 estimate	1970 estimate
Department of Health, Education, and Welfare:			
Office of Education:			
Elementary and secondary education:			
Educationally deprived children	$1,186,873	$1,123,127	$1,226,000
Dropout prevention		5,000	24,000
Bilingual education		7,500	10,000
Supplementary educational services	182,810	164,876	172,876
Library resources	99,085	50,000	42,000
Guidance, counseling, and testing	24,460	17,000	12,000
Equipment and minor remodeling	77,883	78,740	
Strengthening State departments of education	29,457	29,750	29,750
Planning and evaluation			9,250
Total obligations	1,600,568	1,475,993	1,525,876
Higher education:			
Program assistance:			
Strengthening developing institutions	30,000	30,000	35,000
Colleges of agriculture and mechanic arts	11,950	19,191	12,120
Undergraduate instructional equipment and other resources	14,444	14,500	
Institutional sharing of resources			750
Improvement of graduate schools			750
Construction:			
Public community colleges and technical institutes	70,502	83,000	43,000
Other undergraduate facilities	203,478	133,464	87,000
Graduate facilities	33,000	25,577	20,000
Interest subsidization		3,920	10,670
State administration and planning	5,958	7,000	6,000
Administration	4,321	4,833	5,100
Student aid:			
Educational opportunity grants	131,413	133,787	175,600
Direct loans	181,772	193,400	161,900
Insured loans	39,924	71,200	111,187
Work-study programs	133,750	146,050	154,000
Cooperative education			1,000
Special programs for disadvantaged students	35,435	33,800	45,000
Personnel development:			
College teacher fellowships	86,275	70,000	61,469
Training programs	2,500	6,900	10,000
Public service education			3,000
Planning and evaluation			1,000
Total obligations	984,742	976,622	944,546
School assistance in federally affected areas:			
Maintenance and operation	486,355	505,900	300,000
Construction	15,660	74,051	15,167
Evaluation		200	
Total obligations	502,105	580,151	315,167
Vocational education:			
Basic grants	234,082	234,216	234,216
Consumer and homemaking education	14,000	14,000	15,000
Work study	9,998		
Cooperative education			14,000
Innovation			13,000
Curriculum development			2,000
Planning and evaluation			1,000
Total obligations	258,080	248,216	279,216
Libraries and community services:			
Library services	40,073	40,709	40,709
Construction of public libraries	26,997	24,099	9,185
College library resources	24,509	25,000	25,000
Acquisition and cataloging by Library of Congress	5,478	5,500	7,356
Librarian training	8,016	8,250	8,250
University community services	9,755	9,500	9,500
Adult basic education	38,634	45,000	50,000
Educational broadcasting facilities	------	4,184	5,625
Total obligations	153,462	162,242	155,625
Education professions development:			
Preschool, elementary, and secondary:			
Grants to States		15,000	15,000
Training programs	72,274	80,000	89,500
Encouragement of educational careers			500
Total obligations	72,275	95,000	105,000
Research and training:			
Research and development	73,565	74,976	68,800
Major demonstrations		1,000	5,250
Dissemination	2,846	4,226	7,200
Training	6,164	6,750	6,750
Construction	624	29,581	585
Statistical surveys	314	500	2,000
Total obligations	83,513	117,033	90,585
Department of Health, Education, and Welfare—Continued			
Office of Education—Continued			
Education for the handicapped:			
Preschool and school programs	$14,250	$29,250	$29,250
Early childhood programs		945	3,000
Teacher education and recruitment	24,320	30,250	30,500
Research and innovation	10,794	14,600	18,350
Media services and captioned films	2,796	4,750	4,750
Total obligations	52,160	79,795	85,850
Teacher Corps: Operations and training, total obligations	13,377	20,900	31,100
Education in foreign languages and world affairs:			
Centers, fellowships, and research	15,307	15,165	15,000
Fulbright-Hays training grants	2,706	3,000	3,000
International Education Act			2,000
Total obligations	18,013	18,165	20,000
Student loan insurance fund:			
Operating costs, funded: Loss on insured loans	11	1,656	12,730
Capital outlay, funded: Student loans purchased upon default by student borrowers	2	292	2,458
Change in selected resources			1,200
Total obligations	13	1,948	16,388
Civil rights education:			
Training for school personnel and grants to school boards	8,464	9,250	11,900
Technical services and administration	1,404	1,547	1,850
Total obligations	9,868	10,797	13,750
Higher educational facilities loan fund payment of participation sales insufficiencies:			
Commission on sales of participation certificates	181	48	
Interest on participation certificates	7,281	11,291	11,081
Interest expense to Treasury			645
Administrative expenses	6	5	5
Change in selected resources	39	−2	−2
Higher education construction: Loans to higher education institutions	65,244	78,861	77,963
Change in selected resources	81,187	−73,861	−77,963
Adjustment in selected resources (loan obligations)	1,198		
Total obligations	155,136	16,342	11,729
Promotion of Vocational Education Act, Feb. 23, 1917: Grants to States, total obligations	7,161	7,161	7,161
Research and training (special foreign currency program):			
Institutional development grants for training, research, and study	94	808	4,000
Research in foreign education	80	231	
Total program costs, funded—obligations (dollar equivalent)	174	1,039	4,000
Colleges for agriculture and the mechanic arts: Grants to States, total obligations	2,550	2,600	2,600
Salaries and expenses:			
Executive direction and administration	9,787	10,200	11,251
National Center for Educational Statistics	2,570	2,395	2,580
Elementary and secondary education	6,526	6,434	6,949
Adult, vocational, and library programs	3,841	4,833	4,916
Higher education	4,767	7,545	7,686
Research	3,959	3,932	3,990
Education of handicapped	1,273	2,094	2,342
Educational personnel development	2,417	3,371	3,661
Total obligations	35,140	40,804	43,375
Advances and reimbursements:			
College housing loan program (Housing and Urban Development)	25	26	26
Academic financial status of graduate students (National Science Foundation)	25		
Ryukyuan projects (Defense)	33	165	200
School shelter advisory services (Defense)	185	119	
Civil defense adult education (Defense)	4,137	3,000	3,000
Survey of research activities (National Science Foundation)	175		
Menominee Indians (Health Services and Mental Health Administration)	150	150	150
Followthrough program (Office of Economic Opportunity)	14,972		
Educational and information service research (National Science Foundation)	45		

[In thousands]

	1968 actual	1969 estimate	1970 estimate
Department of Health, Education, and Welfare—Continued			
Advances and reimbursements—Continued			
Neighborhood youth development:			
Public Health Service	$30		
Social Rehabilitation Service	30		
Office of Economic Opportunity	200		
Labor	250		
Children's television workshop:			
Office of Economic Opportunity	50	$300	$300
Public Health Service	15		
Medical care training (Public Health Service)	40		
Forest technology (Agriculture)	5		
Water and wastewater technology (Interior)	8		
Adolescent environments (Labor)	17		
Early childhood development (Office of Economic Opportunity)	175		
Consultative services to non-Federal agencies	140	150	150
Miscellaneous services to other agencies:			
Agency for International Development	1,520	1,935	1,935
Other	14	13	13
Total obligations	22,241	5,858	5,774
Social and Rehabilitation Service: Assistance to refugees in the United States: Education, total obligations	17,813	19,090	20,261
Special institutions:			
Howard University:			
Salaries and expenses:			
General administration	2,891	3,082	3,188
Resident instruction and departmental research	14,596	17,036	18,927
Organized research	3,161	4,000	4,000
University libraries	872	1,178	1,188
Operation and maintenance of physical plant	3,211	2,685	2,892
Auxiliary enterprises	3,133	2,973	2,973
Student aid	2,122	2,198	2,198
Construction:			
Site planning and development	636	337	20
Buildings		9,664	29,870
Total obligations	30,622	45,153	65,256
National Technical Institute for the Deaf:			
Salaries and expenses:			
Operations	376	1,520	3,170
Departmental administration	45	38	38
Construction:			
Planning, land acquisition, and site development		740	1,109
Construction of buildings			13,881
Total obligations	421	2,298	18,198
Gallaudet College:			
Salaries and expenses:			
General administration	900	1,071	1,202
Resident instruction and departmental research:			
Gallaudet College	1,487	1,863	2,130
Kendall School	308	397	545
Organized research	110	143	204
General library	168	194	203
Operation and maintenance of physical plant	699	809	874
Auxiliary services and noneducational expense	714	800	879
Student aid	133	133	133
Construction and related activities	867	1,669	838
Total obligations	5,386	7,079	7,008
Model Secondary School for the Deaf:			
Salaries and expenses:			
Administration and general planning	18	88	152
Development of instructional program	4	245	288
Rental of facilities			45
Construction: Planning, site development, buildings and facilities		100	971
Total obligations	22	433	1,456
American Printing House for the Blind: Educational materials, total obligations	1,150	1,265	1,329
Departmental management:			
Payments to the Corporation for Public Broadcasting, total obligations		5,000	20,000
Office of the General Counsel, salaries and expenses: Departmental program services: Education, total obligations	240	305	315
Advances and reimbursements:			
World Conference on Crises In Education	134		
Library services		75	85
Total obligations	134	75	85

	1968 actual	1969 estimate	1970 estimate
Funds appropriated to the President:			
Appalachian regional development programs: Vocational education facilities, total obligations	$11,879	$14,128	$25,000
Office of Economic Opportunity: Community action programs: Headstart and Headstart Follow through total obligations	323,719	341,933	369,178
Peace Corps, School partnership program, total obligations	321	432	432
Philippine education program:			
School building construction project	9,677		
Textbook projection project	2,564		
Cultural development fund project	3,500		
Assistance to secondary education project		6,154	
Projects being negotiated		2,837	
Total obligations	15,741	8,991	
Department of Defense (civil):			
Department of the Army: Ryukyu Islands, Army: Aid to the Ryukyuan economy: Contribution to the government of the Ryukyu Islands to stimulate a higher level of teachers' salaries, total obligations	1,000	4,153	6,000
The Panama Canal:			
Canal Zone Government:			
Operating expenses:			
Education	11,595	12,753	14,064
Library	260	269	273
Capital outlay, education:			
Improvements and replacements to educational facilities	721	636	397
Improvements to military elementary schools			500
Total obligations	12,576	13,658	15,234
Department of Housing and Urban Development:			
Renewal and housing assistance: College housing; college housing fund; capital outlay, direct loans:			
College housing loans, college service facilities, loans for housing of student nurses and interns	310,480	250,000	210,000
Changes in selected resources	−96,532	−40,000	−45,000
Total operating costs, funded	112,564	161,235	165,240
Total obligations	326,512	371,235	330,240
Limitation on administrative expenses, college housing loans: Payment to administrative operations fund, total obligations	2,275	2,263	1,100
Metropolitan development:			
Fellowships for city planning and urban studies:			
Fellowships grants (program costs, funded)	438	500	550
Change in selected resources	61		450
Total obligations	499	500	1,000
Department of the Interior: Public land management:			
Bureau of Indian Affairs:			
Education and welfare services: Educational assistance, facilities, and services, total obligations	89,559	98,161	113,038
Advances and reimbursements:			
Basic education and vocational training	470		
Indian education for the disadvantaged	8,907	9,000	9,000
Indian education, library service	142		
Indian education, supplementary centers	28		
Indian education, education for the handicapped	30		
Total obligations	9,577	9,000	9,000
Department of State, educational exchange:			
Mutual educational and cultural exchange activities:			
Exchange of persons	29,742	18,722	22,600
Special educational and cultural projects	603	682	1,185
Aid to American-sponsored schools abroad	2,053	1,600	2,000
Cultural presentations	1,575	1,200	1,000
Multilateral organizations activities	406	444	444
Program services	6,804	6,495	5,975
Administrative expenses	2,500	2,282	2,196
Total obligations	43,683	31,425	35,400
Center for Cultural and Technical Interchange Between East and West:			
Operating expenses	1,956	1,941	2,024
Scholarships and grants	3,264	3,319	3,319
Total obligations	5,220	5,260	5,343
International educational exchange activities (special foreign currency program): Exchange of persons, total obligations		1,033	
Educational exchange permanent appropriations: Educational exchange fund, payments by Finland, World War I debt, total obligations	363	377	377

[In thousands]

	1968 actual	1969 estimate	1970 estimate
Department of State, educational exchange—Continued			
Educational exchange trust funds:			
U.S. dollars advanced from foreign governments	$204	$250	$250
Contributions, educational and cultural exchange	58	60	60
Total obligations	263	310	310
Department of the Treasury, Bureau of Accounts: Grants to Eisenhower College, total obligations		2,000	2,000
National Science Foundation:			
Salaries and expenses:			
Support of scientific research:			
Scientific research project support	$170,615	$177,300	$195,000
Specialized research facilities and equipment	18,942	7,000	15,000
National sea grant program	5,000	6,000	10,000
Computing activities in education and research	21,998	17,000	22,000
Institutional support for science	83,245	41,000	74,000
Science education support	124,833	116,100	117,500
Advances and reimbursements: Science education program	1,129	1,150	
Total obligations	425,762	365,550	433,500
Grand total	5,295,224	5,209,773	5,138,802

DESCRIPTIONS OF PROGRAMS

OFFICE OF EDUCATION

ELEMENTARY AND SECONDARY EDUCATION

Educationally deprived children: Grants are made to schools to assist in expanding and improving instruction and ancillary services for children from low-income families, handicapped children, dependent and neglected children, orphans and juvenile delinquents, children of migratory workers, and Indians. In addition, payments are made to State educational agencies for administrative expenses.

Dropout prevention: Grants are made to local school districts for experimental projects in poverty area schools to reduce and prevent dropouts.

Bilingual education: Grants are made to local educational agencies to develop, establish, and operate programs of bilingual education and to provide preservice and inservice training for professional personnel participating in such programs.

Supplementary educational services: Grants are made to States and to local school districts, in association with colleges, private schools, museums, and other educational resources, to develop and establish programs which serve as models for improving and supplementing the regular school curriculum. Examples would include support for science or language teaching centers, mobile laboratories, and planning new ways to extend educational services in central cities, metropolitan regions, or sparsely populated rural areas.

Library resources: Grants are made to States for procurement of library resources, textbooks, and other printed and published instructional methods for use by students and teachers in public and private elementary and secondary schools. These are in addition to Federal support for purchase of school library books from other programs such as those for education of the disadvantaged and supplementary educational services.

Guidance, counseling, and testing: Matching grants are made to States to assist in establishing and maintaining programs of guidance, counseling, and testing in public elementary and secondary schools and public junior colleges and technical institutes.

Equipment and minor remodeling: Grants were made to States for equipment and minor remodeling of laboratory or other space suitable for use in providing education in public elementary or secondary schools while loans were made to nonprofit private schools for similar uses.

Strengthening State departments of education: Grants assist State educational agencies in developing systematic and technically proficient planning and evaluation activities, and in supporting research, statistical, and technical assistance for local school systems.

Planning and evaluation: Funds are made available to the Secretary of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare for expenses including grants, contracts, or other payments for planning and evaluation of succeeding year activities or projects for any program for which the Commissioner of Education has responsibility for administration.

HIGHER EDUCATION

Program assistance: Grants are made for projects to strengthen faculty and administrative skills, to upgrade curriculum, and for teaching fellowships. Such grants require the establishment of cooperative links between the developing colleges and universities, businesses, or other developing institutions. Grants also are allotted among States for support of instruction in agriculture, the mechanic arts, and related fields at the 69 land-grant colleges. Grants were made in 1968 and 1969 to higher education institutions for acquisition of television and other equipment and minor remodeling of space in order to improve undergraduate instruction. In 1970, pilot grants will be made for sharing of educational resources such as libraries or faculties and strengthening and improving the quality of graduate programs.

Construction: Matching grants are awarded for construction of academic facilities at colleges, universities, junior colleges, and technical institutes. Beginning in 1969, direct loans will be replaced by annual interest grants, to reduce the cost of loans from non-Federal sources for construction of academic facilities. Direct Federal loans for construction were provided through the higher education facilities loan fund during 1968 and 1969. Grants are also made to assist State commissions in administering undergraduate construction grants under this program, and in comprehensive planning of future higher education construction. Technical engineering and other review services are provided for construction projects.

Student aid: Funds are allotted to colleges and universities to provide: educational opportunity grants for financially needy undergraduate students; work-study grants under which wages are provided for part-time jobs during the school year and full-time summer jobs for students who are in need of financial assistance in order to continue their education; and capital contributions to National Defense Education Act student loan funds from which loans are made to graduate and undergraduate students. Advances are made on a matching basis to State and nonprofit private loan insurance funds to guarantee loans to college and vocational students, and payments are made to reduce interest costs for students whose adjusted family incomes fall below $15,000. Grants are made to higher educational institutions to develop cooperative arrangements with private industry or public agencies to provide students employment experience directly related to their college courses. For disadvantaged students, grants and contracts are supported for: the Upward Bound program to motivate high school students to attend college and improve their academic preparation; the talent search program to identify youths with exceptional potential for a college education and publicize available sources of financial aid; and special remedial and other services for enrolled college students to encourage and assist them in continuing their higher education.

Personnel development: Grants are made to institutions for fellowships leading to a doctorate for prospective college teachers, including stipends for individuals and cost-of-education allowances for participating institutions. Grants and contracts with institutions provide full costs of institutes and other training programs, including stipends to individuals, to train college teachers, administrators, and educational specialists. To attract and improve the education of persons entering the service of State, local, and Federal governments, grants are made to institutions to provide public service fellowships, including stipends to individuals and cost-of-education allowances for institutions.

Planning and evaluation: Funds provide for long-range planning of higher education programs, including the implementation of new legislation; and for program evaluations, particularly in the areas of student aid, graduate education, developing colleges, and institutional sharing of resources.

SCHOOL ASSISTANCE IN FEDERALLY AFFECTED AREAS

Maintenance and operation: Payments are made to assist in operation of schools in areas where enrollments are affected by Federal activities. Under certain circumstances, payments are made to other Federal agencies to make arrangements for education of children where local school districts do not assume responsibility for such children. Arrangements may be made for free public education of children of members of the Armed Forces on active duty not residing on Federal property. The 1970 request is based on legislation to be proposed that will more equitably distribute funds to school districts consistent with the burdens imposed by Federal activities.

Construction: The authorized programs for 1970 will support the following activities:

Assistance to local educational agencies: Grants are made to local districts for school construction, on behalf of increased numbers of children residing on Federal property and/or with a parent employed on Federal property.

Assistance for school construction on Federal properties: Where the local educational agency is unable to provide school facilities for increased numbers of children living on Federal property, the Commissioner of Education is authorized to arrange for construction of schools. Under certain circumstances, the Commissioner may also arrange to provide school facilities on a temporary basis for children of members of the Armed Forces on active duty who do not reside on Federal property.

Payments for technical services: Provides technical and administrative services in connection with the construction of school facilities.

Evaluation: Funds in 1969 provide for studies to evaluate the type of payments, level of funding, and possible legal formula changes to make payments correspond to federally caused burdens upon local school districts.

VOCATIONAL EDUCATION

Basic grants: Matching grants are made to the States for support and improvement of vocational education programs, including the construction and remodeling of vocational education school facilities. Training for gainful employment as semiskilled or skilled workers and for business and office occupations is emphasized. Two-fifths of these funds will be set aside in 1970 for special vocational programs for children from low-income families, the physically and mentally handicapped, and postsecondary courses. In addition, $2,000,000 will be transferred to the Department of Labor for manpower projections and studies which will help State and local officials in planning useful and up to date training programs. Funds are also made available to support the advisory, review, evaluation, and reporting function of the National Advisory Council and the State advisory councils.

Consumer and homemaking education: Matching grants are made to the States for such programs.

Work study: In 1968 grants were made to States for financial support of students from low-income families. These grants have been terminated because of similar benefits provided by the cooperative work and study assistance and by the Neighborhood Youth Corps in-school program administered by the Department of Labor under delegation from the Office of Economic Opportunity.

Cooperative education: Grants are made to States for supervisory and other costs of cooperative study and work programs. Local school districts will arrange with private industry or public agencies for employment experience directly related to student vocational objectives; employers will pay enrollee wages equal to the value of work produced.

Innovation: Exemplary and innovative programs to develop new models for experimenting with alternate approaches for upgrading vocational education programs and stimulating new ways to create a bridge between school and earning a living for young people. In 1970, 106 projects will effect the redirection of State program planning in areas of city ghettos, rural poor, school dropouts, and youth who graduate from high school lacking salable work skills.

Curriculum development: A new program of grants to colleges, universities, and other institutions designed to give assistance to State and local education agencies by development of curriculums for new and changing occupations.

Planning and evaluation: Funds are made available for grants, contracts, or other payments, for planning training programs and conduct of evaluation studies of vocational and technical education.

LIBRARIES AND COMMUNITY SERVICES

Library services: Matching grants are made to the States and territories for the promotion, development, and extension of public library services; interlibrary cooperation; State hospital, prison, and other institutional library services; and services for the physically handicapped.

Construction of public libraries: Matching grants are made to the States and territories.

College library resources: Grants are made to institutions of higher education for acquisition of library books and materials.

Acquisition and cataloging by Library of Congress: Funds are transferred to the Librarian of Congress for comprehensive cataloging of scholarly materials, providing an aid to the efficient management of college and university libraries.

Librarian training: Grants are made to higher education institutions for training and upgrading librarians to staff school, public, and academic libraries.

University community services: Matching grants are made to States and territories for support of higher education extension services which assist local communities in solving poverty, transportation, crime, pollution, and other complex community problems.

Adult basic education: Grants are made to the States and territories for support of basic educational programs attended by persons 16 years and older, who wish to overcome English language limitations, prepare for occupational training and more profitable employment, and participate more effectively in our modern society.

Educational broadcasting facilities: Grants are provided for the establishment and expansion of educational television and radio facilities covering all phases of education from preschool through adult.

EDUCATION PROFESSIONS DEVELOPMENT

Preschool, elementary, and secondary: Grants to States made to recruit and train persons for careers as elementary and secondary teachers and teacher aides.

Training programs: Grants and contracts are supported to meet critical shortages of educational personnel, to improve the quality of teaching at the preschool through postsecondary vocational levels, and for developing and strengthening teacher education programs at the graduate level. Grants and contracts with higher education institutions and State and local education agencies support programs to update and improve the training of personnel such as teachers, teacher aides, supervisors, administrators, counselors, teachers of disadvantaged youth, and educational media specialists. Stipends are paid to participants in these programs.

Encouragement of educational careers: Grants and contracts with higher education institutions, public educational agencies, and other organizations are supported to identify and encourage high school and college students and other capable persons to enter or reenter the field of education.

RESEARCH AND TRAINING

Research and development: Contracts are awarded to educational laboratories and research and development centers, and contracts and grants are awarded to institutions of higher education, States, local educational agencies, and private enterprise. Educational laboratories devote primary attention to the development and validation of curriculums and instructional alternatives for use in the Nation's schools. Research and development centers concentrate on studying such specific problem areas as early childhood learning, teacher education, higher education, problems of the disadvantaged, educational administration, and educational policy. In 1970 research emphasis will be shifted toward minority groups in education, and toward basic research in reading processes, learning, and motivation. Major development efforts will include work on secondary school curriculum systems and the use of television for early childhood education. The amount includes a transfer of $2,000,000 to the National Foundation on the Arts and the Humanities for joint projects involving scholars, practitioners, artists, and writers in the classroom. It also includes $2,000,000 for continuing support of a national study of the educational attainment of the population.

Major demonstrations: Support will be provided for the demonstration of two model approaches to urban education: one, stressing community participation in school program planning and execution, in the Anacostia section, Washington, D.C., will be continued; the second will provide initial assistance for a school in the "new town" setting of the Fort Lincoln community, Washington, D.C.

Dissemination: A network of information clearinghouses is supported to promote efficient transfer of information from research and experimental projects in education to teachers, administrators, scholars, and research personnel. Each clearinghouse selects, evaluates, indexes, abstracts, and disseminates information on current and completed projects in an important area of education—such as teaching of the disadvantaged, teacher training, vocational education, reading, and so forth. Reporting and retrieval services are provided and compilations and analyses are made on research related to selected educational topics. A monthly publication listing all acquisitions is produced and distributed on a subscription basis. In 1970, a newly authorized program will be started to provide—through technical assistance, conferences, seminars, publications, and other information techniques particularly useful for parents, students, teachers, and administrators—information about projects in schools and colleges.

Training: Grants are awarded for the training of manpower to carry out educational research, development, evaluation, and related activities. Awards are also made to develop materials for use in such training programs.

Construction: Grants are made to procure major program equipment items and to construct educational research and development facilities.

Statistical surveys: Contractual studies support the responsibilities of the National Center for Educational Statistics for measuring the progress and status of education in the Nation, and help in developing and applying scientific and technical methods to the collection, processing, and analyses of education statistics. They will include: the collection, compilation, analysis, and dissemination of statistics; work on standard educational terminology and definitions which can serve as the foundation of a comprehensive system of educational information for use in the management and operation of local school systems; and continued research in statistical survey methods and in the development of more efficient sampling techniques.

EDUCATION FOR THE HANDICAPPED

Preschool and school programs: Grants are made to States for expansion and improvement of special classes at preschool, elementary, and secondary levels for children whose mental or physical handicaps make regular classroom activities ineffective or impractical.

Early childhood programs: Grants are made to plan and operate model centers providing educational, diagnostic, and consultative services for preschool handicapped children and their parents.

Teacher education and recruitment: Grants are awarded to support training of teachers, supervisors, speech correctionists, researchers, and other professional and subprofessional personnel for education of the handicapped including physical education and recreation. Grants or contracts may be awarded for new programs which will attract personnel to work in the various fields of education for the handicapped and provide dissemination of information about the special educational programs, services, and resources available.

Research and innovation: Grants and contracts are awarded for the development of new curricular materials, teaching techniques, research and development centers, and other research and demonstration projects including physical recreation and education. Grants and contracts are awarded for the establishment and operation of regional centers to develop and apply the best method of appraising the special educational needs of handicapped children. Grants are also made for model centers to provide diagnostic, educational, and related services to deaf-blind children.

Media services and captioned films: Contracts are made for the acquisition, captioning, production, and distribution of films and other educational media, for conducting research in the use of such materials, and for training persons in the use of the educational materials for the handicapped.

TEACHER CORPS

Teams of experienced teachers and teaching interns are made available to serve, upon request, in schools located in neighborhoods with concentrations of low-income families. Federal grants are made to institutions of higher education for preservice and inservice training of the interns and experienced teachers. Local school districts receive Federal grants for payments of a portion of the salaries of both interns and experienced teachers during their period of service. Cooperative arrangements between the institutions of higher education and local school districts permit the interns to work toward completion of requirements for advanced degrees.

EDUCATION IN FOREIGN LANGUAGES AND WORLD AFFAIRS

Grants and contracts are awarded for institutional research, courses of study, and training of individuals.

STUDENT LOAN INSURANCE FUND

The Office of Education insures loans to college and vocational students in eligible institutions who do not have reasonable access to State or private nonprofit programs of student loan insurance. It is authorized to reinsure loans guaranteed by State and nonprofit private agencies at 80 percent of default by student borrowers.

CIVIL RIGHTS EDUCATION

Training for school personnel and grants to school boards: Special training grants and contracts are awarded to school boards and to training institutions.

Technical services and administration: Salaries and other supporting expenses are paid for those persons in the Office of Education who provide positive assistance to school boards in coping with desegregation problems, and who administer the grants and contracts for special training—see preceding paragraph.

RESEARCH AND TRAINING—SPECIAL FOREIGN CURRENCY PROGRAM

Foreign currencies which are in excess of the normal requirements of the United States are used to support projects which will add to educational and scientific knowledge in the United States. The funds are used for the promotion of education in foreign languages and world affairs by assisting in the support of overseas activities of American institutions of higher education.

COLLEGES FOR AGRICULTURE AND THE MECHANIC ARTS

Grants are for college instruction, including facilities, in agriculture, the mechanic arts, and related fields, and for the training of teachers in these fields.

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

The Office of Education administers programs for support of educational research, elementary, and secondary education, higher education, adult, and vocational education, education of the handicapped, and teacher training. The National Center for Educational Statistics collects, analyzes, and distributes data on the status and trends of American education. Central management and other staff services required in accomplishing the mission of the Office are provided.

SOCIAL AND REHABILITATION SERVICE

Assistance to refugees in the United States, education: Selected training is provided to equip the refugees for employment and resettlement. Loans are made to needy college students.

SPECIAL INSTITUTIONS

Howard University: A private nonprofit institution.

National Technical Institute for the Deaf: A residential facility for postsecondary technical training and education for deaf persons in order to prepare them for successful employment.

Gallaudet College: A private, nonprofit institution providing undergraduate higher education for the deaf, a graduate school offering advanced studies for students interested in the field of deafness, and a research program to provide information about the deaf.

American Printing House for the Blind: Grants are made to this nonprofit institution to support the manufacture of special books and teaching materials which are distributed to all public educational institutions for the blind, as well as to regular public schools in which blind children are enrolled; and provide for staff and other expenses of committees which advise the Printing House relative to administration of the Federal funds.

DEPARTMENTAL MANAGEMENT

Payments to the Corporation for Public Broadcasting: The purpose of this private, nonprofit corporation is to strengthen the quality of noncommercial educational television and radio broadcasting and make such public broadcasting service more widely available across the Nation. Funds are used for strengthening local educational stations, production and distribution of high quality programing, development of an interconnection service, and for corporation administrative expenses.

APPALACHIAN REGIONAL DEVELOPMENT PROGRAMS

Vocational education facilities: Grants are made to States and school districts for the construction and equipment of vocational education facilities for the training and upgrading of potential and existing labor force entrants in skills required in commercial and other vocations.

OFFICE OF ECONOMIC OPPORTUNITY

Headstart and Headstart followthrough: Headstart funds operate child development programs for preschool children. Headstart grants are also made to areas that have no community action agencies. In 1970, greater emphasis will be placed on experimentation through a program of planned variation in Headstart using the followthrough evaluation approach.

BUREAU OF INDIAN AFFAIRS

Education and welfare services: Educational assistance, facilities, and services: The Bureau operates Federal school facilities where public schools are not available or cannot meet the special needs of Indian children. Financial assistance is extended to public schools enrolling Indian children where tax-free Indian lands result in financial problems for the local districts and where other special problems exist that are not covered by Federal impact legislation. Grants are also made to Indian students attending college. In 1970, kindergartens will be established and operated for reservation Indian children by both the public and the Federal school systems. Federal school plans for 1970 include provisions for increased boarding school enrollment, additional kindergartens, upgrading the quality of programs designed to meet the special educational needs of these children, school boards, expanded summer program activities, and initiation of a research and evaluation program.

DEPARTMENT OF STATE

Educational exchange trust funds: U.S. dollars advanced from foreign governments are used to send experts abroad to give foreign nationals scientific, technical, or other training, and to perform technical or other services in this country.

NATIONAL SCIENCE FOUNDATION—SALARIES AND EXPENSES

Support of scientific research: Scientific research project support. Grants are awarded to investigators at more than 450 institutions, principally at colleges and universities.

Specialized research facilities and equipment: Support is provided for major items of specialized scientific facilities and equipment primarily at colleges and universities.

National sea grant program: This supports grants and contracts primarily at academic institutions for training, research, and advisory services concerned with the exploitation of marine resources.

Computing activities in education and research: Support is provided to develop and test alternative methods of providing computational facilities for student use in colleges and universities and continuation of partial support of computational facilities for scientific research.

Institutional support for science: Support is provided to assist in the development and improvement of the science programs of colleges and universities. Included are matching grants for the construction, renovation, and equipping of research laboratories, comprehensive grants to assist developing institutions in achieving a higher level of competence in the sciences and engineering, and grants for graduate and undergraduate education improvements.

Science education support: This provides for programs to strengthen and expand the training and development of scientific manpower, including the following programs: Traineeships and fellowships to graduate students in science, mathematics, and engineering, and fellowships to college and university faculty and foreign senior scientists; institutes for the training of secondary school and college teachers of science and mathematics; and projects directed toward the improvement of secondary school and undergraduate science and mathematics curriculums and supplementary programs to stimulate interest in and secure improvement of teaching and training in the sciences at secondary school and undergraduate levels.

YOUTH INVOLVEMENT ACT AND A BILL TO CREATE AN OMBUDSMAN FOR CONGRESSMEN

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

YOUTH INVOLVEMENT ACT

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. BRADEMAS), the gentleman from West Virginia (Mr. HECHLER), and I have today introduced H.R. 8016, the Youth Involvement Act.

This bill is intended to enlist the energy, ingenuity, and enthusiasm of America's youth in public service. It directs Federal agencies to "take all steps necessary to see that their programs are developed, conducted, and administered with the maximum feasible participation of youth"—generally defined as people under 25 years of age.

In recent years the young people of America have, to an increasing degree, dedicated their considerable talents and energies to public service—in the Peace Corps abroad and in rural and urban social programs at home.

Their expanded concern to improve the quality of life has been a refreshing development, following as it has on the materialism and complacency which pervaded the 1950's to the point of quenching the natural idealism and energies of the young.

Young people are no longer "playing it cool"; instead they are involved—and a healthy development this is.

The Peace Corps was the first Federal recognition of this dramatic shift in the mood of American youth. I need not testify to the immense success of this international endeaver.

The Peace Corps was followed by VISTA—Volunteers in Service to America—and other Office of Economic Opportunity programs which, to a large extent, have been operated by young men and women.

Each of these programs has paid handsome dividends. They have trained a cadre of people for a lifetime of public service. The Peace Corps has graduated 21,738 volunteers in its 8 years; VISTA another 11,278.

Finding solutions to the problems which we as a nation face today—problems of poverty, discrimination, poor housing, poor education, poor health—requires a vast number of highly motivated and well-trained people.

But as a nation we are not training nearly enough. Moreover, all too few of the young Americans we do train are willing to make the personal and financial sacrifices which often accompany public service work.

I am convinced that more of the Nation's young people would enter public service occupations if in their formative years they were to experience the often intangible rewards of such service. For example, Peace Corps statistics show that one of every four ex-volunteers goes to work for a government or nonprofit agency.

It is time now to enlarge the Government-created opportunities for our young people to engage in public service.

The National Democratic Party's 1968 platform endorsed this goal, calling for steps "to include youth advisers on all government studies, commissions, and hearings which are relevant to their lives." The platform went on to say:

Every young person should have an opportunity to contribute to the social health of his community or to humanitarian service abroad. The extraordinary experience of the Teacher Corps, VISTA, and the Peace Corps points the way for broadening the opportunities for such voluntary service. Hundreds of thousands of America's youth have sought to enlist in these programs, but only tens of thousands have been able to serve. We will expand these opportunities.

This, then, is one dimension of the Youth Involvement Act.

There is a second dimension.

The Government must reach down the economic ladder to give the young people of the Nation's ghettos—young people not otherwise able to land part-time or summer jobs—opportunities to work in federally financed jobs.

A job can provide a potential high school dropout with a sense of responsibility, an awareness of his earning power, a sense of self-security, and in some instances with a change of environment which will cause him to value himself and his educational opportunity more highly.

Though the Federal Government has some responsibilities for the employment of the poor youth in the past several summers, much remains to be done to expand and improve these programs.

In addition to well-known Federal job programs like the Neighborhood Youth Corps and the Job Corps, the last administration offered the Nation's youth two major opportunities to be of service to their country and to themselves.

First. The President's Youth Opportunity Campaign. In 1965, the President established the President's Youth Opportunity Campaign to provide summer employment for young people aged 16 to 21 years. The Civil Service Commission asked Federal agencies to hire one youth for every 100 employees nationwide and to hire three youths for every 100 employees in the District of Columbia. In 1967 nearly 100,000 young people were employed through the Youth Opportunity Campaign. They were paid at a minimum wage of $1.60 per hour. Efforts were made to put these young people into jobs where they could learn a skill which could be translated into a permanent job when their formal education was completed.

The program was balanced evenly between the youths chosen on the basis of their scores in a competitive examination and those youths especially in need of a job. Among the latter, top priority was given to young people from families receiving welfare payments.

Second. The President's Council on Youth Opportunity. On March 9, 1967, the President, by Executive Order 11330, established the President's Council on Youth Opportunity.

The Vice President was named to head the Council, which was made up of the heads of 10 Federal departments and agencies—the Departments of Defense, Interior, Commerce; Health, Education, and Welfare; Justice, Agriculture, Labor, Housing and Urban Development, the Office of Economic Opportunity, and the Civil Service Commission.

The Executive order gave the Council responsibility for: Assuring effective program planning for summer and other youth programs of the Federal Government; strengthening the coordination of youth programs and activities of Federal departments and agencies; evaluating the overall effectiveness of Federal youth opportunity programs; encouraging State, local, nonprofit and other private organizations to participate fully in efforts to enhance opportunity for youths.

In less than 2 years of operation, the Council accomplished a number of its objectives—mainly those concerned with summer and part-time youth employment programs.

One of the most successful summer youth employment projects, sponsored by the Council and the National Communicable Disease Center of the Public Health Service, was the employment of 51 youths in city health departments to do jobs at an adult level—working under the supervision of professionals. As a result of this program, 45 of these young people now plan to continue their education; whereas, prior to their participation, only 24 had indicated a desire to continue.

The President's Council established mayor's councils on youth opportunities in cities across the Nation to launch, coordinate, evaluate, and improve local youth opportunity programs.

There are many examples from both government and private experience of what can be accomplished under the Youth Involvement Act.

In education, from New York City to Los Angeles, high school and college students are being employed in their spare time to tutor younger students.

In juvenile delinquency prevention, potential delinquents can be employed in juvenile delinquency prevention programs which benefit both them and their community.

One example is the Twelfth & Oxford Street Corp., made up of members of one of north central Philadelphia's 60 organized street gangs. The corporation began in 1966 with a successful venture in filmmaking, then went on to purchase three tax delinquent properties in the neighborhood which they renovated for rental at low rates to community residents. Plans are now on the drawing board for a restaurant and a teenage record company. During the 2½ years the corporation has existed gang members have devoted much of their energy to the corporation's work and delinquency rates have remained low.

Another example is the Real Great Society, begun on the Lower East Side of New York in April 1965 by several rival gang leaders. The Real Great Society's first major venture was a University of the Streets, operating out of a five-story building on the Lower East Side. Over 50 courses were started, and at its peak the university had over 1,600 active participants, including persons from all over the city as well as youth from the Lower East Side. The Real Great Society has continued to grow, and now the group owns a community center, townhouses, and two apartment buildings which have been renovated by youth with a minimum of adult assistance. Rentals are as low as $80 a month. In addition RGS has designed and constructed vest pocket parks and also operates two restaurants in Harlem.

In public safety, the President's Commission on Law Enforcement and the National Advisory Commission on Civil Disorders have both recommended that local police forces establish positions for community service officers to be filled by young men between the ages of 17 to 21 with the aptitude, integrity, and stability to perform police work.

Community service officers would be apprenticeship policemen—an entirely new type of police cadet working with a police officer. Their duties would be to assist police officers in their work and to improve communications between the police department and the neighborhoods. Last year, the Chicago police department employed 50 youth cadets to help handle citizen complaints of a noncriminal nature such as uncollected garbage and streets and disrepair.

In conservation, the National Youth Conference on Natural Beauty and Conservation, which in 1967 held its Youth for Natural Beauty and Conservation Year, demonstrated in scores of projects throughout the country that teenage youths will involve themselves in conservation and community improvement projects which afford them opportunities for community service.

The real test of any employment program for youth is the amount of responsibility which youths are given. Young people wish to work with adults, not for them. They resent adult takeovers.

A recent experimental program in the Department of Labor could serve as a model under this act for the maximum feasible participation of youth in developing, conducting, and administering a Government program.

At the initiative of management interns in the Department of Labor, the Department established a new program to help the Nation's disadvantaged youth find jobs. The program was administered by management interns in Washington and by local boards of college students in cities throughout the country. Youth were employed to carry out the program as well.

This was a Government program which from inception to finish, from top to bottom, was a youth program. More of such programs could be usefully established.

Our Federal Government has only scratched the surface in employing youth to carry out the Nation's social programs. It needs to create more opportunities for youth participation.

Besides employment, youth can be usefully employed to a greater extent in education, health, recreation, housing, and welfare programs.

The Youth Involvement Act lists 27 programs which directly affect youths or in which the participation of youths would make good sense—programs such as the provisions of child welfare services, the U.S. census, educational television, urban beautification, outdoor recreation, public housing.

The list is not meant to be exhaustive. Many other opportunities exist, if the Government would mobilize itself to employ the Nation's young people.

Let us give the Nation's young people an opportunity to show their talents. They will benefit and the Nation will benefit from their talent, their energy, and their dedication.

The bill follows:

H.R. 8016

A bill to encourage the involvement of youth in federally financed programs and projects

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That this Act may be cited as the "Youth Involvement Act."

STATEMENT OF PURPOSE

SEC. 2. The Congress of the United States declares that it is the policy of the United States and the purpose of this Act to apply the energy, ingenuity, and enthusiasm of America's youth to the solution of the Nation's social problems by encouraging qualified young people to advise and to serve in federally-financed programs and projects.

EMPLOYMENT OF YOUTH

SEC. 3. The heads of Federal departments or agencies responsible for administering the following programs shall take all steps necessary to see that these programs are developed, conducted, and administered with the maximum feasible participation of youth:

Pilot school breakfast program (42 U.S.C. 1773 et seq.);

National school lunch program (42 U.S.C. 1753 et seq.);

United States Census (13 U.S.C. 1 et seq.);

Child Welfare Services (42 U.S.C. 191 et seq., 721 et seq.);

Educational television (47 U.S.C. 390 et seq., Public Law 90–129);

Elementary and Secondary Education Act programs (20 U.S.C. 241(a) et seq., 821 et seq.);

Handicapped children and youth research and demonstration programs (20 U.S.C. 618);

Higher Education Act (20 U.S.C. 1001 et seq.)

Juvenile delinquency prevention and control (42 U.S.C. 2541 et seq.);

Science youth activities (Public Law 85–875);

Low-rent public housing (42 U.S.C. 1401 et seq.);

Model cities (42 U.S.C. 3301 et seq.);

Neighborhood facilities (42 U.S.C. 3101 et seq.);

Open space land, urban beautification, and historic preservation (42 U.S.C. 1500);

Rental housing for moderate income families (12 U.S.C. 1711 et seq.);

Urban renewal (42 U.S.C. 1450 et seq.);

Outdoor recreation assistance (16 U.S.C. 4601);

Services to American Indian children (25 U.S.C. 452 et seq.);

Community relations service (42 U.S.C. 2000g);

Neighborhood Youth Corps (42 U.S.C. 2731 et seq.);

Youth opportunity centers (29 U.S.C. 31 et seq., 20 U.S.C. 107, 42 U.S.C. 2571 et seq.);

Precollege education in science program (42 U.S.C. 1861 et seq.);

Peace Corps (22 U.S.C. 2500 et seq.);

Community center program (42 U.S.C. 2711 et seq.);

Headstart (42 U.S.C. 2711 et seq.);

Job Corps (42 U.S.C. 2711 et seq.);

Upward Bound (42 U.S.C. 2711 et seq.);

Volunteers in Service to America (42 U.S.C. 2711 et seq.); and

any other program which the President shall from time to time by Executive order designate as coming within the purview of this Act.

ANNUAL REPORT TO CONGRESS

SEC. 4. Within one year from the date of enactment hereof, and annually thereafter, the President shall transmit a report to the Congress on the actions taken by Federal departments and agencies to carry out the provisions of this Act.

DEFINITION

SEC. 5. "Youth" means a person who is twenty-five years of age or under, a person who has completed his formal education within the past three years, or a Federal management intern.

AN OMBUDSMAN FOR CONGRESSMEN

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced legislation, H.R. 8017, to create a congressional ombudsman. This official would help Members more effectively to serve their constituents who face problems in dealing with the Federal Government.

To the same end, I introduced H.R. 7593 on July 16, 1963, in the 88th Congress, H.R. 4273 on February 3, 1965, in the 89th Congress, and H.R. 3388 on January 23, 1967, in the 90th Congress.

The chief purposes of this bill are to enable Congressmen to help more constituents more effectively in dealing with Federal Government agencies, and to give Congressmen and their staffs more time to work on legislation on great national problems by easing the growing burden of casework. The congressional ombudsman would be appointed by the Congress.

Establishing a congressional ombudsman would not disrupt the existing congressional-constituent relationship. On the contrary, it would strengthen that relationship to the benefit of both parties.

The bill assures this by providing that the congressional ombudsman and his office would exist, like the Legislative Reference Service and the Legislative Counsel, to act only at the request of a Senator or Representative. Only a Member could refer a case to the congressional ombudsman for review.

The bill delimits the types of cases which the congressional ombudsman would review:

> The congressional ombudsman, unless he believes that the complainant has available another reasonable remedy, shall review the case of any person who alleges that, as a result of any action or failure to act on the part of any officer or employee of the United States other than those exempted under section 6 of this Act (a) he has been subjected to any improper penalty or has been denied any right or benefit to which he is entitled, under the laws of the United States; or (b) the relevant proceedings are being conducted in a manner that is unreasonable, unfair, oppressive, dilatory, or inefficient.

The bill further provides that the congressional ombudsman, after completing his review, "shall report his conclusions and recommendations, if any, to the Member by whom the case was referred."

The bill makes clear that no Member would be required to use the congressional ombudsman's services for any case unless the Member so chose. Furthermore, the Member would be at perfect liberty to ignore completely any conclusions and recommendations by the congressional ombudsman.

In no way, therefore, would the congressional ombudsman interfere with the traditional relationship between Members and their constituents.

The congressional ombudsman would adapt to our constitutional system and political traditions the institution of the ombudsman first established in Sweden in 1809. The ombudsman has proved so valuable in protecting the rights of citizens against bureaucratic errors and abuses that the institution has in recent years been established elsewhere. Finland, Denmark, Norway, New Zealand, and Great Britain have set up their own versions of citizen's defenders.

The concept and term "ombudsman" have recently become familiar here in public speeches and the daily press. Interest in the ombudsman at the State and local level continues to grow.

In May 1967, Hawaii passed legislation creating an ombudsman, although an ombudsman has not been appointed yet. Utah has created a legislative investigating committee to act as an ombudsman. Lt. Gov. Mark A. Hogan, of Colorado, serves as a voluntary ombudsman. Michigan's secretary of state has designated one of his staff members as an ombudsman to handle complaints on procedures and policies relating to the State department, California has a multiservice center.

At the county level, in Nassau County, N.Y., the ombudsman's functions are carried out through the office of the commissioner of accounts. Montgomery County, Md., has a public action line which is a kind of telephone ombudsman.

At the city level, Miami, Fla., has a municipal complaint department which performs many of the duties usually assigned to an ombudsman. In New York City, the mayor has established "little city halls" on the neighborhood level to handle citizen complaints. In Boston, Mass., the mayor has established the office of public services, housed in trailers. In New Haven, Conn., Pittsburgh, Pa., and Baltimore, Md., the human relations commissions handle the function. In Denver, Colo., it is the mayor's committee on city-citizen relations, and in San Diego, Calif., the citizens assistance office.

Some 20 to 30 colleges have also adopted the ombudsman system. Among them are the University of Chicago, City College, Columbia University, Stony Brook College, San Jose State College, University of California, at Berkeley, University of Detroit, Eastern Montana College, Michigan State University, University of Texas College of Arts and Sciences, Florida State University, and the University of Kentucky.

At the Federal level, the ombudsman concept is still very much in the study rather than the action stage.

Population growth and movement of Americans from the country into cities and from central cities into suburbs are making our society, and therefore, the citizen's relationship with his government, ever more complex. In addition, his expectations of the quality as well as the quantity of rights and benefits, such as medical care and higher education, are rising. A citizen having a problem with a Federal Government agency may have administrative or judicial remedies. But these are often costly, complex, and even unknown to him. He therefore is likely to write to his Congressman.

Thus population growth and rising expectations of public service are rapidly expanding the Representative's traditional and valuable role as citizen's advocate against the bureaucracy.

Meanwhile, as casework becomes more burdensome and claims an ever larger proportion of each Member's time, his role as a legislator grappling with major domestic and foreign policy issues continues to grow. Such problems demand more time for thought and study and debate. Yet the growing burden of casework allows us less.

Congress would benefit in four ways from having a congressional ombudsman:

First, by reducing the caseload burden on congressional offices, the congressional ombudsman would free time for Members and their staffs to devote more study and thought to legislative and political issues.

Second, the congressional ombudsman could do a better job of protecting the interest of constituents than the jacks-of-all-trades in congressional offices who often find themselves somewhat at the mercy of more knowlegeable administrators. Members lack staffs large enough to have a separate expert in each field of bureaucratic activity. But experts on the staff of the congressional ombudsman would be able to protect citizens' interests faster and better. Prof. Walter Gellhorn of Columbia University reports:

> Experience abroad suggests that an internal critic's review of a closed file often discloses significant materials or raises suggestive questions that might not have come to the fore if the critic had relied entirely (as congressional caseworkers usually do) on the report made by the challenged administrator. Accessibility of the files to an ombudsman's examination seem not to have impaired efficiency or candor. . . .

Third, handling casework on a centralized basis instead of in 535 separate offices would be more efficient and less costly. Gellhorn, after sampling how congressional offices handle casework, concluded:

> Those who cherish the good old ways of doing business . . . are likely to be crushed

by the weight of the business to be done. . . . Most offices, however, have little slack, either in available personnel or in available space. . . . Unless Congress were to continue to expand its quarters indefinitely, a bursting point must soon be reached.

Fourth, the Congressional ombudsman would have a unique vantage point from which to spot causes of citizen's difficulties with the Federal bureaucracy. Gellhorn writes:

The implications of the individual case are more likely to be grasped by the congressional ombudsman's staff than by a Congressman's often inexperienced assistants; complaints in the mass may dramatize issues that a seemingly isolated grievance leaves unnoticed.

Congressmen may be able to correct injustices done to those citizens who appeal to them, but the basic cause may go uncorrected while many individuals who do not appeal to their Congressmen suffer injustice.

The text of the bill follows:

H.R. 8017

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That this Act may be cited as the "Congressional Ombudsman Act".

SEC. 2. The Congress hereby finds and declares that the increasing complexity of the Federal Government has created difficulties on the part of private citizens in dealing with the Government, that there is a clear need for the Congress to be informed of the nature of such difficulties, particularly those of a recurrent nature, in order that remedial legislative action may be taken, and that, under existing procedures, such information is only sporadically available and frequently is inadequately developed or fails entirely to reach the appropriate legislative committees. The Congress further finds that the necessary and proper efforts of its individual Members to deal with these problems have increasingly become so burdensome as to constitute a serious impediment to the discharge of their other legislative duties.

SEC. 3. (a) There shall be an officer of the Senate and House of Representatives who shall be known as the Congressional ombudsmen and shall perform such duties as are prescribed by this Act. He shall be appointed by the Speaker of the House of Representatives and the President pro tempore of the Senate, without reference to political affiliations and solely on the basis of his fitness to perform the duties of his office, for a term which shall expire upon the commencement of the Congress succeeding the Congress during which he was appointed, except that he may continue to act during such succeeding Congress until he has been reappointed or his successor has been appointed. He shall receive the same salary as Members of Congress.

(b) Subject to the availability of appropriations, the Congressional Ombudsman may appoint such assistants, clerks, and other personnel as may be necessary to carry on the work of his office.

SEC. 4. Upon request of any Member of either House of Congress, the Congressional Ombudsman, unless he believes that the complainant has available another reasonable remedy, shall review the case of any person who alleges that, as a result of any action or failure to act on the part of any officer or employee of the United States other than those exempted under section 6 of this Act, (a) he has been subjected to any improper penalty or has been denied any right or benefit to which he is entitled, under the laws of the United States; or (b) the relevant proceedings are being conducted in a manner that is unreasonable, unfair, oppressive, dilatory, or inefficient. The Congressional Ombudsman may, in his discretion, confine his review of the case to the material submitted to him with the request for review, or may make such further investigation as he may deem appropriate. Upon completion of his review, he shall report his conclusions and recommendations, if any, to the Member by whom the case was referred.

SEC. 5. All officers and employees of the United States, except those exempted pursuant to section 6, shall furnish to the Congressional Ombudsman such information regarding their activities within the scope of their official duties or employment as he may require of them, and the Congressional Ombudsman, or any of his assistants, when duly authorized by him, shall, for the purpose of securing such information, have access to and the right to examine any books, records, files, or other documents, and the right to consult directly any officers or employees of the United States without securing the permission of their superiors.

SEC. 6. (a) This Act shall apply to all officers and employees of the United States except the following:

(1) The President;

(2) Members, officers, and employees of the Senate, the House of Representatives or any committee or joint committee thereof;

(3) Judges, clerks, commissioners, referees in bankruptcy, and other officers (other than attorneys as such) and employees of any court of the United States, regardless of whether such court is legislative or constitutional;

(4) Officers and employees of the District of Columbia or any other local governmental unit not under the supervision or control of some other department or agency of the United States; and

(5) Any other officer or employee of the United States whose activities are of such a nature that, in the discretion of the Congressional Ombudsman, the application of this Act thereto would be contrary to the public interest.

(b) For the purposes of this Act, the term "officers and employees of the United States" includes officers and employees of any department, agency, or instrumentality of the United States.

SEC. 7. (a) The Congressional Ombudsman shall make an annual report to the Congress. Such report shall summarize his activities, shall include reviews of those individual cases which, in his judgment, should be brought to the attention of the Congress, and shall set forth such recommendations for legislation or further investigation as he may deem appropriate.

(b) The Congressional Ombudsman may, in his discretion, make an interim report on any occasion when he deems such action appropriate to carry out the purposes of this Act.

(c) Any report of the Congressional Ombudsman pursuant to this section shall be printed as a public document.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to Mr. PREYER of North Carolina (at the request of Mr. EDMONDSON), from February 28 through March 8, 1969, on account of official business.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

Mr. FEIGHAN, for 20 minutes, today; and to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

Mr. MICHEL, for 30 minutes, today; and to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

Mr. REUSS (at the request of Mr. BINGHAM), for 1 hour today; and to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

Mr. MATSUNAGA (at the request of Mr. BINGHAM), for 1 hour, on March 12, and to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks was granted to:

Mr. PASSMAN and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. ZABLOCKI in two instances and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. RUMSFELD in two instances and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. SAYLOR and to include extraneous matter.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. DENNIS) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. ZWACH.

Mr. BOB WILSON in four instances.

Mr. WYATT.

Mr. ASHBROOK in two instances.

Mr. DERWINSKI in three instances.

Mr. QUILLEN in four instances.

Mr. KUYKENDALL.

Mr. CONTE.

Mr. STEIGER of Wisconsin in two instances.

Mr. MCKNEALLY.

Mr. MINSHALL in two instances.

Mr. PELLY in two instances.

Mr. BRAY in three instances.

Mr. MORSE.

Mr. MICHEL.

Mr. LIPSCOMB.

Mr. ROUDEBUSH in two instances.

Mr. SHRIVER.

Mr. SCHWENGEL in three instances.

Mr. WYMAN in three instances.

Mr. WHALEN.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. BINGHAM) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. REES.

Mr. ULLMAN in five instances.

Mr. WILLIAM D. FORD in two instances.

Mr. MACDONALD of Massachusetts in two instances.

Mr. RODINO.

Mr. CORMAN in five instances.

Mr. JABOBS in two instances.

Mr. OTTINGER.

Mr. ABBITT.

Mr. LONG of Maryland in three instances.

Mr. DINGELL in two instances.

Mr. RYAN in two instances.

Mr. RARICK in three instances.

Mr. HELSTOSKI in two instances.

Mr. BROWN of California.

Mr. GILBERT.

Mr. HAWKINS.

Mr. BROOKS in two instances.

Mr. ROSENTHAL in five instances.

Mr. O'HARA in three instances.

Mr. STUBBLEFIELD.

Mr. HICKS in two instances.

Mr. O'NEAL of Georgia.

Mr. PICKLE in two instances.

Mr. BINGHAM.

Mr. MCCORMACK.
Mr. GONZALEZ in two instances.

SENATE BILL REFERRED

A bill of the Senate of the following title was taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 1058. An act to extend the period within which the President may transmit to the Congress plans for reorganization of agencies of the executive branch of the Government; to the Committee on Government Operations.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. BINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 12 o'clock and 50 minutes p.m.), the House adjourned until tomorrow, Tuesday, March 4, 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:

546. A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting the 13th annual report on the financial condition and results of the operations of the highway trust fund, pursuant to the provisions of section 209(e) (1) of the Highway Revenue Act of 1956, as amended (H. Doc. No. 91-84); to the Committee on Ways and Means and ordered to be printed.

547. A letter from the Secretary of Defense transmitting a report on special pay for duty subject to hostile fire for calendar year 1968, pursuant to the provisions of 37 U.S.C. 310; to the Committee on Armed Services.

548. A letter from the Deputy Assistant Secretary of Defense (Properties and Installations), transmitting notification of the location, nature, and estimated cost of certain facilities projects proposed to be undertaken for the Air National Guard, pursuant to the provisions of 10 U.S.C. 2233a(1); to the Committee on Armed Services.

549. A letter from the Executive Director, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting a report on the backlog of pending applications and hearing cases in the Federal Communications Commission as of January 31, 1969, pursuant to the provisions of section 5(e) of the Communications Act, as amended; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

550. A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, U.S. Department of Justice, transmitting copies of orders suspending deportation, together with a list of the persons involved, pursuant to the provisions of section 244(a)(1) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, as amended; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

551. A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, U.S. Department of Justice, transmitting copies of orders suspending deportation, together with a list of the persons involved, pursuant to the provisions of section 244(a)(2) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, as amended; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

552. A letter from the president and chairman, Little League Baseball, transmitting the annual report of Little League Baseball for 1968 and audit of the organization for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1968, pursuant to the provisions of section 14(b) of Public Law 88-378; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

553. A letter from the national secretary-treasurer, Sons of Union Veterans of the Civil War, transmitting a report of the proceedings of the 87th Annual National Encampment of the Sons of Union Veterans of the Civil War, together with a copy of the 1968 audit of the organization, pursuant to the provisions of Public Law 605, 83d Congress; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

554. A letter from the Chairman, Federal Maritime Commission, transmitting the seventh annual report of the Commission for fiscal year 1968, pursuant to the provisions of section 103(e) of Reorganization Plan No. 7 of 1961 and the Merchant Marine Act, 1936; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BARING:

H.R. 7959. A bill to temporarily suspend the recent increases in fees for grazing of livestock on public lands; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H.R. 7960. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to allow a credit against the occupational tax on coin-operated gaming devices for similar new taxes imposed by a State where the operation of such devices is legal; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BARRETT (for himself, Mr. NIX, Mr. BYRNE of Pennsylvania, Mr. EILBERG, and Mr. GREEN of Pennsylvania):

H.R. 7961. A bill to provide a special milk program for children; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. BERRY:

H.R. 7962. A bill to encourage the employment of Indians in the performance of service contracts entered into by the United States; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H.R. 7963. A bill to redesignate the Badlands National Monument as the "Badlands National Park"; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. BRASCO:

H.R. 7964. A bill for the relief of certain distressed aliens; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BROWN of California:

H.R. 7965. A bill to require contractors of departments and agencies of the United States engaged in the production of motion picture films to pay prevailing wages; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H.R. 7966. A bill to amend the Federal Hazardous Substances Act to protect children from toys and other articles intended for use by children which are hazardous due to the presence of electrical, mechanical, or thermal hazards, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. BROWN of Ohio:

H.R. 7967. A bill to establish the Commission for the Improvement of Government Management and Organization; to the Committee on Government Operations.

H.R. 7968. A bill to create a catalog of Federal assistance programs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. BURTON of Utah:

H.R. 7969. A bill to provide for orderly trade in iron and steel mill products; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CASEY:

H.R. 7970. A bill to change the definition of ammunition for purposes of chapter 44 of title 18 of the United States Code; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CUNNINGHAM:

H.R.7971. A bill to provide an equitable system for fixing and adjusting the rates of compensation of wage board employees; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin:

H.R. 7972. A bill to make it a crime to move or travel in interstate or foreign commerce to avoid compliance with certain support orders, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. EDWARDS of California:

H.R. 7973. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to increase the amount payable on burial and funeral expenses; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H.R. 7974. A bill authorizing the Secretary of the Army to establish a national cemetery at Camp Parks, Calif., for northern California; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. EILBERG (for himself, Mr. BARRETT, Mr. NIX, Mr. BYRNE of Pennsylvania, and Mr. GREEN of Pennsylvania):

H.R. 7975. A bill to improve and increase postsecondary educational opportunities throughout the Nation by providing assistance to the States for the development and construction of comprehensive community colleges; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. ERLENBORN (for himself, Mr. AYRES, Mr. DENT, Mr. PERKINS, Mr. ESCH, Mr. STEIGER of Wisconsin, Mr. HANSEN of Idaho, Mr. GERALD F. FORD, Mr. SAYLOR, Mr. MCDADE, Mr. RUTH, and Mr. WAMPLER):

H.R. 7976. A bill to improve the health and safety conditions of persons working in the coal mining industry of the United States; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. FARBSTEIN:

H.R. 7977. A bill to amend section 231(b) of the Trade Expansion Act of 1962 to suspend the benefits of trade agreement concessions with respect to products imported from Poland; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. FINDLEY:

H.R. 7978. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to provide payment for chiropractors' services under the program of supplementary medical insurance benefits for the aged; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. FRASER:

H.R. 7979. A bill to amend title 39, United States Code, to extend to neighborhood improvement organizations or associations the special third-class bulk rates for nonprofit organizations; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H.R. 7980. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to raise needed additional revenues by tax reform; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. FUQUA:

H.R. 7981. A bill to amend title 5, United States Code, to include as creditable service for purposes of the civil service retirement system certain periods of service performed in Federal-State cooperative programs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. GREEN of Pennsylvania:

H.R. 7982. A bill to authorize the Small Buiness Administration to provide financial assistance to certain small business concerns suffering substantial economic injury as a result of the current work stoppages at east and gulf coast ports; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. HALPERN:

H.R. 7983. A bill to provide for the establishment of a national cemetery within the Manassas National Battlefield Park, Va.; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H.R. 7984. A bill to amend title 35 of the United States Code to provide for compulsory licensing of prescription drug patents; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HARSHA:

H.R. 7985. 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. HATHAWAY:

H.R. 7986. A bill to provide for the compensation of persons injured by certain criminal acts; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HICKS:

H.R. 7987. A bill to permit injured Federal employees to receive the benefits of the Federal employees compensation program notwithstanding they are in receipt of military retired pay, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H.R. 7988. A bill to exempt from the manufacturers excise tax on automobiles and parts and accessories tops designed and sold for use to provide sleeping quarters when mounted on an automobile truck body; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. JACOBS (for himself, Mr. McCarthy, Mr. Tunney, Mr. Brown of California, Mr. Ichord, Mr. Hanna, Mr. Brademas, Mr. Edwards of California, Mr. Adams, Mr. Kyros, Mr. Corman, Mr. Friedel, Mr. Meeds, Mr. Hicks, Mr. Hamilton, Mr. Edmondson, Mr. Galifianakis, Mr. Hathaway, Mr. Thompson of New Jersey, Mr. Pryor of Arkansas, and Mr. Van Deerlin):

H.R. 7989. A bill to extend benefits under section 8191 of title 5, United States Code, to law enforcement officers and firemen not employed by the United States who are killed or totally disabled in the line of duty; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JOELSON:

H.R. 7990. 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. 7991. 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. KYL:

H.R. 7992. A bill to amend the Federal Corrupt Practices Act, 1925, to prohibit the copying of certain records by mailing list brokers; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. KYROS:

H.R. 7993. A bill to prohibit the dissemination through interstate commerce or the mails of materials harmful to persons under the age of 18 years, and to restrict the exhibition of movies or other presentations harmful to such persons; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LUKENS:

H.R. 7994. A bill to provide for the establishment of a national cemetery within the Manassas National Battlefield Park, Va.; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. McCLOSKEY:

H.R. 7995. A bill to extend the executive reorganization provisions of title 5, United States Code, for an additional 2 years, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. MEEDS:

H.R. 7996. A bill to amend the Agriculture Adjustment Act, as reenacted and amended by the Agricultural Marketing Agreement Act of 1937, as amended, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mrs. MINK:

H.R. 7997. 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. 7998. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to provide payment for chiropractors' services under the program of supplementary medical insurance benefits for the aged; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MORGAN:

H.R. 7999. 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. MURPHY of New York:

H.R. 8000. A bill to amend title V of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. OLSEN (for himself and Mr. Daniels of New Jersey):

H.R. 8001. A bill to amend title 5, United States Code, to grant the entitlement to severance pay to certain classes of employees excluded from such entitlement by executive authority; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. O'NEILL of Massachusetts:

H.R. 8002. A bill to amend title 5, United States Code, to establish special requirements with respect to the retirement of air traffic controllers, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. PODELL:

H.R. 8003. A bill making a supplemental appropriation to the Office of Education to carry out the Bilingual Education Act for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1970; to the Committee on Appropriations.

H.R. 8004. A bill to amend the Urban Mass Transportation Act of 1964, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H.R. 8005. A bill to establish a Commission To Study the Organization, Operation, and Management of the Executive Branch of the Government, and to recommend changes necessary or desirable in the interest of governmental efficiency and economy; to the Committee on Government Operations.

H.R. 8006. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to conduct investigations, studies, surveys, and research relating to the Nation's ecological systems, natural resources, and environmental quality, and to establish a Council on Environmental Quality; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H.R. 8007. A bill to establish a Commission on Trading Stamp Practices to provide for the regulation of trading stamp companies, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 8008. A bill to amend the Federal Hazardous Substances Act to protect children from toys or other articles intended for use by children which present any electrical, mechanical, or thermal hazard; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 8009. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to increase the amount of outside income which a widow with minor children may earn without suffering deductions from the benefits to which she is entitled thereunder; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 8010. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to provide payment for chiropractors' services under the program of supplementary medical insurance benefits for the aged; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. POLLOCK:

H.R. 8011. A bill to amend chapter 44 of title 18, United States Code, to exempt licensees from recording sales of ammunition to residents of the State in which the licensee's business is located; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 8012. 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. RAILSBACK (for himself, Mr. Brock, Mr. Conable, Mr. Cowger, Mr. Erlenborn, Mr. Evans of Colorado, Mr. Hunt, Mr. Lukens, Mr. Meskill, and Mr. Whalley):

H.R. 8013. A bill to provide for the investigative detention and search of persons suspected of involvement in, or knowledge of, Federal crimes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RAILSBACK (for himself, Mr. Brock, Mr. Conable, Mr. Cowger, Mr. Evans of Colorado, Mr. Hunt, Mr. Lukens, Mr. McClory, Mr. Meskill, Mr. Thompson of Georgia, and Mr. Whalley):

H.R. 8014. A bill to amend title 28 of the United States Code to provide that any judge or justice of the United States appointed to hold office during good behavior shall retire from regular active service upon attaining the age of 70 years; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RAILSBACK (for himself, Mr. Brock, Mr. Conable, Mr. Cowger, Mr. Evans of Colorado, Mr. Hunt, Mr. Lukens, Mr. Meskill, Mr. Thompson of Georgia, and Mr. Whalley):

H.R. 8015. A bill to amend section 2312 of title 18, United States Code, to permit a person enforcing that section to stop a motor vehicle to inspect the serial number of its body and motor if he has reason to suspect that the motor vehicle has been stolen; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. REUSS:

H.R. 8016. A bill to encourage the involvement of youth in federally financed programs and projects; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H.R. 8017. A bill to provide for a congressional ombudsman; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. RIVERS:

H.R. 8018. A bill to amend section 1072(2) of title 10, United States Code, to include a foster child within the definition of dependent; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H.R. 8019. A bill to amend title 37, United States Code, to provide for the payment of uniform allowances to certain persons originally appointed, temporarily or permanently, as commissioned or warrant officers in a regular component of the Armed Forces; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H.R. 8020. A bill to amend title 37, United States Code, to provide entitlement to round-trip transportation to the home port of a member of the naval service on permanent duty aboard a ship overhauling away from home port whose dependents are residing at the home port; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H.R. 8021. A bill to amend title 37, United States Code, to authorize a dislocation allowance under certain circumstances, certain reimbursements, transportation for dependents, and travel and transportation allowances under certain circumstances, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H.R. 8022. A bill to amend title 37, United States Code, to authorize travel, transportation, and education allowances to certain members of the uniformed services for dependents' schooling, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. ROSENTHAL:

H.R. 8023. A bill to prevent the transportation 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.

By Mr. ROSENTHAL (for himself and Mr. Koch):

H.R. 8024. A bill to amend the National Housing Act to require disclosure of the applicable FHA-approved rent schedule and related information to tenants and prospective tenants of certain FHA-insured multifamily rental housing, and to require a public hearing before approval of any rent increase above the level specified in such schedule; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. ROUDEBUSH:

H.R. 8025. A bill to amend title 10, United States Code, to provide for an American Hero Award Medal to be awarded to the next of kin of members of the Armed Forces who lose their lives as a direct result of injuries or disease incurred in armed conflict; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. ST. ONGE:

H.R. 8026. A bill to amend title 10, United States Code, to equalize the retirement pay of members of the uniformed services of equal rank and years of service, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. SLACK:

H.R. 8027. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to provide disability insurance benefits thereunder for any individual who is blind and has at least six quarters of coverage, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. STEED:

H.R. 8028. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to lease certain deposits of minerals in the bed of the Red River in Oklahoma; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H.R. 8029. A bill to regulate imports of milk and dairy products, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. STUBBLEFIELD:

H.R. 8030. A bill to amend title 10, United States Code, to permit the recomputation of retired pay of certain members and former members of the Armed Forces; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H.R. 8031. A bill to designate the Okefenokee National Wildlife Refuge as the "Okefenokee Wildnerness"; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H.R. 8032. 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. TALCOTT:

H.R. 8033. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to study the most feasible and desirable means of establishing Monterey Bay, the coastal areas of Santa Cruz, Monterey, and San Luis Obispo Counties, Calif., certain portions of the tidelands, Outer Continental Shelf, and seaward areas of the United States as marine sanctuaries, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. WALDIE:

H.R. 8034. A bill to amend title 5, United States Code, to improve the basic workweek of firefighting personnel of executive agencies, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H.R. 8035. A bill to amend title 5, United States Code, to provide for the establishment of minimum and maximum age limits governing new appointments of firefighters in the competitive service; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H.R. 8036. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to permit a woman to become entitled to full wife's insurance benefits after attaining age 65 even though she became entitled to reduced old-age insurance benefits (or disability insurance benefits) before attaining that age; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 8037. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to provide disability insurance benefits thereunder for any individual who is blind and has at least six quarters of coverage, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BOB WILSON:

H.R. 8038. A bill to provide compensation for civilian American citizens and prisoners of war captured during the Vietnam conflict; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. WOLFF:

H.R. 8039. A bill to amend title 37, United States Code, to provide for the procurement and retention of judge advocates and law specialist officers for the Armed Forces; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. ZABLOCKI:

H.R. 8040. A bill to amend title 5, United States Code, to provide for the recrediting of annual leave forfeited as a result of administrative error, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. ZWACH (for himself, Mr. DENNEY, Mr. GOODLING, Mr. LANGEN, Mr. MAYNE, Mr. MILLER of Ohio, Mr. NELSEN, Mr. QUIE, Mr. REIFEL, Mr. THOMPSON of Georgia, and Mr. WOLD):

H.R. 8041. A bill to establish the Countryside Development Commission to study the economic problems of rural America; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. BINGHAM (for himself, Mr. ADAMS, Mr. BOLAND, Mr. BRADEMAS, Mr. BROWN of California, Mr. BURTON of California, Mr. BUTTON, Mr. COHELAN, Mr. CONTE, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. DELLENBACK, Mr. EDWARDS of California, Mr. ESCH, Mr. FARBSTEIN, Mr. FRASER, Mr. FRIEDEL, Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania, Mr. GILBERT, Mr. GREEN of Pennsylvania, Mr. GUDE, Mr. HALPERN, Mr. HAWKINS, Mr. HECHLER of West Virginia, Mr. HELSTOSKI, and Mr. HORTON):

H.R. 8042. A bill to establish a National Economic Conversion Commission, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. MORSE (for himself, Mr. KOCH, Mr. LEGGETT, Mr. MCCARTHY, Mr. MCCLOSKEY, Mr. MIKVA, Mr. MINISH, Mrs. MINK, Mr. MONAGAN, Mr. MOORHEAD, Mr. OTTINGER, Mr. PEPPER, Mr. POLLOCK, Mr. REES, Mr. REID of New York, Mr. ROSENTHAL, Mr. ROYBAL, Mr. RYAN, Mr. SCHNEEBELI, Mr. SCHEUER, Mr. SCHWENGEL, Mr. SYMINGTON, Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey, Mr. VAN DEERLIN, and Mr. WHALEN):

H.R. 8043. A bill to establish a National Economic Conversion Commission, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. BARING:

H.J. Res. 504. Joint resolution authorizing the President of the United States of America to proclaim September 17, 1969, "General von Steuben Memorial Day" for the observance and commemoration of the birth of Gen. Friedrich Wilhelm von Steuben; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LOWENSTEIN:

H.J. Res. 505. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relating to the conservation of the natural resources and natural beauty of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MACDONALD of Massachusetts:

H.J. Res. 506. Joint resolution consenting to an extension and renewal of the interstate compact to conserve oil and gas; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. QUILLEN:

H.J. Res. 507. 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. ST. ONGE:

H.J. Res. 508. 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. SANDMAN:

H.J. Res. 509. Joint resolution in honor of Amelia Earhart and Joan Merriam Smith; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SISK:

H.J. Res. 510. 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. WATTS:

H.J. Res. 511. Joint resolution creating a Joint Committee To Investigate Crime; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. BOB WILSON:

H.J. Res. 512. 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. HAWKINS:

H. Res. 286. Resolution to abolish the Committee on Internal Security and enlarge the jurisdiction of the Committee on the Judiciary; to the Committee on Rules.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

32. By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of Arizona, relative to recognition of the grazing rights of the Gray Partners on the Organ Pipe National Monument; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

33. Also, memorial of the House of Representatives of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, relative to tax incentives for businesses to locate in slums and offer job-training programs to the disadvantaged; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

34. Also, memorial of the House of Representatives of the State of Montana, relative to funds for aid to families with dependent children under the Social Security Act; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ADDABBO:

H.R. 8044. A bill for the relief of Anna Gioia Bosco and daughter, Francesca Bosco; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 8045. A bill for the relief of Antonino Cioffi; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 8046. A bill for the relief of Renato Recine; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 8047. A bill for the relief of Rosaria Tallegra; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 8048. A bill for the relief of Francoise Toussaint; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BARING:

H.R. 8049. A bill for the relief of Valerie Ann Handford; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 8050. A bill for the relief of McCarran Ranch; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BIAGGI:

H.R. 8051. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Antonia Alabiso, Filippe Alabiso, and Giovanni Alabiso; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 8052. A bill for the relief of Mariano and Dolores Cabigiosu; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 8053. A bill for the relief of Assunta Cacciuottolo; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 8054. A bill for the relief of Gennaro Cacciuottolo; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 8055. A bill for the relief of Giuseppa Constantino; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 8056. A bill for the relief of Antonio Carbone; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 8057. A bill for the relief of Bonaventura Di Lorenzo; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 8058. A bill for the relief of Salvatore Di Marco; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 8059. A bill for the relief of Salvatore Di Marco and wife, Maria Di Marco; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 8060. A bill for the relief of Hugh Dyer; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 8061. A bill for the relief of Maria Fontana; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 8062. A bill for the relief of Vito Gissara and Gaetano Gissara; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 8063. A bill for the relief of Andrea Guglielmi; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 8064. A bill for the relief of Raffaele Ippolito, his wife, Ada Ippolito, and their children, Giuseppe and Nunzia Ippolito; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 8065. A bill for the relief of Elio Lauria, his wife, Miniello Lauria, and their child, Eduardo Lauria; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 8066. A bill for the relief of Ippolita Maffei; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 8067. A bill for the relief of Assunta Morano; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 8068. A bill for the relief of Joaquina Maria Nabais; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 8069. A bill for the relief of Giovanni Recupito; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 8070. A bill for the relief of Luigi Siano; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 8071. A bill for the relief of Raffaele Turri; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 8072. A bill for the relief of Domenico Viscariello; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BRASCO:

H.R. 8073. A bill for the relief of Garzia Antonia Calogero; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 8074. A bill for the relief of Mario and Maria Titone; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BROWN of California:

H.R. 8075. A bill for the relief of Juan Guajardo; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BROWN of Michigan:

H.R. 8076. A bill to authorize Col. Helmuth Sprinz to accept employment with the Government of the Kingdom of the Netherlands after his retirement from the U.S. Army; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. BURKE of Massachusetts:

H.R. 8077. A bill for the relief of Ilse Breitenstein; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 8078. A bill for the relief of Adriana Forbes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CAREY:

H.R. 8079. A bill for the relief of Francesco Castelli and Giuseppa Castelli (also known as Giuseppina Castelli); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 8080. A bill for the relief of Giovannina Maria Cona and Angelina Cona; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 8081. A bill for the relief of John Henry May; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 8082. A bill for the relief of Rupert Rodney; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 8083. A bill for the relief of Enrico Scalarini and his wife, Giovanna Chiara Scalarini; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 8084. A bill for the relief of Luigi Scattarreggia; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 8085. A bill for the relief of Dr. Erlinda P. Vidal; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CASEY:

H.R. 8086. A bill for the relief of Marie Thorley; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 8087. A bill for the relief of I Ping Yu; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. CHISHOLM:

H.R. 8088. A bill for the relief of Audrey Jones; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 8089. A bill for the relief of Guiseppe Montemaggiore; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 8090. A bill for the relief of Angela Puglisi; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DANIEL of Virginia.

H.R. 8091. A bill for the relief of Ramon Cuasito, Jr.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DELANEY (by request):

H.R. 8092. A bill for the relief of Gregorio Buonocore and Filomena Buonocore; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 8093. A bill for the relief of Luigi Gambino; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 8094. A bill for the relief of Elmira Tanoy; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FARBSTEIN:

H.R. 8095. A bill for the relief of Lena S. Tillman; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FRIEDEL:

H.R. 8096. A bill for the relief of Dr. Delfin S. Santos and his wife, Mena A. Santos; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HAGAN:

H.R. 8097. A bill for the relief of Salvatore Frisella; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HALPERN:

H.R. 8098. A bill for the relief of Pietro Di Mino, his wife, Filippa Di Mino, and their minor children, Antonietta Di Mino and Alfonso Di Mino; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 8099. A bill for the relief of Dr. Indravaden S. Sanghvi and his wife, Jasu Sanghvi; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HATHAWAY:

H.R. 8100. A bill for the relief of Burrowes Manufacturing Corp.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HELSTOSKI:

H.R. 8101. A bill for the relief of Loucas Arvanitis; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 8102. A bill for the relief of Ciro Benanti; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 8103. A bill for the relief of Paul Disclafani; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 8104. A bill for the relief of Gaetano Geranio; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 8105. A bill for the relief of Alfio Lagalia; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 8106. A bill for the relief of Ciro Lala; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 8107. A bill for the relief of Antonino Raimondi; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 8108. A bill for the relief of Mr. Epaminodas Triantis; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JOELSON:

H.R. 8109. A bill for the relief of Andreas Boutsis; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LIPSCOMB:

H.R. 8110. A bill for the relief of Blagoje Nikola Zlatkovic and his wife, Nevenka Zdenka Zlatkovic; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McCLOSKEY:

H.R. 8111. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Balasan Babakhan; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 8112. A bill for the relief of Pilar Sartiaguda; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MINISH:

H.R. 8113. A bill for the relief of Dr. Yu Yung Lin; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 8114. A bill for the relief of Angelo Russo; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. MINK:

H.R. 8115. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Toyo Shota Ikeuchi; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 8116. A bill for the relief of Katherine Keiko Aoki Kaneshiro; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MURPHY of New York:

H.R. 8117. A bill for the relief of Teresa Antonaglia; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 8118. A bill for the relief of Angel and Azucena Avila; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 8119. A bill for the relief of Guido Barone; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 8120. A bill for the relief of Vincenzo Ianni; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 8121. A bill for the relief of Carlos Abel Majia-Herrera; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 8122. A bill for the relief of Alonso Gonzalez-Palacio; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 8123. A bill for the relief of Hector Antonio Rivas-Echeverri; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 8124. A bill for the relief of Jacob, Rivka, Eliyuhu, Moshe, Rina, and Ilan Rouach; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 8125. A bill for the relief of Javier Salazar-Ruiz; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 8126. A bill for the relief of Luis Enrique Sierra-Gonzalez; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PELLY:

H.R. 8127. A bill for the relief of Chun Chai Chung, Kyung-Wha Chung, Myung-Wha Chung, and Myung-Whun Chung; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PODELL:

H.R. 8128. A bill for the relief of Giuseppina de Magistris; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 8129. A bill for the relief of Noemi Sbili; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RODINO:

H.R. 8130. A bill for the relief of Zenaida I. Biroq; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROYBAL:

H.R. 8131. A bill for the relief of Paz I. Cruz; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SANDMAN:

H.R. 8132. A bill for the relief of Dr. Herminia Buni; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SCHADEBERG:

H.R. 8133. A bill for the relief of San Yun Kim and husband, Wan Young Kim; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WALDIE:

H.R. 8134. A bill for the relief of Provvidenza Piscitello; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WATTS:

H.R. 8135. A bill for the relief of Dr. Mohammad Kamali; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ZABLOCKI:

H.R. 8136. A bill for the relief of Anthony Smilko; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII,

69. The SPEAKER presented a petition of Gordon Levon Dollar, Springfield, Mo., relative to redress of grievances, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.