EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

PRAYER AND BIBLE READING IN OUTER SPACE BY AMERICAN ASTRONAUTS

HON. HERMAN E. TALMADGE

OF GEORGIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, May 8, 1969

Mr. TALMADGE. Mr. President, there appeared in the April edition of the Masonic Messenger, the official publication of the Grand Lodge of Georgia, F. & A.M., a splendid article on prayer and Bible reading in outer space by American astronauts.

This article, composed by Wilmer C. Tolleson, chaplain of Morningside Lodge No. 295 in Atlanta, emphasizes with great perception that ours is a nation and world under God and, whether it be in the outer reaches of space or here on this earth, He is the guiding force behind all that we do.

I commend this article to the Senate, and ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the Extensions of Remarks.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE VOICE IN GOD'S HEAVENS WHICH CAME TO US OVER TELEVISION 240,000 MILES AWAY

(By Wilmer C. Tolleson, Chaplain, Morningside Lodge No. 295, F. & A.M., Atlanta)

A miracle happened in the Heavens on the day before last Christmas, when the three astronauts were in space. The miracle to all of us was the voice of Captain James A. Lovell as he read from the Holy Bible the first words found in the first chapter of Genesis.

"In the beginning God created the Heaven and the Earth. And the earth was without form, and void; and darkness was upon the face of the deep. And the Spirit of God moved upon the face of the waters. And God said, Let there be light: and there was light. And God saw the light that it was good; and God divided the light from the darkness."

If there was ever a time for a man to carry the Holy Bible with him it was then. He and the other two needed God's words of comfort to give them strength, faith, hope and courage. Voices in themselves are miracles, each person having a different voice distinct from other voices, and each recognizable from others. (These are also among God's miracles.) The television announcer said that the voice coming from Apollo 8 was the voice of Captain James A. Lovell, Jr.

The miracle to our minds was the human voice coming from away up in the Heavens, God's Heavens and travelling to the listeners all over the world as they heard this voice repeat to millions a few words from the first chapter of Genesis.

As Captain James A. Lovell, Jr., repeated the words from the Holy Bible the moon was 70 miles below Apollo 8 and the earth was 240,000 miles away. It is good to know that Captain Lovell carried the Holy Words of Almighty God with him during this historic flight. Almighty God watches over us. He, watching over us, neither slumbers nor sleeps. We are in the Hollow of His Hand always. He, watching over Israel, neither slumbers nor sleeps.

After the invention of telegraphy these words were flashed around the nation: "See what God has wrought. Yes, it is Almighty God who gives us the mental ability to do all these creations. We speak of Science, yet without Almighty God we could not do any of the things that have been done.

We are so very dependent on Almighty God that we should keep His commandments and with all of our hearts study and obey them.

Let us with all our hearts rejoice and be glad that these three brave men, Borman, Lovell and Anders were returned to this earth through the merciful goodness of our God Jehovah. How great thou art. Oh sing my soul to my Master and my God, how great thou art. Let us consider how how close to God these men were. No man has ever chartered a course to God's dwelling place, although many of our good preachers are trying to get you to charter your course to God's Heaven each Sunday. How lovely is Thy dwelling place, oh God. Billy Graham, the great evangelist, is pouring out his very heart and soul to get you to charter your course to God's Great Dwelling place.

God's miracles are many and His blessings are continuous. Be strong in His strength.

CONGRESSMAN TALCOTT'S DEDICATION ADDRESS AT THE JAMESBURG EARTH STATION

HON. JERRY L. PETTIS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 8, 1969

Mr. PETTIS. Mr. Speaker, my distinguished colleague, the Honorable BURT L. TALCOTT, recently took part in the dedication of an important addition to the Nation's communications system in Jamesburg, Calif. This is the Jamesburg earth station which ties in the telephone, television, and telegraph facilities of the continental United States, via communications satellite, with those of Hawaii and four countries of the Pacific. Our communications satellite program is a matter of particular interest to me, as a member of the Science and Astronautics Committee, and I was most pleased that my fellow Californian, in whose district this new facility is located, represented Congress at the dedication.

Congressman TALCOTT's comments at the dedication ceremony explain the significance of this new station, and also mention the role played by California in binding the Nation together through communications. I would like to share his comments with our colleagues:

THE HONORABLE BURT L. TALCOTT, U.S. CONGRESSMAN, DEDICATION ADDRESS, JAMESBURG EARTH STATION, APRIL 25, 1969

Dr. Charyk, COMSAT's partners, Mr. Scroggs, ladies and gentlemen.

It is a special honor to participate in these dramatic spacemark ceremonies. We are always proud to welcome this caliber of new enterprise into our great and growing State. And it is a privilege to extend the congratulation of the people of California to COMSAT and its partners for the contribution that this new earth station will make to the advancement of our nation's communications capacity.

We take special pride in this new facility, because it again projects California into the forefront of modern world communications. This seems both fitting and proper. We have already become the center of our nation's aerospace industry, and a pioneering spirit has been the hallmark of our progress from the earliest days.

It is, in fact, exactly 125 years ago that another communications milestone was achieved about 125 miles north of here. That was the occasion of the completion of the first transcontinental telegraph line, and the historic message that flashed from San Francisco to Washington, D.C. In that dedication ceremony, on October 24, 1861, Stephen J. Field, then Chief Justice of California, telegraphed this message to Abraham Lincoln. He said, in part:

"The people of California desire to congratulate you upon the completion of the great work. They believe it will be the means of strengthening the attachment which binds both the east and the west to the Union, and they desire in this—the first message across the continent—to express their loyalty to the Union and their determination to stand by its Government on this, its day of trial. They regard that government with affection, and will adhere to it under all fortunes."

From this historic beginning, central California became the west coast communications center of the United States and then the gateway to the Far East with the advent of the radio telephone and then the trans-Pacific ocean cable in 1964. I was privileged to speak the first words via trans-Pacific cable—from Washington, D.C., to Ambassador Reischauer in Japan via the land fall station in San Luis Obispo County. I shall always treasure these two significant moments in communications history.

Now, in this beautiful quiet valley, in close proximity to the San Francisco cablehead, but away from the noises of the cities (which was a requirement in site selection of this station), millions of telephone, telegraph, data and facsimile messages, and television programs, black and white and color, will be processed electronically without a sound. Only the antenna reaches majestically toward the heavens. It appears merely to be gazing into space, but in reality it links our country directly with similar stations in Hawaii, four countries of the Pacific, and with others to come. And we especially look forward to the day when we shall also be in direct communication via satellite with our sister State of Alaska, where the task of building is reminiscent of the task our young State faced a century go.

Transportation and communication systems have always served as the lifelines in the movements of man, and as the umbilical cord in his social, economic and cultural development. The satellite has made live television possible among all nations bordering the Pacific and it has expanded their communications potential fantastically. Jet planes traverse the vast Pacific ocean in hours, and this will be reduced further with the advent of the supersonic aircraft. I foresee these sophisticated modern tools of progress as bringing the Pacific community of nations into ever closer understandings and harmony through economic and cultural exchange.

I trust you will believe, therefore, my closing observation. As Justice Field once saw the telegraph binding both the east and the west to the Union, I see this magnificent structure and the men who operate it play-

AUTHENTICATED U.S. GOVERNMENT INFORMATION GPO

ing a preeminent role in the potential that communications satellites have for increasing the level of understanding and harmony among the peoples of our planet that has never heretofore been possible.

MR. NIXON DEALS HIS CARDS

HON. STROM THURMOND

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, May 8, 1969

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, on April 21 radio station WBT in Charlotte, N.C., broadcast an editorial concerning President Nixon's domestic program. The editorial points out that "the things that he has proposed are reasonable rather than wild experimentation." He calls the President's program both practical and heartening.

Mr. President, I do not expect to agree with each and every proposal that President Nixon sends to the Congress; however, I believe that WBT has summed up the feelings of the majority of the American people toward President Nixon's domestic program, a program based on performance, not promise.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that this editorial entitled "Mr. Nixon Deals His Cards" be printed in the Extensions of Remarks of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MR. NIXON DEALS HIS CARDS

The preliminary outline of his domestic program which President Nixon has sent to Congress contains nothing that is startling or unexpected, yet it is a welcome indication that he intends to put the nation's house in order. Coupled with his earlier announcement that he expects to have a budget surplus of nearly $6 billion, this gives us an assurance that has been lacking for many years.

Of course a budget surplus is easier to promise than deliver, but the President has put himself so firmly on the side of government economy that we can accept his estimate with good faith. And the things he's proposed are reasonable rather than wild experimentation. The problems of poverty, hunger, job opportunity, transportation, crime, and inflation all come in for their share of attention. There's also good news that the postal system will be re-organized and that a start is to be made in sharing federal revenue with state and local governments—revenue which will allow them to carry a greater share of responsibility and hopefully reduce the amount of dictation from Washington.

Then there is the proposal which may not be the most important in the President's package but which will surely delight the vast group of middle-income citizens who just wrestled their way through the income-tax deadline; and that is the reform of the tax structure.

To know that someone is finally making an effort to plug the loopholes and remove the inequities in our tax system is almost like being rescued from drowning.

This station finds the President's program both practical and heartening. Congress of course must still pass on it. But the goals are so sensible we are allowing ourselves the hope that we might once again live under a government that is well-planned, well-organized, and well-directed.

EDITORIAL COMMENT BY THE NATIONAL SHERIFFS' ASSOCIATION

HON. JAMES HARVEY

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 8, 1969

Mr. HARVEY. Mr. Speaker, I would like to bring to the attention of the membership an editorial which appeared in the latest issue of the magazine, the National Sheriff. Written by Ferris E. Lucas, who serves in a dual role as executive director of the National Sheriffs' Association and editor of the association's official publication, I believe he has clearly established that departmental consolidation of our local law-enforcement agencies under the administration of the sheriff is a continuing and increasing trend.

But, the principal thrust and purpose of this well written editorial by Mr. Lucas—himself former Sheriff of St. Clair County in Michigan, which is included in our Eighth Congressional District, for a number of years—is a call for unity of all types of local law-enforcement agencies—be they village marshals, county police, sheriff departments, or city police.

Let me quote Mr. Lucas:

There are far too many who would break the law. There are far too many who would attempt to divide the forces of law enforcement so as to weaken the efforts of all. There are far too many reasons for closer cooperation than ever before. Internecine bickering can only hurt law enforcement while aiding those who live without the law.

The entire editorial follows:

LET'S LOOK AT THE RECORD

(By Ferris E. Lucas)

A Washington, D.C., area law enforcement administrator recently discussed his opinions of law enforcement and was widely quoted by two newspapers published in the nation's capital.

Unfortunately for the profession of law enforcement, this official's comments displayed an abysmal lack of knowledge concerning present-day trends in police administration.

The occasion for the statements was a news conference called after the sheriff of that county (which also has a county police force) had proposed that in the interests of efficiency and economy, the two departments be merged under the direction of the sheriff.

This particular chief of county police, possibly afraid for his job and therefore striking out blindly at anyone or anything which posed a threat to his private "kingdom," retaliated to the proposal by saying, "All over the country, the trend is to limit rather than enlarge the sheriff's authority."

He was also quoted as saying that a police department operated by a sheriff would be "backward, unwieldy, and dangerous."

This administrator continued, quoting from some alleged manual of police administration. Interestingly enough, the manual wasn't named specifically. This supposedly "authoritative" treatise on police administration purportedly said, or so our ill-informed public official would have us believe, "[The sheriff] is a mere bird of passage, never well trained and incapable of making his work a career service."

To those of us who know the true facts, the statements are laughable. However, when we consider that they may have been read by countless thousands of folk who might be grossly misled thereby, it gives us cause for genuine concern.

For this reason, it seems advisable to discuss the allegations and to set the record straight so that whenever or wherever such insidious distortions of the truth are encountered, the true facts may be made readily available.

If any trends are discernible in the nation today, they indicate the increasing popularity of departmental consolidation under the administration of the sheriff. An increasing number of cities, towns, and townships have voted to turn over all law enforcement duties within their jurisdiction to the sheriff. This trend is noted in all parts of the nation, in both large and small population counties.

We are all familiar with the contract law enforcement services offered by the sheriff of Los Angeles County, California.

Los Angeles County covers 4083 square miles and has a population of 7,000,000 residents. Jurisdiction of the sheriff's department, as set forth by government code, is the total territory and inhabitants within the county.

In addition to services rendered all of Los Angeles County, the sheriff's department is the sole policing agency for more than 1,750,000 citizens. Over 4000 sworn personnel provide service in a geographical area encompassing 3209 square miles.

Progressive California legislation enables cities to provide independent police service or, through mutual agreement, to contract for such service with the sheriff.

At the present time there are no fewer than thirty cities, covering 177 square miles, with a combined population of 710,000 residents that have contracted with the sheriff's department to handle their policing needs.

In many cases in Los Angeles County, contract municipalities have been able to enjoy greater-than-average police manpower at a cost of one-third to one-half the expenditures of neighboring self-policing cities of the same size.

To the north of California, in Malheur County, Oregon, we find another example of consolidation. Malheur County encompasses 9780 square miles with only about 23,000 inhabitants.

The county seat city of Vale asked that the sheriff take over the law enforcement function in Vale. The sheriff agreed to do so on a contract basis. The city policemen are now a part of his staff of deputies and he has the responsibility of providing for the policing of his entire county which is, incidentally, larger in area than the entire Commonwealth of Massachusetts. Malheur County has more than four times the area of Delaware.

Across the nation, in Duval County, Florida, the voters of the county and city (Jacksonville) balloted to consolidate the sheriff's and city police departments. These same voters also specified that they wanted the sheriff to administer the new, combined department. They further stipulated that, as in almost every other location, the sheriff remain an elected official, responsive and responsible to the voters.

The county-city of Duval-Jacksonville is now enjoying better law enforcement at less cost than was possible with the costly duplication of efforts which had existed.

In many counties, contractual law enforcement is prohibited by law for a variety of reasons. Some states, Michigan, for example, have passed enabling legislation to overcome this obstacle.

The Operating Director of the Police Legal Advisor Program of the Northwestern University School of Law, Wayne Walter Schmidt, has researched the concept of Sheriff's Corporation Police whereby a non-profit police corporation is formed. Mr. Schmidt recommends that the by-laws of the corporation

provide for the election of the sheriff as president of the corporation, "thereby giving him executive control."

There is scarcely a week goes by in which the National Sheriffs' Association is not asked for details or advice on consolidation matters.

It appears obvious that the *true* trend as disclosed by a study of the facts and the *purported* trend cited by the aforementioned public official are diametrically opposed.

What about the "bird of passage" garbage? Let us turn to some of the most well-known and widely respected experts in the field of present-day law enforcement training and education . . . men who can be and are identified by name . . . and who can verify any statement attributed to them.

In 1966, John Edgar Hoover, Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, said:

"America owes a great debt of gratitude to the thousands of sheriffs who today are doing such a magnificent job. We in the FBI appreciate the splendid cooperation which you . . . have given our Special Agents over the years. Your problems are our problems. We are partners on the same team. We are proud to stand at your side."

In that same year, John L. Sullivan, Assistant Professor and Coordinator of Police Science, Pasadena City College, Pasadena, California, authored a book, *Introduction to Police Science*, wherein he states:

"With roots stemming primarily from Great Britain, the sheriff of today in the United States has become an integral part of American law enforcement. The past has proven that the American people like to elect the top law enforcement officers in their counties."

In 1968, Edward A. Farris, Professor of Police Science at New Mexico State University, Las Cruces, New Mexico, wrote a book, *A New Vitsa For Sheriffs. . . . New Mexico.* He spoke of sheriffs in this way:

"In general it might be stated that the sheriff is the only viable officer remaining of the ancient offices, and his contemporary responsibility as (conservator of the peace) has been influenced greatly by modern society."

"While changes have been brought by technological and social advances, the framework of government within which the sheriff functions has not changed drastically. His duties and powers may be altered by the existing social and political climate, but his basic responsibility—to protect life and property—has not been diminished."

Also in 1968, Joseph J. Casper, Assistant Director of the FBI in charge of training, said:

"There is no honorable law enforcement authority in Anglo-American law so ancient as that of the county sheriff whose role as a peace officer goes back at least to the time of Alfred the Great.

"If there is one who seeks the remarkable characteristics of the office of sheriff, he will not find it solely in antiquity. The benefits of the sheriff and the job of the sheriff—the deeds and activities of the sheriff—will not be found in the renowned medieval sagas or in the tales of the American western sheriff. They are to be found, I think, instead in the aspects of this inmportant public office such as the vital jobs they perform in the area of our changing social, political, and economic lives—the competent discharge by men of dedication, who hold a job that has a host of functions both civil and criminal."

The "testimonials" could go on indefinately. The facts speak for themselves. Should any readers of *The National Sheriff* be confronted with any such unfounded and untrue allegations, perhaps these lines will serve to set the matter straight.

The writer has no quarrel with county police forces . . . nor with any other type of professionally-administered law enforcement operation.

We rather believe that the best type of law enforcement is that type chosen by the inhabitants of a particular jurisdiction whatever form it may take.

It has been said that the community enforces the laws; the police merely suppress the exceptions. If this be true, and there is evidence that it is, a community should be free to express its wishes in the creating and administering of one of the most significant forces with any community, i.e., the policing function.

Conversely, the writer does object most vigorously to erroneous statements whether issued by academicians, theorists, journalists, or members of our own profession. When these statements are not only erroneous but deliberately slanted for personal gain, they are doubly odious.

There are far too many who would break the law. There are far too many who would attempt to divide the forces of law enforcement so as to weaken the efforts of all. There are far too many reasons for closer cooperation than ever before. Internecine bickering can only hurt law enforcement while aiding those who live without the law.

The NSA continues to wish well to all its members . . . in whatever law enforcement jurisdiction or capacity they serve. We can only hope that no member of the NSA will be guilty of the type of anti-law enforcement diatribe which, intentionally or not, injures us all.

NEWSPAPER COMPETITION

HON. PAUL J. FANNIN

OF ARIZONA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, May 8, 1969

Mr. FANNIN. Mr. President, Monday, I was delighted to read an excellent editorial in the Evening Star which set forth a very cogent argument for pending legislation that has the object of preserving newspaper competition.

I ask unanimous consent that the editorial appearing May 5, in the Washington Evening Star be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Evening Star, May 5, 1969]

PRESERVING NEWSPAPER COMPETITION

It is no accident that an ever-smaller number of cities is served by two or more daily newspapers. Rather, it is a simple matter of economics. The costs of producing newspapers are skyrocketing. Yet the newsstand price needs to be kept within reach of the ordinary man's budget. Moreover, there is increasing competition from television and other media for the advertising dollar.

This is the context in which a bipartisan group of lawmakers have introduced the Newspaper Preservation Bill. The bill is designed to prevent a sudden, further decrease in competing newspaper voices by exempting newspapers from the broad sweep of a recent Supreme Court decision involving two Tucson, Arizona, dailies.

Tucson's Star and Citizen had cut costs by a joint operating arrangement, entered into 29 years ago, whereby they pooled production, advertising and circulation facilities, but maintained separate news and editorial departments, thus offering the community separate and competing newspaper voices.

The Supreme Court by a seven-to-one vote held this arrangement to be in violation of anti-trust laws. There are 21 other cities where two or more newspapers are maintained by virtue of joint operating arrangements. Each such arrangement would be effected unless the newspapers involved can prove that, at the time of their commercial merger, one paper was on the verge of bankruptcy and could not find another purchaser. The catch, of course, is that a newspaper once on its deathbed hardly ever recovers its readership and advertisers.

As a Justice Department lawyer told the Supreme Court, "if an exception (to existing anti-trust laws) is to be made, legislation is the proper course."

At this point, there is substantial bipartisan support for the Newspaper Preservation Act in the House and the Senate. Extensive hearings on this general subject have already been held. The time to act is at hand. Congress should pass this bill in the current session.

ENDORSEMENTS OF H.R. 8397—POSTAL OBSCENITY BILL

HON. JOHN E. HUNT

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 8, 1969

Mr. HUNT. Mr. Speaker, on March 6, my good friend from Ohio's 15th Congressional District, Congressman CHALMERS P. WYLIE, and I sponsored a measure, H.R. 8397, to prohibit the use of the mails or interstate commerce for the dissemination of obscene materials to minors or families with minor children residing with them.

The response to this proposal has been most encouraging, in terms of support for its prompt enactment, but the reaction is also disturbingly indicative of a mounting frustration of an aroused public which wants answers now as to why something has not been done to put the peddlers of obscenity out of business. One obvious difficulty has been the confusion arising from numerous decisions of the Supreme Court as to just what obscenity is and the extent to which the content of such materials should be protected in order not to offend the constitutional freedoms of speech and the press. This proposal, then, embodies the hope of the adult community, whose senses of propriety and morality have been offended, that their children will be afforded a protection of the law, by statute and judicial interpretation, not heretofore granted.

Congressman WYLIE's articulation of this controversial issue before his constituency has contributed to the endorsements of the Better Business Bureau of Columbus, Ohio, the local Buckeye Branch No. 78, and the National Association of Letter Carriers. I am pleased to insert in the RECORD a news report, carried in the April 22 edition of the Dispatch, Columbus, and commend Mr. WYLIE for his diligent efforts:

LETTER CARRIERS SUPPORT WYLIE'S ANTI-SMUT BILL

(By Jack Shough)

The 900 letter carriers operating out of Columbus Post Office, disgusted with delivering pornographic mail to residents, are throwing their support to a federal bill, which if enacted, might discourage the smut peddlers.

The bill to amend present law, was introduced March 6 by Rep. Chalmers Wylie R-Columbus, and is now before the Judiciary Committee of the U.S. House of Representatives.

It would prohibit the delivery of obscene materials to persons under 18 years of age or to any person who has a minor child residing with him.

Last week a South Side family complained their 10-year-old son had received an advertisement for a "marriage manual," complete with nude illustrations.

George Bonner, president of Buckeye Branch 78 of the National Association of Letter Carriers, said the 900 local men and women are supporting Wylie's bill.

He said a letter to this effect was sent to the congressman Tuesday.

"Letter carriers are embarrassed because we have to deliver this type of mail," Bonner said. "We know from experience what it is, and when you think of bringing it to homes it's disgusting."

He said the 900 local people are "adding their voice to the 220,000 other national postal employes to put some teeth in the postal laws against pornographic literature being sent through the mails."

In his letter congratulating Wylie and offering his union support, Bonner said in part:

"After a person has carried mail for any length of time he knows what kind of mail he is delivering . . . I have become half sick when I knowingly place this mail in the box knowing full well the clean living and wholesome family living there will resent such trash.

"I can hear the lady say, 'There goes George the mailman, I wonder what he brought us today' and know the shock she's going to get."

EMPLOYMENT OF THE HANDICAPPED

HON. GALE W. McGEE

OF WYOMING

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, May 8, 1969

Mr. McGEE. Mr. President, last week the Nation's Capital was honored by a visit from the various winners in each State of the 21st annual "Ability Counts" competition sponsored by the President's Committee on Employment of the Handicapped. These winners were 11th and 12th graders, who submitted essays on the theme: "What Every Employer Should Know About Handicapped Workers."

Among the many excellent essays in this competition was one by Patricia Lou Berry, of Cheyenne Central High School, my State's winner. I ask unanimous consent to have her essay printed in the Extensions of Remarks.

There being no objection, the essay was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WHAT EVERY EMPLOYER SHOULD KNOW ABOUT THE HANDICAPPED

(By Patricia Lou Berry, Cheyenne Central High School, Cheyenne, Wyo.)

The still warm summer air is heavy laden with the tang of cured hay. A muscular six foot rancher deftly loads his truck with bales of new hay . . . Cheers rally through the frosty fall air. An injured football player draws on all his strength to limp off the field. Quickly and expertly the trainer comes to his aid. Examining the injured player he immediately gives emergency aid . . . An anxiety torn expression is worn on the face of a slightly grayed gentleman as he steps on the elevator and quietly hums up several stories. Down the hall he enters the office of a prominent attorney to seek advice . . . A worried mother fidgets in her chair and glances at her small boy leafing through a comic book. The door clicks and the doctor nods for her to enter his office . . . The first session of the 1969 legislature is called to order. The musty air buzzes with plans for the new year. A representative takes the floor to debate an urgent bill.

A rancher, an athletic trainer, an attorney, a doctor, and a legislator. Each of these is serving his community in a very different, yet vital way. The image painted of them is one of respectable, hard working citizens. Let us look at each of these for what he can do; not what life has done to him. Yes, each of these is handicapped.

Endurance, patience and hard work symbolize the life of Dorance Berry. Working to produce top quality registered Herefords with his two brothers on a large ranch is his life.

Three years of hard work as a trainer proved a victory for Mike Fendley. There is a certain pride in rehabilitating the injured athlete. Summer months find Mike on a construction job. Polio struck and deformed Mike's leg leaving an obvious limp its trademark.

A dream come true—Law. Dick Tobin now has a practice of his own and a place as a respected lawyer in the state. Once paralyzed from the neck down he has now a taste of victory—he walks with a cane.

Curing his patients of disease which he has overcome, Doctor Preston remains one of the top bone specialists in the Rocky Mountain Region. His empathy is real, he knows how they feel. He defies his leg struck by polio to hinder him.

Active in state government we find Mr. Van Velzor in the House of Representatives this time of year. Also being a prominent business man he runs and owns two music stores. His stature conceals an artificial limb—a leg is gone.

Obviously the handicapped are an asset. "Experience has shown that a handicapped worker, properly placed in respect to his abilities, will turn out at least as good as and often better than his able-bodied associates." Why? Because a handicapped person who has overcome his defect has developed a strong character, a desire to prove his value and a need to retain employment.

Handicapped workers are quite impressive on the job. *The Monthly Labor Review* states they are just as efficient as co-workers. They have no more absenteeism, are just as safe, have lower injury rates and far less job turnover. They are not asking for special privileges. They want to be seen for their abilities.

There are many institutions set up in the State to help the handicapped develop their abilities. For example there is the Wyoming Summer School for the Adult Blind, the Community Business Services for the Handicapped, or the Division of Exceptional Children of the State Department of Education. Each of these is furthering the development of the handicapped and their skills. Now the handicapped are seeking employment where they can put their skills to use.

The handicapped have come a long way in overcoming misconceptions that people have of their abilities. Many have overcome personal barriers. Handicapped people have received a second sight that casts off the impression that they are unable, uncontributing citizens. They are now tasting a new life. They are proving to our modern society that love is not blind, deaf is not incapable, retarded is not stopped, handicapped is not unable! This every employer needs to know.

HOUSE REPUBLICAN RESEARCH COMMITTEE TASK FORCE CHAIRMEN OUTLINE GOALS

HON. ROBERT TAFT, JR.

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 8, 1969

Mr. TAFT. Mr. Speaker, on Tuesday, May 6, 1969, the House Republican Research Committee, of which I am chairman, held a press conference to outline the goals of the various task forces operating under the committee. Eight of the task force chairmen were present and made excellent statements concerning the projects planned for their respective study groups. I commend these gentlemen for their statements, and look forward to viewing the progress of the task forces.

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to bring these statements, plus my introductory remarks to the attention of my colleagues:

REPRESENTATIVE ROBERT TAFT, JR., CHAIRMAN, HOUSE REPUBLICAN CONFERENCE RESEARCH COMMITTEE

It is my pleasure to introduce the Chairmen of the Research Committee Task Forces.

These are the men who will be carrying a major share of the workload of this Committee.

We have outlined an ambitious study program for their task forces, and I am confident that they will produce extremely useful reports.

As you know, we have created nine task forces to study problems of urban affairs, earth resources and population control, education and training, agriculture and rural affairs, international trade, labor law reform, nuclear affairs, social security and human needs, and transportation.

While all of these areas have received some attention in the past, we believe there is much to be learned and much remaining to be done. Under the direction of their task force chairmen, the various study groups will dig into their areas of concern and report back to the entire Research Committee.

We are embarking on an ambitious research program which will take these task forces into some of the most complicated problem areas facing this country.

In the next few months, we look forward to hearing from these task force chairmen. I am confident that their reports will be of use to our colleagues in the House and will provide useful background material.

Several of the chairmen are here today, and would like briefly to outline some of the immediate goals they have in mind for their task forces.

REPRESENTATIVE ODIN LANGEN, CHAIRMAN, TASK FORCE ON AGRICULTURE AND RURAL AFFAIRS

The decision by the House Republican Conference and the Research Committee chaired by Congressman Taft to reactive the Task Force on Agriculture and Rural affairs is to be applauded. The leadership is to be commended for its full awareness that the problems of the farm, the rural community and the metropolitan areas cannot be isolated or separated.

The related activities of people living on farms and in rural areas provide jobs for approximately one-third of this nation's citizens and provide the food and fiber for all. Agriculture by itself represents America's largest industry, employing more people than the steel, auto, utilities and transportation industries combined. Agriculture is American Industry's biggest customer.

The House Republican leadership feels it intolerable that our farmers continue to operate on a deficit basis, with farm debt increasing at a rate of about 10 percent a year while income has remained almost constant. Farm production expenses are expected to again outdistance the gain in gross farm income this year.

It is equally intolerable that the average person on a U.S. farm today has only three-fourths as much income as the average nonfarmer, and that all of rural America, with a little more than one-fourth of the nation's population should have almost half of the nation's poor and more than half of the country's inadequate housing. Not to tackle these problems simultaneously and equally energetically with those of urban areas would be but to defer additional problems for the metropolitan areas at a later date.

In responding to the Republican leadership's call, we on the Task Force on Agriculture and Rural Affairs pledge to explore every possibility for the encouragement of sound economic growth and development on the farm and in the countryside. Rural America, with most of the nation's land area, has the human and other natural resources needed by all in the years ahead.

As Chairman, it is a pleasure to welcome these members to the Task Force: Robert V. Denney (Nebr.), Hamilton Fish, Jr. (N.Y.), George A. Goodling (Pa.), Durward G. Hall (Mo.), John Paul Hammerschmidt (Ark.), Thomas S. Kleppe (N.D.), Catherine May (Wash.), Alexander Pirnie (N.Y.), Robert Price (Tex.), Tom Railsback (Ill.), William J. Scherle (Iowa), and Keith G. Sebelius (Kans.).

REPRESENTATIVE WILLIAM O. COWGER, CHAIRMAN, TASK FORCE ON URBAN AFFAIRS

Seventy per cent of the people in the United States live in urban areas, according to 1960 census figures. Today, the figures are even higher. Our urban citizens, taxpayers and voters deserve a fair share of our attention.

The Task Force on Urban Affairs will be concerned with analyzing the complex problems confronting residents of the nation's cities and towns. Housing, services, safety, urban decay and renewal, local government, economic and environmental factors—these admittedly intricate questions have no simple answers. However, it is our goal to develop a system of priorities for urban America upon which a coherent, consistent Republican position can be built.

The plight of the cities is one of the most serious issues facing us today. Our task force is by no means alone in seeking solutions to these concerns. Many bills pertaining to the cities have already been introduced. The White House is taking an active role in guiding the development of urban policies and the executive agencies are focusing increasingly upon the urban sector. We will continue to cooperate with a number of organizations, among them the National League of Cities, National Association of Counties, National Governors' Conference, the U.S. Conference of Mayors and the various State Municipal Leagues.

REPRESENTATIVE GEORGE BUSH, CHAIRMAN, EARTH RESOURCES AND POPULATION CONTROL TASK FORCE

Every day the population of the world increases by 180,000 people. It is estimated that by the year 2,000 the population of the United States will be between 280 and 360 million and the population of the world, 7 billion. The problems that these additional millions and billions of people will create are unimaginable.

Now is the time to begin making preparations for these ever increasing mouths to feed. Now is the time to make the public aware of the consequences of a constantly increasing population—on ourselves, our children and on the environment in which we will have to live. Now is the time to remove the stigma from the words "population control" and "family planning". Now is the time to insure that every person in this country is aware of the voluntary services available for the asking and to insure that these programs are adequately continued.

There is so much that needs to be explored. When one glimpses the vast resources of the oceans, one cannot help but become excited about the possibilities of subsea farming, fish meal and many of the new ideas that are being advanced in this area. The use of the sea and space, as well as the use of the land, will play an important part in the world food supply.

I want to commend the leadership of the Republican Party and my colleague, Bob Taft, for having the courage to initiate action in this critical area. Frankly, I don't know that the task force will come up with a panacea that will solve the earth's problems, but I do know that we will be doing something constructive about them. We will be holding hearings, collecting data and publishing reports that, hopefully, will serve to educate our fellow members and the American people of the need to prepare for these population increases and for the reclamation and recycling of our resources. At the same time we will be working in close coordination with the White House and the Executive Branch to insure maximum support and understanding.

We will be striving to make these topics the subject of household conversation as only out of this kind of awareness can come the action needed.

REPRESENTATIVE JOHN DELLENBACK, CHAIRMAN, EDUCATION AND TRAINING TASK FORCE

No area of national concern is of greater long-range significance than the field of education. What Congress does in education will have a tremendous impact on the future of our nation's most valued resource, its people. Too often education is not suited to the needs of students. We must develop new policies and programs that will make education relevant and meaningful.

While there are important education measures coming before Congress, still other emerging problems merit our attention. The Education and Training Task Force will look into such areas as early childhood, vocational education, junior colleges, teacher preparation and recruitment and financing education. We hope to recommend new legislation and to develop a Republican policy in areas where Congress has not yet taken the initiative.

Education Task Force members are driving and innovative legislators who have had a great deal experience in the field of education. We will give our best efforts to this important and challenging assignment.

REPRESENTATIVE DONALD G. BROTZMAN, CHAIRMAN, TRANSPORTATION TASK FORCE

The various components which make up a nation may be compared to the human body, and in applying this analogy it may be said that transportation is our circulatory system.

Thus, if our national arteries are in bad repair, the other functions of the national body will suffer.

There is no doubt in my mind but that our national arteries have not kept pace with our progress and our problems, and that is true whether you speak from an economic, a sociological or an esthetic viewpoint. In varying degrees, we face in the 1970's chronic arterial disease on the land, on the waters and in the air.

There is a high degree of awareness on Federal, state and local government levels of the seriousness of the problem. However, the conversion of concern into public policy has been slow in coming, and I believe it is going to take a very large effort on the part of our nation's policymakers to assign the proper priorities to the application of our expertise and resources.

The Task Force on Transportation can, in my opinion, play a unique role in this process, since it will be unencumbered by the policies of the past and yet will be able to avail itself of the full body of knowledge about not only our problems but the human and physical resources which are available to solve them.

REPRESENTATIVE MARVIN L. ESCH, CHAIRMAN, TASK FORCE ON SOCIAL SECURITY AND HUMAN NEEDS

The Social Security System was established more than a quarter of a century ago, and although there have been many changes in it, there has never been an overall review of its effectiveness in meeting its goals. Our Task Force hopes to make an analysis of the entire system and recommend changes which appear to be appropriate. Our consideration will include such questions as: should benefits increase as the cost-of-living increases; are benefit levels adequate and to what extent are increases possible in relation to costs; has the public concept of Social Security as a full retirement fund rather than a retirement supplement been encouraged by false claims in Social Security literature; should the method of taxation remain on its present basis or should it be a percentage of total income; should "welfare" type functions such as disability benefits be separated from retirement benefits and, if so, should they be paid for from trust funds or from general tax revenues; are working wives equitably treated; and should the Social Security system be actuarily sound. We have made no prejudgment on the answers to these numerous other questions but feel that our senior citizens deserve our attention.

The question of welfare is one of the most politically charged and difficult facing all levels of government. Our Task Force hopes to concentrate on proposals to encourage those who are able to work to return to the working force. At the outset, we recognize that there are many who are disabled who cannot work through no fault of their own. Our programs dealing with these persons should assure that a decent standard of living can be maintained. Among the questions we hope to consider are: measures to increase work incentives by establishing a smoother transition from poverty into economic responsibility; the extent to which equalization of benefits among the states is possible or desirable; minimization of burdensome red tape and administrative regulations; means to retard the disintegration of family life; and the relationship between welfare, the poverty program, and the private sector and the need to coordinate programs.

REPRESENTATIVE SHERMAN P. LLOYD, CHAIRMAN, LABOR LAW REFORM TASK FORCE

It will be the objective of this Task Force to conduct studies and investigations and to formulate recommendations for long range legislative action in the field of labor legislation.

The Task Force is primarily interested in the problem of strikes which create national emergencies. The adequacy of present legislation to represent effectively the welfare of the general public in the case of a nationwide work stoppage will be closely investigated.

The Task Force will seek the advice and counsel of the Secretary of Labor, of authorized spokesmen of organized labor, organized industry and others who can make useful contributions to our objective.

The Task Force will also consider for possible recommendation, the recurring suggestion that the exemption of labor organizations from the provisions of the anti-trust laws should be removed.

REPRESENTATIVE CHESTER L. MIZE, CHAIRMAN, TASK FORCE ON INTERNATIONAL TRADE

"Open-minded inquiry will be our approach to the difficult and delicate problems of international trade.

"All Members recognize there are differences of opinion among Americans and within the Republican Party on basic trade policy. These differences will be sifted and weighed to determine the best possible course for this Nation to follow. It will be our responsibility to conduct in-depth analysis of such topics as East-West trade, protectionism at home and abroad, the balance of payments, the gold flow, and possible tariff revision for increased trade. Members of the task force, at the first organizational meeting held May 1, concluded that inflexible attitudes of the past were inadequate to successfully meet the challenge of the 1970's.

"The Task Force on International Trade will hold further organizational meetings in the immediate future, then will begin a systematic program of investigation and analysis. Position papers and studies will be developed for release from time to time.

"Our job will be to inform the Administration of our conclusions and to inform the American people as well. We hope to complement Administration thinking in an area where diverse views, economic and political, have caused confusion and conflict. The diversity of membership within our Task Force should provide an excellent forum for the exchange of views essential for development of a prudent, profitable, national trade policy."

MARTY ALLEN—MILITARY HOSPITAL ENTERTAINMENT TOUR

HON. CHARLES E. GOODELL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, May 8, 1969

Mr. GOODELL. Mr. President, starting on January 6, 1969, for 3 whirlwind weeks, Marty Allen, the comedian, canceled his personal appearances, and donated his time exclusively to the disabled veterans of the Vietnam war in hospitals here in this country.

Last year Marty had donated his time for a first tour with no publicity. In 1969 he was persuaded that more entertainers would be inspired to similar ventures, if he allowed the press to know about his "Second Operation Hello Dere."

Beginning in the Washington, D.C., area, Marty visited the Walter Reed Medical Center, the National Naval Medical Center, the Andrews Air Force Base Hospital, and the Kimbrough Army Hospital. From there he went to Pennsylvania, to Texas, Colorado, and California, visiting 16 hospitals in all, ending the tour on January 24 at Camp Pendleton Naval Hospital.

When he visits the hospitals, there is no advance notice that Marty is coming to the wards. Depending upon the given situation, he will exchange quips, react, or play it straight, usually ending up giving an autographed picture.

Currently the first entertainer of U.S. military hospitals, Marty hopes that many other entertainers will follow his example. He states:

These guys are a great audience, and they deserve everything we can do for them. You have to be careful though, or they might think you're condescending to do them a favor. Once they know you're sincere, they're with you all the way. Politics should not enter into the question of whether our Vietnamese wounded—whether recuperating here or overseas—merit as much consideration, concern, and happiness as show business personalities can give them. I don't want them to be forgotten men.

Mr. President, I wanted to inform my colleagues of the work that Marty Allen is doing. Hopefully, other personalities will follow his lead. Marty Allen is the kind of American that makes us all proud.

SUBMISSION TO ARMED STUDENTS HUMILIATING: NEGRO LEADER

HON. ROBERT H. MICHEL

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 8, 1969

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, last week I inserted an article in the RECORD quoting a few remarks of Mr. Bayard Rustin with regard to the antics of black militants on our college campuses around the country.

A more extensive account of his remarks together with some questions and answers put to him by a reporter appears in the May 5, 1969, edition of the Peoria Journal Star and I include the article in the RECORD at this point:

SUBMISSION TO ARMED STUDENTS "HUMILIATING": NEGRO LEADER

(By Brian Sullivan)

NEW YORK.—Bayard Rustin, long-time Negro civil rights leader, says colleges are taking a cheap way out by agreeing to Negro students' demands for black studies programs.

Instead, he says, colleges need to develop massive—but expensive—remedial projects to improve the scholastic level of Negro students and to enable them to make their academic way.

In a question-and-answer session with a reporter on Negro unrest on the campus, Rustin deplored violent protests and said it was humiliating to see college administrators and faculty submitting to Negroes with guns.

They wouldn't submit to "Ku Klux Klansmen coming on campus with guns," he said, and suggested this indicated the college officials didn't really consider Negroes equal to whites.

"They say, well, it's only Negroes behaving that way. They wouldn't tolerate this from white students," he said.

Rustin, who organized the March on Washington in 1963 and now is executive director of a A. Philip Randolph Institute, said Negroes had made substantial gains in educational opportunities.

"It is therefore all the more tragic that instead of taking advantage of the opportunity for learning, they are reducing the situation to a series of courses that cannot really prepare them for the kind of life they have to live."

The interview ranged over a spectrum of Rustin's views on campus problems, Negro militancy, and faculty reactions and concessions.

The questions and answers:

Q. How do you view the efforts to establish separate black studies departments?

A. I am very much opposed to separation under any circumstances, and I'm also opposed to black studies. And I believe it is a grievous mistake that there has not been the study of Negro culture history, but I'm opposed to it as black studies, because I believe there should be the integration of Negro contributions into the American historical forces, into the economic forces, and into other forces. For example, I don't think you should study the American Revolution without studying Crispus Attucks.

Q. Do you think that the college militants, black or white, have a valid protest?

A. I think there are valid reasons for protesting. I think administrators have been insensitive to the needs of college students. I think that in a society where we have war, racism and poverty, young people are justified in protesting. But, I'm not interested in protest that is going to strengthen rightist forces in this country. Nor am I interested in infantile leftism.

That's to say protest that is so outlandish that instead of causing the society to move forward, it, in fact, causes the society to move in the opposite direction. Now, my criticism is not of protest per se, my criticism is of particular types of protest.

I could name a few—first of all, I'm very much opposed to the use of violence as a means of protest—the appearance of youngsters on campuses carrying guns and attempting to get decisions while holding guns at the heads of the administrators is first of all very bad for the students.

Second, it is humiliating to me to see college professors and presidents so filled with guilt and so masochistic as to submit while they would not submit to Ku Klux Klanists coming on the campus with guns. Why do they submit to Negroes? Because they really do not believe as yet that Negroes are equal. They say "Well, that's only Negroes behaving that way." They wouldn't tolerate this from white students.

I'm against what I call putschism, brown shirtism. Any time 20 or 30 people seize buildings, which must be used by thousands of people, they're being putschists. In addition, they're being elitist, that is to say, they think they have the right to make the decisions for thousands of people where no vote has been taken. Who are they that they should do this? So I say violence, elitism, putschism have no place in social protest in this nation and certainly not on the campus.

Q. What kind of demonstration would you lead on a campus in a protest you consider justified?

A. I believe people have the right to withdraw. They have the right to go on strike, but not to interfere with other people. They have the right to refuse to go to classes, they have to right to carry on any form of nonviolent protest.

Q. Do you think Negroes have made significant gains in the past few years, within the education system?

A. I think there have been a number of important gains. The U.S. government expects that by 1975 there will be 400,000 Negro college students. The fact is in 1969 there are over 400,000. We are way ahead of schedule—largely because of the education bill which President Johnson introduced and Congress passed.

There are many, many campuses where only three or four years ago Negro students did not have an opportunity to attend. Now they have been offered scholarships, or special cases have been made to encourage Negro students to come on campus.

It is therefore all the more tragic that, instead of taking advantage of the opportunity for learning, they are reducing the situation to a series of courses that cannot really prepare them for the kind of life which they have to live when they get out of college. Now here again I'm all for studying in an integrated manner. Just as I'm for integrating whatever contributions Jews and Irish and Italians made into our whole history, I'm for integrating the contributions of blacks. However, in the long run, what one has to come out of college with, is a degree which prepares one to do something significant in the society. We need doctors, we need lawyers, we need people with degrees in economics and sociology and a myriad number of things. People ought to use their

time in college really to specialize and to be able to make a contribution.

Q. There were reports that black students at Cornell armed themselves from fear of an imminent attack by some white students. You mentioned psychological stress that the ghetto student is under when he is dropped into an Ivy League school. How are you going to resolve this?

A. There is a police matter or, better still, a matter for the university to take care of. If the university cannot take care of it, then it's a police matter. I think there's been brutality to Negroes for centuries. We have been able to mount a concern about brutality to Negroes precisely because people were fairly convinced that Negroes were not engaged in aggressive violence.

It's going to be increasingly difficult now when people see pictures of young Negroes carrying guns for us to get attention called to that degree of brutality which is still left in our society. People will get the notion that Negroes are engaged in aggressive violence and, therefore, that the brutality may be justified. So I think these people are doing us a grave disservice with these guns. And I simply do not believe that there are organized groups of white college students on campus, at this point, which are prepared to attack Negro students with violence and guns. If Negro students continue to carry guns, that may very well happen later.

Q. How are we going to resolve this, given the feelings of the black militants?

A. The college administrations will have to be honest with themselves; first of all, believe that Negroes are equal to other people and treat them accordingly. If Negroes and any other students engage in this kind of behavior, something must be done to prevent it.

And I think the college administration needs to stop playing young Negroes cheap. Now everybody knows that the ghetto schools and high schools are basically inferior. Efforts to get more youngsters into college and through college is a good idea, but it must not be done in a cheap way.

Now, it's very inexpensive to give in to the demands of Negro students for black studies. But it's also ineffective. What colleges should be doing is spending hundreds of thousands of dollars for remedial work, bringing the students' mathematics up, bringing their reading rate up, bringing their ability to write a decent sentence to the fore, developing their thinking processes through courses which are useful. But of course this will require a much larger teaching staff, many more hours of teaching.

Let me put it another way. There is no Italian history of the United States. There's no Jewish history, there's no black history; there is American history and whatever role Jews, Italians and blacks have played in it ought to be written as it occurs and integrated into the whole picture. Therefore, you have American history.

The problem is we have not yet had American history, because blacks have been excluded. You don't deal with that problem of American history by doing the opposite thing now.

Q. What do you think of Harvard allowing Negro students to have a voice in selecting teachers for the Afro-American studies department?

A. I am all for students being consulted on all courses given at the university; I am not for students having the right to hire and fire teachers. Furthermore, why should Harvard give this right to black students for black courses, but not to a total student body, for the hiring and firing of professors?

Q. Can you answer that question?

A. I think it's a form of not caring, of a reverse racism. They are saying, "Okay, we face a problem where Negro students are churning things up on the campus. We don't give a damn about them, really, so if they want to take courses which are fairly useless let's give them the courses."

Q. In summary, what's the root of the campus problems?

A. One of the problems is that young Negroes are facing the shock of integration. They have been partially integrated, but there is a distance in their minds between what they aspire to be and what the conditions they have lived under makes it now possible for them to be. The conflict between this aspiration and ability creates many internal confusions. Therefore one is often tempted, instead of fighting that conflict through, to revert to one's self, to look inward . . . So that if I set up courses myself I'll set them up so I can pass them. And that, you see, is what I mean when I say there should be lots of money and energy spent in helping the young Negro over that psychological barrier.

There's only one way to do that. That is to give him enough tutoring, enough remedial work so that when he does finish college, he will finish on a par with all other students.

RHODESIAN CHROME

HON. STROM THURMOND

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, May 8, 1969

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, Mr. Jack Kilpatrick's column in the Evening Star of last Tuesday points out that the U.S. policy with regard to the Rhodesian chrome situation is pure folly. I have addressed myself to this problem on the floor of the Senate on more than one occasion. As long as 2 years ago, it was evident that the U.S. policy toward Rhodesia would result in a serious situation in which we would become dependent upon Soviet mines for our chrome supplies.

Mr. Kilpatrick points out that the Communists have made a fat profit off the Rhodesian situation while American-owned companies in anti-Communist Rhodesia have been frozen out of the picture.

Mr. Kilpatrick describes this situation as lunacy. I can think of no better word to describe it and I hope that when the Nixon administration finishes its announced full-scale review of the southern Africa situation that commonsense will prevail.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the article entitled "Rhodesian Chrome a Lesson in U.S. Folly," published in the Evening Star of Tuesday, May 6, be printed in the Extensions of Remarks.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Evening Star, May 6, 1969]

RHODESIAN CHROME A LESSON IN U.S. FOLLY

(By James J. Kilpatrick)

The chrome ore deposits of Rhodesia surely rank low on a list of the sexiest subjects a columnist might find to write about, yet the dismal story of U.S. policy toward Rhodesia—and the effect of that policy on a vital industry—offers an instructive theme.

Almost no one has much to say any more about Rhodesia. Not in this country, at least; and even in the British press, the volume of comment dwindles. Plainly, Rhodesian independence has become a fact of political life. Just as plainly, the punitive economic sanctions imposed by the United Nations have failed in their purpose.

The White House disclosed last week that the President has ordered a full-scale review of U.S. policy toward all of southern Africa. Presumably, this study will embrace the whole series of bad judgments, blunders, and political follies in which Great Britain, the United Nations, and the United States have shared. If the President obtains some outside advice—outside Joe Palmer's office in the State Department, that is to say—perhaps the study will lead to a wiser course. And if Nixon wants an expert consultant for the task, he could not do better than to ask Dean Acheson to draft the report.

The immediate problem as to chromium may not wait upon a leisurely policy study. Chrome is a vital element in the production of stainless steel and other high-strength steels used in American defense. We have to have it.

In years gone by, when American policy toward Africa made more sense than it has seemed to make lately, our steel industry obtained crome ore from Rhodesia. The finest chrome deposits in the world lie at Selukwe, about 140 miles south of Salisbury, and in the North Great Dyke 40 to 50 miles west of the capital city. Two American companies, Union Carbide and the Foote Mineral Company, own the mines.

Prior to December of 1966, when the U.N. embarked upon its vain and wrongful intervention in Rhodesia's domestic affairs, the Foote and Union Carbide mines provided a steady source of ore for the free world. The mines are not of overwhelming significance to the Rhodesian economy; they provide jobs for several hundred native workers and bring in some useful income, but the ore exports never approached tobacco as a factor in Rhodesia's trade.

As the U.N.'s sanctions progressively were tightened in 1967, the two American companies were compelled to cease operations. They could not even import some 200,000 tons of ore that already had been mined and put in stockpiles—ore that already had been paid for. It is their property. Present U.S. policy prevents them from putting it to use.

Meanwhile, the American steel industry had to have chrome. The only alternative source—and what an irony it is—lay in the Soviet Union. The Communists were happy to make a fat profit off the Rhodesian situation. So for the past two years, American steelmakers have had to depend upon Communist suppliers of chrome ore, while two American-owned companies in anti-Communist Rhodesia have been frozen out of the picture.

This lunacy has other aspects. The peculiar geological nature of Foote's serpentine mine demands continued operation. The hard-pressed government of Ian Smith has been providing some maintenance, but it is sheer folly—dangerous folly—to risk the loss of this important source of chromium.

For roughly $1,000,000 a year, a sum too small to matter to anyone, the Foote mine could be saved. All that is required is a common sense decision on the part of our government to let Foote spend it in Rhodesia. A second commonsense decision would permit the companies to import the ore they already have stockpiled.

These actions ought to be taken at once, without waiting upon the policy review. Great Britain could hardly object, for Great Britain herself has allowed for hardship cases in the Rhodesian mess. The African bloc in the U.N. doubtless would howl, but so what? Nixon came into office pledging a fresh approach in foreign affairs. One such fresh approach would lie in candidly placing our own national interests in first place, ahead of the political concerns of

Prime Minister Wilson and a few black despots in central and northern Africa. Such a course would be sound in principle, and sound business practice, too.

SPEECH BY EDWIN M. HOOD, PRESIDENT OF THE SHIPBUILDERS COUNCIL OF AMERICA

HON. THOMAS N. DOWNING

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 8, 1969

Mr. DOWNING. Mr. Speaker, for the past decade Mr. Edwin M. Hood, president of the Shipbuilders Council of America, has been one of the most able and dedicated advocates for a strong U.S. merchant marine and for American seapower in general. Recently before a Propeller Club audience in Texas he paid tribute to the remarkable job which our space scientists have accomplished in overtaking and surpassing the Soviet Union. At the same time Mr. Hood called for a similar "national attitude of determination and dedication" which is so urgently needed if we are to prevent Soviet domination of the world's oceans.

His message is clear and his language is such that every American can understand and should heed the warning. I am pleased to include them in the RECORD:

SPEECH BY EDWIN M. HOOD, PRESIDENT, BEFORE THE PROPELLER CLUB OF THE UNITED STATES, PORT OF THE SABINE, BEAUMONT, TEX., MARCH 25, 1969

In these days of controversy and confusion, it is frequently said that agreement on public problems or national issues is impossible. The present debate on the merits or demerits—depending on one's point of view—of deploying an anti-ballistic missile system would seem to infer the accuracy of that statement. On the other hand, the popular acclaim extended the recent Apollo mission in outer space would seem to adequately refute the point and to sunggest that the nature of the times is not completely, or always, diffident or dissident.

The latter example has captured the public fancy. It has all of the elements of adventure. It stirs the imagination and emotions of all Americans. It represents a successful blending of people, skills, talents, technologies, capabilities and resources. It composes the symbol of a contest in which a late-starter has emerged as an impressive participant, and conceivably an exceptional victor.

In almost every department of outer space achievement, the United States has surpassed the Soviet Union, and every American can accordingly be proud of the collective teamwork of our space agency complex and of the individual courage of our astronauts. But, these accomplishments could have been far less impressive, virtually impossible, without the strong impetus of a national policy—a national attitude of determination and dedication—favoring primacy over the Russians.

President Kennedy, in a 1961 message to the Congress on urgent national needs declared: "It is time . . . for this nation to take a clearly leading role in space achievement, which in many ways may hold the key to our future on earth." His words, eight years ago, set the stage for the remarkable Apollo 9 mission, only two weeks ago. He offered a new inspiration to the American people and committed the United States Government to its fulfillment.

Once it had been declared as a matter of national policy that our nation would not founder in the backstream of the space age, the people reacted through their elected officials. All of the elements of capability—all of the requisites of success—began to fall in line. Federal funding was forthcoming; technical skills and professional disciplines transferred from other activities; the scientific, technological, manpower, and financial resources of the country were marshalled; production facilities were constructed; manpower training was quickened; and research and development reached out in unprecedented ways.

As a result of this determined national policy and supporting national attitude, our astronauts will soon land on the moon—a feat which many formerly considered impossible.

Can the same results be achieved with respect to sea power? That is a question of important substance with a timeliness equal to that of landing on the moon. The question arises from the uncertainties of present times not too dissimilar from those which prompted President Kennedy to call for rededicated action and substantial progress with respect to space efforts just eight years ago.

The Soviet Union, in eight years plus two, has perhaps been more successful in connection with its efforts on the oceans than it has been in outer space. Admiral Thomas H. Moorer, USN, Chief of Naval Operations, puts it this way: "By any measuring stick, they (the Soviets) are today the second largest sea power in the world. In a mere 10 years, the Soviet Union with dedication of purpose, huge outlays of funds, and with priorities equivalent to or even surpassing their space programs, has transformed itself from a martitime nonentity to a major sea power."

Year by year, the Russians have perceptibly narrowed the margin of U.S. sea power superiority. Year by year, U.S. naval and merchant fleets have been undergoing progressive qualitative decline, though it must be recognized that the too few ships constructed or being built in this country are perhaps the most sophisticated ever conceived by man.

In any event, the Soviet Navy is today second only to that of the United States, and a Committee of the Congress has concluded that "In naval matters the United States no longer enjoys clear-cut military and technological superiority." The Soviet merchant marine will shortly be larger than the American flag maritime fleet in terms of tonnage, but it has already surpassed the number of active U.S. flag merchant ships on the high seas. Russian fishing and oceanographic ships are perhaps the most modern afloat, and Soviet trawlers equipped with sophisticated electronic gear are employed as "lookouts" for the Russian Navy.

The geo-political implications of this steadily growing communist armada to the national security of the United States and the collective security of the entire Free World have been brought into sharp perspective by the withdrawal of the British Navy from historic outposts, the imposing presence of the Soviet naval fleet in the Mediterranean Sea and the aggressive solicitations of commercial cargoes by the Russian merchant marine.

When viewed against the high ratio of overaged ships in the U.S. Navy and the American merchant marine, when viewed against levels of ship construction output of the recent past, the changing power structure on the oceans is a proper cause for national concern.

Admiral John S. McCain, Jr., Commander of U.S. Forces in the Pacific, warns that Russia is already engaged in an "undeclared" war against the United States for control of the seas. Says Admiral McCain: "It is a war of design and construction, of manpower and national resources, of money, planning and organization—and the signs are that we are losing it."

There is considerable evidence of increasing public concern. In this case, the national attitude has clearly been ahead of national policy for the past five years. Signs that we were losing the space race impelled President Kennedy to make his historic declaration of 1961, already mentioned. No comparable call "for the nation to take a leading role" over the Russians in terms of sea power was forthcoming from President Johnson.

On the contrary, in the past five years, the seeming policy of the Executive Branch of the Government was to discount or minimize the obvious outward thrust of the Soviet Union to the seas. Prior to the start of 1969, Administration spokesmen pontificated with bland, and unsupportable statements, to the effect that Russia's expanding maritime strength represented no menace to the United States or to the Free World.

An alert journalist revealed that a former Administration official had directed that the Soviet sea power threat was to be "played down" to keep a lid on public demands for effective correction of the high degree of obsolescence in our naval and our maritime fleets. There were repeated reports of State Department intercession to prevent the formulation of a constructive national policy for fear that other countries would object to the American merchant marine carrying more than 5 percent of our own trade and commerce.

Whatever the reason, the statistics applicable to the present situation are hardly comforting.

Latest intelligence information suggests that the Soviet shipbuilding industry can now equal our current nuclear submarine construction capability. Defense Secretary Melvin R. Laird told the Senate Armed Services Committee, only last Thursday, that the Russian submarine production rate is now one per month. This development further suggests an expansion of capacity and the acquisition of technological proficiency of considerable magnitude over the last six to eight years.

The Russians have been building many more merchant ships than we have. Last November, they were constructing 458 ships compared to our 62. There are other startling statistics: for the past several years new ship deliveries to the Russian merchant fleet have outpaced U.S. deliveries by a ratio of nearly 6 to 1 . . . about 80 percent of the Soviet shipping fleet today is less than 10 years of age, while approximately 80 percent of the American merchant marine is 20 years of age or older . . . in the past 20 years, more than 1,000 ships have been added to the Russian merchant marine, while in the same period our shipping fleet has contracted by about 1,000 vessels . . . 58 percent of the ships in the U.S. Navy are at least 20 years of age, and less than one percent of the Soviet Navy's surface combatant ships and submarines are 20 years old or older.

In assessing the serious obsolescence in our Navy fleet and the steady decline of our merchant fleet against the backdrop of advances in Soviet sea power, the distinguished Chairman of the House Committee on Armed Services, the Honorable L. Mendel Rivers, last Wednesday, said: "It can be best described in one word: Shocking."

President Nixon, during the 1968 presidential campaign, said that "if we permit this decay to continue, we will find that we have abdicated our maritime position to none other than the Soviet Union." In essence, he echoed President Kennedy's challenge: "It is time . . . for this nation to take a clearly leading role" on the oceans. He has evidenced an intention to meet this situation through measures to assure U.S. supremacy at sea at all times . . . to assure the constant availability of a U.S. Navy second to

none . . . and to restore the United States as a first-rate maritime power.

The program and policies to carry out these declared national goals have yet to be announced. But this much can be said: there is a national attitude of optimism and support favoring full achievement of the sea power goals defined by President Nixon, and achievements on the oceans will more directly, more intimately, hold the key to our future on planet earth. Freedom of the seas, access to the seas, will long control our destiny.

THE IDEALISM OF AMERICAN YOUTH

HON. LEE METCALF

OF MONTANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, May 8, 1969

Mr. METCALF. Mr. President, American young people today are a generation more concerned over the course of events in the Nation and the world than perhaps any in history. Their concern sometimes takes extreme forms, and young people have thus been subject to vilification and sometimes have been the victims of policemen's clubs. Many Americans, I think, tend to lump the "new generation" into a single category and define it by its most outrageous members.

I believe this is grossly unfair—because there are so many devoted, unselfish, and capable young people who provide a far better definition of our younger generation.

One of these young people, Russell Twedt, son of Gordon Twedt, president of the Montana Farmers Union, recently spoke before the National Farmers Union on the concerns of America's young people. Russell is a freshman at Montana State University in Bozeman, and I think he was a remarkably articulate witness for young people today.

His main topic was the preservation of the family farm, and he spoke of the tacit assumption on the part of many in the "establishment" that economic forces beyond man's control have rendered the family farm obsolete. Russell deplores what he sees as an abject submission to economic forces at the expense of human and social values. Young people, he says, place more value on human beings than they do on the so-called practical needs of an economic machine. He speaks not only of preservation of the family farm, but of dozens of other ways in which the young see society as a tool for the betterment of human life rather than as a mindless mass.

The speech is a fine expression of the idealism of American youth, and I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the speech was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SPEECH OF RUSSELL TWEDT, MEMBER OF THE NATIONAL FARMERS UNION, SENIOR YOUTH ADVISORY COUNCIL, 67TH ANNUAL CONVENTION, MARCH 16, 1969

Flossie Nikkel, President Dechant, Mr. Johnson, Mr. Ray, Members of the convention: Last fall when I entered the ranks of American university students as a Freshman, I enrolled in one of our nation's several Colleges of Agriculture, which of course includes the various general areas such as Agricultural Business, Agricultural Education, Agricultural Science, and one conspicuous area entitled Agricultural Production, which they have conveniently branched off into several other minor headings which all inevitably lead back into one of the other major areas. All this, as I saw later, was to eventually guide the student away from any hope of "going back to the farm" and making a successful life of it. Cleverly as this was disguised, I came face-to-face with the problem later when I took a course orienting us with the over-all scheme of the College of Agriculture.

In this course we were to hear the same line from the representatives of every department in the College: Get into something besides plain Agricultural Production. In a few years there won't be enough farms left in your state to support 1/50 of you. You say you love Agriculture? Agriculture is your whole life? Well, you'd better get into some phase of Agricultural training that will land you a job with one of the big corporations who will soon control all the farms in your area. It's the only way you'll be able to remain affiliated with the type of life and community you rural youth have come to live and need. And even the small rural communities you're used to won't be the same any more. If they're even still there, they will soon be the same "company towns" as are exhibited by other industries controlled by the same few factions. There won't be enough people to support that small church you belong to, or to maintain a satisfactorily-functioning school within reaching distance.

No, the human and social side of this problem can have no bearing on the situation, just as with all the other problems of our society, it is an economic and political surety.

What really woke me up, though, was the fact that all these professors seemed to accept this situation without objection or question, and as a result, almost all of the students involved are led to accept it as final also.

This, I believe, is one of the main reasons I'm standing before you here tonight, and why I'll be here all my life, as all the other dedicated people in Farmers Union; fighting to overcome this feeling of helplessness when it comes to *solving* our problems rather than be taken over.

Don't misunderstand me; these students fully *realize* the impact this is going to have on their lives and future, and understand the *causes* of it; but when asked what they will do to *change* it, they come back with what *has* to be the classic excuse of all time: "What can *I* do about it? I'm only *one man!*" Well, Ladies and Gentlemen *you and I know* there are *several* ways to go about it, but as for the *main* one, it's going to take all of us here and *more* to go out and *show* that type of people what we have learned *all our life* in Farmers Union, that we *can* have strength in unity, where we are helpless standing alone; that truly "when the Union's inspiration through the farmers' blood shall run, there *shall* be no power greater anywhere beneath the sun!" That we *do indeed* have in our hands a power "greater than the might of Armies magnified a thousand fold." Because *we* feed those Armies, and what power could have *more effect* on a *man*, an *Army*, or a *Nation* than the basic physical need for food? Food for thought, we ask? This trend of thought could open many *new* possibilities.

But, it's this feeling of *helplessness*, or *hopelessness*, if you wish, that we have to vanquish if we are to have a continuation of the basic democratic traditions of thought and practice.

Americans today *are worried* about the direction they see their country heading. What's worse, so many of them feel powerless to *do* anything about it individually, and don't expect any change, that may have "given up" on it altogether. This feeling seems much more predominant among such oppressed or minority groups as poverty-stricken people, Negroes, and Indians. They look at it as a "materialistic society—the age of the fast buck," where they can't run their own lives and make their own decisions any more. As one of the many Negro militants who have given up any hope of trying to change or improve the "White Society" puts it: "There's no way to reform your system, baby; it's rotten from top to bottom; and it's gonna come down . . .," and yet another, "You made this system and you must change it. It's corrupt to the core." Although I don't agree with the philosophy that there can't be any change, I know we must face reality in dealing with the problems we have created. Sure, we provide job-training programs and aid to oppressed people through welfare, but when there are no jobs they can get afterwards and prices are raised above their meager allowances, what good does it do?

I believe that before we can solve the major problems confronting our society, we have to look at the underlying causes of them which must be eliminated first, oftentimes individually. In the words of Sen. Harris of Oklahoma, "Equality of social, economic, and political opportunity must be made real, immediately, for all Americans."

We must face reality. And change is the most real thing about our age. One main reason we're more alarmed about change *now* is that we're more aware of it. It's hitting "close to home." We can no longer enjoy the comfort of ignorance and unawareness. America's population grows at the rate of 6400 people a day. With larger and growing populations, we naturally have larger growing problems.

In facing reality, we must face our future. Our lives and society have changed because there are a great many more of us, and there *will* be *still* more. Other forces of change parallel population growth. Knowledge and technology have literally exploded, and as we as students change to keep up with it, we must also be allowed other changes to go along with it. We can't afford to let some phases of our society advance while others just as important lag behind. If we are ready to handle the advanced material we find in our schools today, we are surely ready for the responsibilities that accompany the use of it. While the average age of qualifications for everything else goes down and down, I believe the age for adults status should be included. We young people want to be involved; want to participate in the decisions affecting our destiny, and feel frustration and more alienation when this desire isn't satisfied.

Because today's young people are the best educated and most idealistic ever, they feel the pressures of modern society more acutely than anyone. I believe that we young people are becoming more and more alienated from adult society, as we live in a world of ever-increasing change and adults live in their already-patterned worlds not nearly so involved with change. Thus, we have an ever-widening split we have come to know as the "generation gap." With the lower maturity age, and the longer education time, we are being held out of adult society for longer than at any period in our history.

We want this to change. Now, we find ourselves outside, questioning the values adult society believes in. Unlike the adolescent of a generation ago, we find no one to pattern ourselves after other than members of our own age group, wherein we find practically all our activities, as well as our values and leaders, behavior and dress, language and customs. We try on our own to find meaning in life, and therefore desire more authority over our life and future. This feeling of alienation is aggravated even more when the youth in question is among the poor or oppressed people of America. These types of

people are becoming increasingly aware of the exploitation they are subject to at the hands of many of our faulty welfare programs, but, since they're generally unorganized and powerless, this knowledge brings them not results, but more frustration. This adds to the feeling of alienation and inferiority which is almost forced upon them, and consequently on their children, making the situation worse instead of better. This type of situation is worsened even more by the problem of racial discrimination. In the words of one Negro economist, "There are a lot of poor people who are poor because they are black, but there are not any white people poor because they're white."

As a former U.S. Attorney General said, "Racial discrimination also furnishes the grist for the Communist propaganda mills and raises doubt even among friendly nations as to the intensity of our devotion to the democratic faith." And to quote Senator Harris once again, "For all white Americans the persistent gap between ideal and reality has done severe damage to our collective mental health. As a nation, we have been living a false life, and, deep down, we know it and *have* known it all along." He goes on to say, "But, while the alarms are sounding throughout America, it is not too late for hope."

I believe that the best illustration of this lies in the issue closest at hand—the family farm. Even with all today's programs for the support of agriculture, rural life is still terribly substandard on the whole in America. As a result of this disparity between the quality of life in the cities and that in the rural areas and small towns, there has been a flood of migrants to the cities. Accompanying that is the movement from inner city to suburbs, and many even across country and state lines. This mass movement has made it very difficult for an increasing number of Americans to put down or maintain any roots, to retain family and community ties. All these forces of change in America have placed enormous tresses on the traditional institutions around which our sense of community and sense of direction have centered—the home and family, the school, the church, and the local government. We must know that, more than anything else, a renewed feeling of community is our greatest need—and it must be fullfilled.

Although there *is* a very definite movement of land ownership to corporate-type absentee control, accompanied by a great rural-to-urban shift of our population, the family-type farm *is still* the basic pattern of agriculture in America. We must fight and fight *now* to keep it that way! This trend has gone on too long already. I believe the family farm *does indeed* provide the best possible environment for the development of individual personality and character for stability of good family life, for strength of rural communities and their institutions such as churches, schools, and private business establishments, as well as protecting our basic American democratic traditions of thought and practice. Farming is a *way of life* for many of us, and an *important* one for our American society. If it's statistics you want, there *are* studies proving that communities consisting of family-owned and operated farms *are* more progressive and wholesome in terms of education, religion, business, and overall community life, than are either urban communities or comparable rural communities dominated by huge agricultural tracts run by managers and manned by transient workers.

Throughout the world, throughout history, one of the greatest causes of poverty, ignorance and disease (which are the underlying causes of revolution) is the concentration of land in the hands of the wealthy few. If you'll look into history, you'll find that one of the first and foremost endeavors of almost all new revolutionary governments is that of land reform, as it directly or indirectly affects all other phases of government and society.

And seemingly "contrary to popular belief" we *could* have the type of farm program here in America which *would* keep land ownership in the hands of the people, *and* allow family farmers, large *or* small, to earn full parity income.

But when we have such a feeling of complacency, indifference, helplessness, whatever the case may be, we are *never* going to accomplish anything. It is going to take great *individual* effort, a great *unified* effort to even *begin* to put ourselves back on the road to prosperity. The first few major steps toward the necessary *legislation have* been taken, but it's *not* going to continue by *itself*. It's going to take all of us here and more to keep the ball rolling. We *know* we have much opposition, but it's a task we *must overcome* if we are to continue as a successful democracy. It's up to *us here* to get the rest of the needed force *interested*, and even more than that, up and *doing* something about it! Is *is* true that when *one* of us as an *individual* makes a certain commitment, it doesn't mean much in our society today. *But when* a number of individuals are led to or make the *same* commitment, we really begin to make an impact on "the Establishment".

Getting people to make such a commitment, I believe, is the duty of each and every one of us as citizens. It is a responsibility each of us *must* accept if we are to steer our society in the right direction away from the "crisis" it definitely faces today. It is a *crisis* of *change*, and just that name for it should imply that it pertains to far more than just Agriculture. We young people in *rural* America are involved in *all* our society's problems, just as we think *other* Americans should be aware of the problems of *rural* America. We young people of America are striving more and more each day to prove that, among other things, the "Establishment," as we know it, is *not* a permanent fixture, any more than any other facet of our society in the face of today's unstoppable change. We know that anything which tries to assume such a position of permanence in this world of ever-increasing change will inevitably either submit to change or meet a death which in some cases has proven to be violent.

By the same token, some people who can't stand to see the forces of change and progress win out resort to violence in an attempt to stop it. Lee Harvey Oswald—James Earl Ray—Sirhan Sirhan—to name a few.

This change is not always *complete* change, the way I see it. An "establishment" can meet changes and still continue to survive and function successfully if it absorbs the forces of change and makes within itself the necessary moderations and advancements to "keep up with the times." The basic illustration of this, I believe, is our American democracy, which has stood with the same basic foundations for nearly two centuries, and I hope many more, because of its ability to adapt to new situations as they evolve. The same basic principle applies, in my opinion, all the way down through such smaller-scale issues as family farming. I sincerely believe that we family farmers and small rural communities *can* make all the necessary technological and other advancements *without* having to change our whole economic system of land ownership and control. I think that *both* the human and social side *and* the economic or practical side of *all* these problems *do* overlap, and that they *can* do so harmoniously. Therefore, I say that we *must not* and *cannot afford* to keep these problems separate, if we are to find satisfactory solutions to them.

What can we Americans, especially we young people, do in finding solutions to these problems? First, we *must* realize that our country is *indeed* facing a crisis of major proportions. Among other things it is a crisis of personal values, as we look for our place in today's society. We search for meaning and purpose. We aren't happy, because the quality of our life doesn't match our affluence. We must accept change and shape it to our own desires, *not* let it rule us. We must realize that our greatest concern today and our greatest hope for the future *is* our youth. Americans everywhere are searching for a renewed sense of community, and we young people hardest of all. We must resolve to take more account of the individual—particularly the young and the poor. Individual effort will be more important than any other, but we also need a commitment and mobilization led at the highest levels of our government, to meet the crisis of our day. It *will* cost us, but as a former Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare said, "We are in deep trouble as a people. And history is not going to deal kindly with a rich nation that will not tax itself to cure its miseries." And we should be aware that doing nothing will cost us much, much more.

We must campaign not just against *discrimination*, but against *prejudice*, which has been called the *number one* mental health problem in America. We will *all* benefit by giving *real* equal opportunity to *every* American. We need to make improvements, both urban *and* rural, in housing, employment, education, and in our welfare programs. The job ahead for just rural youth is astounding. One of the most *crucial* tasks is closing the gap between world food production and growing population. As long as there is threat of starvation, it overshadows all other problems. I believe that, although slowing the massive population growth isn't the sole solution, it is an indispensable *part* of the answer.

Our rural educational facilities must be brought into the main stream of society through better teaching aids, techniques, and attitudes. We must strive to bring to sparsely settled areas the highest quality of instruction for the largest number of students. This also pertains to health and welfare services. This will mean that rural areas must become attractive as places to work and live for both the professional and non-professional people who will be needed. Rural communities will prosper when their residents enjoy high quality education for their children, adequate health and welfare services, and employment close to where they live. As a result, all the surrounding communities will prosper and be able to support many more extensive activities, therefore further erasing the old lines between urban and rural.

But all this will remain "dream stuff" unless we plan now for tomorrow. Only through cooperative effort and careful planning can these dreams come true. Those who *choose* to live in rural America must be given a meaningful opportunity to *do* so. In the words of Snorri Thorfinnson, "Our *two* worst enemies are *complacency* and *indifference*. Both of these are afflictions of the spirit, and *both* are curable by *ourselves*."

In ending my comments in reference to "the corporate invasion of Agriculture," I would like to reemphasize some wise and far-reaching words that *I've* really taken to heart, written by a man I can have nothing less that admiration and respect for, our national president, Tony Dechant, who says: "The corporate invasion is still in the beginning stage. Some people see this trend as inevitable—that it cannot be stopped. Not only *can* it be stopped, it *must* be stopped. We should not concern ourselves only with trying to decide what the future of American Agriculture is *going to be*—but what it *should* be. We should not accept any trend as inevitable. What is happening in America is *because* of our public policy, not *in spite* of it." He goes on to say, "The Agricultural establishment of this nation is *more* than land. *People* are involved. We in Farmers Union believe that it is in the national interest that we decide—now—what direction we want to go. And *now* is the time to start doing something about it."

So you see, Ladies and Gentlemen, tonight I have just tried to impress upon you the fact that we young people do recognize and understand the problems of our society. We

don't want just to *rebel;* we want to *better*. This *is* our country; it will very soon be in our hands. We want nothing *more* than to be ready for it, and *it* ready for us. It is not yet *in* that state, but it *has* to come to reality, just as surely as *we are coming* into the picture. We hope and pray that it *is* going to be a *new* and a *better* picture. We need more and better understanding among generations, among *all* our people, among all *mankind*. We need more and better education, more and better legislation, more and better co-operation, which I think is the most important of *all*. Although we are not completely *ready* for this awesome task, as I said, we want nothing more than to *be* ready, just as it *must* be ready for us *and* our changes. We cannot attain all these goals by *ourselves*, Ladies and Gentlemen; we *still* need your help—*and* your *trust*. We are willing to earn it. Thank you.

AMERICAN LEGION CELEBRATES 50TH ANNIVERSARY

HON. CARL ALBERT

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 8, 1969

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, the American Legion was organized in Paris, France, in March 1919. Recently the Oklahoma Legislature adopted a resolution expressing its congratulations to the American Legion on its 50th anniversary. Under the unanimous consent request, I include a text of that resolution, Enrolled House Concurrent Resolution 1032 of the first session of the 32d Oklahoma Legislature.

Text of resolution follows:

ENROLLED HOUSE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 1032

A concurrent rsolution congratulating the American Legion on its 50th anniversary; and directing distribution

Whereas, the American Legion was organized in Paris, France, in March, 1919; and

Whereas, following the return of the World War I veterans, the American Legion held its first caucus in St Louis, Missouri, at which it adopted the preamble "For God and Country" to tell the world that the Legion stood for service to the widows and orphans of those killed in World War I and to the wounded and disabled; and

Whereas, the American Legion has become the largest veterans' organization in the world comprised of some three million veterans of four wars—World War I, World War II, Korea and Vietnam; and

Whereas, twenty-two Presidents of the United States of America have served their country in time of war and associated with the Legion; and

Whereas, through the past fifty years, members of the organization have served the people of America with dedication and devotion; and

Whereas, the American Legion has become a driving force against communism and oppression through the world; and

Whereas, the year 1969 marks the fiftieth Anniversary of the American Legion and on May 1, a Fiftieth Anniversary program will be celebrated in the House of Representatives, where World War I veterans met on May 3, 1919, to elect delegates for the St. Louis caucus, to commemorate fifty years of service by the Legion to community, state and nation; and

Whereas, it is fitting and proper that the First Session of the Thirty-second Legislature of the State of Oklahoma pay tribute to the men and women of America who have made the American Legion the dynamic and united group of veterans it is today.

Now, therefore, be it resolved by the House of Representatives of the first session of the thirty-second Oklahoma Legislature, the Senate concurring therein:

Section 1. The First Session of the Thirty-second Legislature of the State of Oklahoma hereby extends to the American Legion its heartiest congratulations and sincerest wishes for continued service to the community, state and nation.

Section 2. Duly authenticated copies of this Resolution shall be transmitted to each member of the Oklahoma Congressional Delegation and to Department Headquarters of the American Legion, Oklahoma City, for distribution to Department and National Officials.

Adopted by the House of Representatives the 28th day of April, 1969.

REX PRIVETT,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.

Adopted by the Senate the 28th day of April, 1969.

GEORGE NIGH,
President of the Senate.

FELLOWSHIP AWARD TO LYNN R. DUNSON, OF INDIANAPOLIS, IND.

HON. BIRCH BAYH

OF INDIANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, May 8, 1969

Mr. BAYH. Mr. President, I was pleased to learn that one of the 20 recipients of fellowships awarded recently by the Washington Journalism Center for study in the Nation's Capital next fall was Miss Lynn R. Dunson, of Indianapolis. The fellowships, which carry a $2,000 stipend, are designed to encourage and provide experience for young men and women interested in newspaper careers.

As a deserved tribute to Miss Dunson, who is now a student at Indiana University but formerly was employed by the Indianapolis Star, I ask unanimous consent that a brief article which appeared in that newspaper on May 5 be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STAR REPORTER ON LEAVE GETS NATIONAL FELLOWSHIP

WASHINGTON, D.C.—An Indiana University senior on leave from the reportorial staff of The Indianapolis Star is among 10 Negroes with newspaper experience awarded fellowships by the Washington Journalism Center yesterday.

The student is Miss Lynn R. Dunson, 27 years old, Indianapolis, who returned to I.U. at Bloomington last fall to complete work on a bachelor's degree after having worked as a reporter for The Star since July, 1966.

Miss Dunson, who covered stories in the social welfare field, including antipoverty programs, won Community Appreciation for Service in Public Enlightenment and Relations (CASPER) awards in 1967 and 1968. The awards are presented by the Community Service Council of Metropolitan Indianapolis.

Ten other Negroes with little or no experience in newspaper or television-radio work also were awarded fellowships.

She is a Ford Foundation fellow.

Under the fellowship program, offered to encourage Negroes to follow careers in journalism, the 20 fellows will spend 16 weeks in Washington, beginning Sept. 2, and each will receive $2,000 for living expenses.

They will attend special seminars with Federal officials, members of Congress and Washington reporters, and will pursue in-depth investigative reporting projects or work as interns with Washington news bureaus.

REMARKS OF THE HONORABLE FRANK J. BRASCO BEFORE THE HOSPITAL FINANCIAL MANAGEMENT ASSOCIATION

HON. FRANK J. BRASCO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 8, 1969

Mr. BRASCO. Mr. Speaker, I wish to submit for the RECORD a transcript of the address I have today delivered before the Hospital Financial Management Association:

Reverend Clergy, Mr. Chairman, Distinguished Guests, and panelists, Ladies and Gentlemen: I wish to extend my thanks for being given the privilege of addressing this body today. As the Keynote speaker, I believe that most everyone hopes to hear something new and different. As a Legislator and member of the Banking and Currency Committee of the House of Representatives, I find it rather difficult to tell you, who are the prime movers in fiscal management and hospital administration, what is novel, change, and daring experimentation.

To you who are the experts, the challenge in the oncoming years is extremely great. Social and economic movement, changes in hospital services and management are creating greater and larger frontiers. Therefore, to all of you falls the awesome responsibility of contributing to the framework of our health programs, locally and nationally. All of us understand what the problems are, but, a review must be undertaken so as to some light on what the future may be. The possibly give another image and maybe cast most important problem as a Legislator is the status of our present health structure and its socio-economic implications.

When 25 percent of our nation can be ill-housed, or ill-clad, or poorly fed, or of poor health, our future as a great nation is seriously threatened. When the disadvantaged in any of these segments are disbursed throughout 50 States in pockets of poverty. There is much need for reform and change. I must classify these pockets as ghettos. They are not ghettos from the ethnic aspect, but a ghetto in the sense that a moat surrounds and separates the deprived whether Appalachian, Indian, Eskimo or Negro, whether in an Urban center or a Rural district, from the mainstream of our affluent society. These blights cannot exist if we are to retain our leadership in the world Community.

This deprivation undermines the health of our 50 million citizens. Our purpose is to see that these citizens as well as all others receive the best service, health wise sociologically and economically.

Health is not a privilege, Health is a right and a basic one, that must be constantly reinforced and watched. It therefore is your privilege and purpose to see that the quality of care shall be of the highest standards and available to all. The cold, hard benches of the clinic and its impersonal approach has to be done away with. The automation type of care to the disadvantaged must be set aside. The bleak wards with bed after bed must be a thing of the past.

We must realize that in this time of mass visual communication, not one segment of our population is unaware of what the other has. In New York City, the task is even

greater. Massive, archaic Municipal Hospital system, which for years should have been constantly rehabilitated must either be corrected or phased out. Yet if this is to be corrected with the new Agency, as written into law by the State Legislature and Governor, to be called the New York City Health and Hospital Corporation, will not in and of itself be the answer, since poverty, housing, disease and lack of opportunity all act as retardants for any isolated advancement.

We must resolve ourselves to the thinking that welfare is only a first-aide measure and not the answer for the ill.

So, in order that a Health Program be successful, no matter how great or diversified, there must be the other partners. Adequate Education, Proper Housing, Equal Opportunity, and Guaranteed minimum wage.

We must address ourselves to the problem that is particularly important to New York City. At one time or another, various estimates on a number of physicians who are not staff members, of the hospitals of the City of New York. This number ranges from 5000 to 7500 physicians who are disenfranchised from the mainstream of medical practice, through lack of hospital privileges. The shortage of physicians is great. The need for utilization of all resources is mandatory. The failure to employ these physicians in this urgent program does great disservice to the general populous, as well as to the physician himself, who is being deprived of hospital based continuing educational programs and in-service training.

Substitution of physician manpower by paramedical personnel is not the answer and most certainly will never be the cure. The creation of more medical training facilities should be of top priority. Funding must be generously advanced by federal agencies in conjunction with a private sector. Research and development activities must be advanced in all institutions, but not under the same budget ascribed for patient care.

The Federal Government, through the popular Title XVIII and IXX have of necessity become partners with you of the hospital industry. The spiraling costs of health is causing many legislators and many agencies to take a second look. A 50 billion dollar industry which appears to continually escalate its price cannot be handled with a Laissez-Faire approach. The Federal Government cannot honestly subscribe to the concept that within one institution the reimbursement is different for Medicare, Medicaid and Blue Cross. We must suppose that those who are recipients of Medicare and Medicaid or Blue Cross contract are all receiving the same care, yet in many instances, there are Medicaid reimbursements that are higher than the 2 prior mentioned plans. One questions therefore, whether the ward medicaid care is superior in quality and quantity to that of others.

With New York State's push for Federal Government to assume the major responsibility of Welfare Funding, we must now reflect on whether the so-called rugged individualism of some hospital operations are as fiscally prudent as it is claimed, and furthermore, are they tendering through this mechanism the best possible medical care. The Federal Government if requested to assume a responsibility of this nature can no longer idly sit by and let things go on in some instances in a rather imprudent fashion. The new requirements of the Joint Committee on Accreditation of Hospitals are requesting that the Board of Trustees of Hospitals have a documented budgetary expenditure.

A bill in the State Legislature to amend the Public Health Law created a method of establishing hospital cost control. Medicaid reimbursement was frozen, and it is anticipated in some quarters that there may be some relief from this. Senator Anderson, in the Senate of the United States, on February 28, 1969, introduced Senate #1195; a bill to amend the Social Security Act, so as to provide a more uniform, orderly, economical and equitable method of payment for hospitals, extended care facilities, nursing homes, and intermediate care services, under programs established by or pursuant to such Act. Within the bill, the Secretary was given broad powers to implement the intent of this legislation.

Ladies and gentlemen, it is readily apparent that strict guidelines are to be formulated. Many questions arise. Why is it possible in one Community that the reimbursement for several hospitals may vary as greatly as they do. In some instances as much as 40 dollars per day. Todays mark of 100 dollars reimbursement is a truism, and it appears to be skyrocketing itself out into infinity. Many hospital leaders have said that the increase is due to labor cost. I don't believe that skilled nurses should receive less than many civil servants. I don't believe that Technicians should be priced considerably lower than those in industry. I definitely do believe that the service workers, porters, and others are entitled to a living wage, and not to be the exploited element in our society. A $1.60 or $2.00 per hour is not consistent with the cost of living for a family of four, which is felt to be $6,000 by some. I do believe that the interns and residents should be paid a wage that would not strap them economically, but all these increments must come out of the hospital care budget, which would reflect itself in the reimbursement formula and not include those personnel engaged in research and development, or other activities, which are extremely vital, but not part of patient care.

Hospitals vied with each other in their construction, and built Marble Halls and started raising costs of basic construction from 10 to 15 to 45 thousand dollars per bed. The Hospital no longer was a place to care for the ailing. It started to assume the proportions of a resort hotel. But, to curtail an extravagant movement in construction, or reduplication of facilities is not only thrifty and prudent, but has a "yankee" characteristic of good business.

The problem now resolves itself—How much of this 100 dollars per day cost is reflected in true patient care. How much of it is reflected in a Marble Hallway. How much is reflected in electric beds, T.V. sets, and fancy decor. How much of this 100 dollars is vital for the patient. How much of this 100 dollars can you people save from being expended in order to reach the true figure of Health care. Yours is the responsibility to see that there should not be a premium compensation for inefficiency. Leadership in this direction is your responsibility. In this free society, it must not become necessary for the government to legislate fiscal responsibility. The competative spirit of business in the market place has apparently infected the hospital systems. Hospital X has a big fancy computer, Hospital Y has to have the same machine, although it is not needed for patient care. Hospital X has a big fancy machine, Hospital Y has to have the same machine, although one wonders whether the need is essential in say a 100 bed institution. Hospital X has undertaken a massive expansion program, and is contracting out for 45 thousand dollars per bed or more. What part or factor of that expenditure is essential and meaningful. Is there a reduplication of personnel in an area. How is the inventory regulated, how are purchases made. How is cost control instituted. How effective are these prophylactic measures. Is the need for 50 billion dollars a year a real need, or one that has been inflated by a grab-all philosophy.

Ladies and Gentlemen, to you the responsibility is great. As fiscal administrators and Administrators of Hospitals, you are confronted with many problems. The imaginative resolution of these problems will render a meaningful service to all. I must thank you for the opportunity to be here. I do believe I have only nicked the surface and presented some of the problems that are present. I believe there are many others. I think it is your responsibility and goal to try to eradicate as many as possible.

Thank you again.

NEW PRESIDENT OF NATIONAL CHAMBER OF COMMERCE

HON. PAUL J. FANNIN

OF ARIZONA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, May 8, 1969

Mr. FANNIN. Mr. President, the Chamber of Commerce of the United States has just installed a distinguished editor and publisher, Mr. Jenkin Lloyd Jones, as its new president.

Mr. Jones, at his initial press conference, said some things which help put the current troubled national situation in perspective. I particularly noted Mr. Jones remarks in regard to motivation for the "hard core" unemployed. He said:

> Business cannot supply motivation. When the door is open, the individual, himself, must walk through. He cannot expect to be carried. This may have been understressed in the past. Too many people, perhaps, have been told that the way to a better life lies by demand, riot and mindless commotion. If these peoples continue to be misled—and if the majority of Americans react with backlash and disgust—then we'll all be worse off.

Mr. President, these words need an audience, an audience of all Americans. Mr. Jones has succinctly put his finger on one of the most potent and misunderstood problems in America today. I ask unanimous consent that the complete text of his remarks along with a biography of Mr. Jones, be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY JENKIN LLOYD JONES, EDITOR AND PUBLISHER, THE TULSA TRIBUNE, TULSA, OKLA., AT NEWS CONFERENCE TO ANNOUNCE HIS ELECTION AS 42D PRESIDENT OF THE CHAMBER OF COMMERCE OF THE UNITED STATES

The National Chamber hopes to promote a pragmatic approach to some of the perplexities facing the American people, in contrast to some of the highly theoretical efforts in this direction which have been recently in vogue.

Without discounting in any way the intelligence or sincerity of many people in government who have been struggling in recent years with America's social and economic problems, the National Chamber feels that businessmen, who are subject to sterner disciplines, are able to make some useful contributions.

If the head of a government department proceeds on faulty theories and false premises and gets no results he can always call for larger appropriations and more personnel. The businessman who does so goes broke.

There is no humanitarianism in unworkable social action, however, vigorously pursued. There is little uplift or social stability to be found in schemes based on the assumption that human beings will react in one way if it turns out that they generally react in another way.

Ten years ago no one dreamed that almost a million people would be receiving public

assistance in New York City or that the bill would amount to close to a billion dollars annually. This is now a fact. In the face of a record per capita national income and gross national product we are seeing a steady rise in dependency and a steady degradation of the poor. This is no time for recriminations, but it is certainly time for a re-examination of some of our past assumptions.

One thing the business community of America can do is increase opportunity to escape from the poverty cycle. It can, if it gets cooperation from the unions, end discriminatory practices in which the worth of a man is discounted or appreciated according to the color of his skin. It can increase on-the-job training for better jobs. It can support educational programs, not merely for technical training—which everybody seems to be for—but for giving the so-called "hard-core" the basic skills for simple and repetitive jobs.

But business cannot supply motivation. When the door is open, the individual, himself, must walk through. He cannot expect to be carried. This may have been understressed in the past. Too many people, perhaps, have been told that the way to a better life lies by demand, riot and mindless commotion.

If these peoples continue to be misled—and if the majority of Americans react with backlash and disgust—then we'll all be worse off.

The Chamber of Commerce of the United States has no unthinkable thoughts.

It is ready to examine all suggested solutions, however novel or far out. While the Chamber represents, essentially, the business and professional communities of America, it proceeds on the theory that nothing could possibly be so good for business and professional men as general prosperity and a stable social system. As Mark Twain pointed out, even undertakers dislike epidemics.

Officers of the National Chamber have already called upon President Nixon to offer the support of this organization to any government plans designed to give the man adrift a hope, the man confused a purpose, and the man who has been chronically unable to cope, the equipment for can-do.

The Chamber asks only that government and social scientists apply one principle which has long been the foundation of any successful business system:

If it hasn't worked and doesn't look as though it's going to work, let's try something else.

JENKIN LLOYD JONES, PRESIDENT, CHAMBER OF COMMERCE OF THE UNITED STATES

Jenkin Lloyd Jones, editor and publisher of the Tulsa Tribune, is the 42nd president of the Chamber of Commerce of the United States.

He was born Nov. 1, 1911, at Madison, Wis., a few months after his father, Richard Lloyd Jones, had resigned as associate editor of Collier's magazine in New York and bought the Wisconsin State Journal.

In 1920 his family moved to Tulsa where his father bought the Tulsa Democrat, changing its name to the Tulsa Tribune.

Jenkin Lloyd attended Culver Military Academy, along with his brother, Richard Lloyd, Jr., and he has this to say of the experience:

"Both of us were thrown out, in the summer of 1926. It seems that Dad, who was a didactic character, got into a heated argument by mail with an old friend, a colonel on the Culver faculty, about techniques of military training, and the colonel, an equally didactic character, wouldn't let the Jones boys back in. Perhaps the high point in my career is the fact that I am probably the only Culver kickout who later returned to make a commencement address."

Mr. Jones was graduated from the Tome School, Port Deposit, Md., in 1929, then went to the University of Wisconsin, graduating with a Ph.B. degree in 1933. He has worked for the Tulsa Tribune ever since.

As a reporter he covered all beats, started a daily column, and at 25 had become managing editor.

During World War II he served as communications officer on the jeep aircraft carrier, U.S.S. Makassar Strait, which supported the logistics supply group at the Iwo Jima invasion, carried planes to the Philippines, and took part in the fighting at Okinawa during the kamikaze craze.

At the end of the war, as a lieutenant commander, he served as chief press officer for Admiral Louis Denfeld, head of the bureau of personnel.

Soon after Mr. Jones returned to civilian life he was invited by the Defense Department to tour Europe and observe the beginning of reconstruction. He was in Berlin shortly before the four-power government fell apart and when the realities of Russian intransigence were dawning. His travels since then have taken him to 95 countries on all continents. He has been three times above the Arctic Circle and once to the South Pole.

In 1953 Secretary of the Navy Robert Anderson asked him to come to Washington to set up a Navy office of analysis and review. His four months on this task gave him a sympathetic insight into the problems of many government administrators.

He was elected president of the American Society of Newspaper Editors in 1956. The next year he received the William Allen White award for excellence in journalism.

Several years ago a national syndicate began selling the weekly column Mr. Jones was writing for the Tulsa Tribune. It is now published in about 150 newspapers. The syndicate also published a collection of his columns in a book titled, "The Changing World."

In 1935 he married Juanita Carlson, daughter of a former governor of Colorado. They have three children: Jenk, Jr., now the Tribune's managing editor; David, the Tribune's Washington correspondent, and Georgia, who is women's editor of a Tulsa television station.

Mr. Jones formerly held a commercial pilot's license, which he never used. He is a member of Phi Gamma Delta, Sigma Delta Chi, the National Press Club, International Press Institute and Inter-American Press Association, and is a Unitarian.

RAISE IN POSTAL RATES

HON. GLENN M. ANDERSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 8, 1969

Mr. ANDERSON of California. Mr. Speaker, recently President Nixon called for a raise in the postal rates from 6 to 7 cents for first-class mail.

This would be the fourth time our postal rates have been raised in the last 10 years. The taxpayers of this country are getting very tired of paying, every 2 or 3 years, more money for stamps so they can pay their bills, send out their Christmas cards, and correspond with their friends and relatives.

If we continue at the rate we are presently going, the price of a single stamp in 10 years could be close to 20 cents. We must draw the line at extracting more and more money from the lower and middle income taxpayers, giving the wealthy continued tax breaks.

Mr. Speaker, it is too easy for the administration to ask the taxpayer to fork over $557 million by raising the first-class postal rate again. Second- and third-class mail users contribute only about $27 million, and these are the ones who can afford it the most and, again, who will pay the least. Too many times it is the little man, the average consumer and the middle-income taxpayer, who must bear the burden of these regressive and unnecessary increases.

Mr. Speaker, I earnestly call upon President Nixon to rescind this proposed first-class postage increase and instead put the Post Office on a businesslike basis as he promised.

It is all too easy to attempt to justify a postal increase by saying this will wipe out the postal deficit. Well, every time there has been a postal raise it has been to wipe out the deficit, and every time, even though hundreds of millions of dollars in additional revenues are taken from the taxpayers, the deficit always exists, usually larger than before. During the 1968 campaign President Nixon promised to run the Post Office like a first-class business and did not say he would raise the rates. Let him make good on that promise.

STATEMENT BY SENATOR BELLMON ON POSTAL REVENUE AND OFFENSIVE INTRUSION OF SEXUALLY ORIENTED MAIL ACT OF 1969

HON. HUGH SCOTT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, May 8, 1969

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, at the request of the Senator from Oklahoma (Mr. BELLMON), who is necessarily absent, I ask unanimous consent that a statement by him on the Postal Revenue and Offensive Intrusion of Sexually Oriented Mail Act of 1969 be printed in the RECORD.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The statement follows:

STATEMENT ON POSTAL REVENUE AND OFFENSIVE INTRUSION OF SEXUALLY ORIENTED MAIL ACT OF 1969

Mr. BELLMON. Mr. President, the American people are sick and tired of receiving crude, sex-oriented material through the mails. This salacious advertising is offensive to adults and frequently harmful to their children.

In the light of recent court decisions, it is not legally obscene, but it is damaging and disgusting. A court decision regarding legality is small comfort to American families bombarded with offensive mail.

Mr. President, I applaud President Nixon's decision to stop the flow of pandering advertisement to families that do not want it, and to youths under 18 years of age.

In proposing the Postal Revenue and Offensive Intrusion of Sexually Oriented Mail Act of 1969, the President is urging that we protect the privacy of a family and adopt a new measure for protecting the young.

The President's legislation would not deny adults the right to order such material and to receive it through the mails or other channels of commerce. The law would still make it illegal, of course, to send material held obscene by the courts.

The President's recommendation will help hault the decline of moral standards and reduce the crime rate of our country. This legislation will go a long way toward cleaning up the mails. It will give American families new confidence in our postal service.

If we must increase postal rates—as I believe we should in the light of the postal deficit—the least we can do is curb the flow of mail which is deeply offensive to the American people.

DAY CARE CENTERS

HON. MARTHA W. GRIFFITHS

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 8, 1969

Mrs. GRIFIFTHS. Mr. Speaker, the Washington Post on April 23, 1969, carried an article by William Raspberry entitled "Law Dooms Care Project." This article describes how a very small day care center operated by a Washington woman for some of her neighbors was forced to close because her operation did not meet the required standards.

In my judgment, Mr. Raspberry describes the whole problem of providing day care services precisely when he says:

Some of the rules are based on such practical considerations as fire hazards, but many seem to be based on the assumption that the choices are between a not-quite-adequate day care center and the sort of middle-class homes one sees on television. The real choice may be between a day nursery that isn't too bad and a bad home that will become worse when the mother is forced to quit work and go on welfare.

As you know, I have long advocated the establishment of day care centers and strongly supported the day care provisions of the Social Security Amendments of 1967. But, as this law is now being administered in many States, including my own State of Michigan, a very high percentage of women receiving day care assistance are simply given money to hire a babysitter. Of course, there are official standards these babysitters must meet. But, at least in Michigan, at present, no one checks to see that the sitters do, in fact, meet these standards. How much wiser it would be to permit the establishment of small neighborhood centers like the one Mr. Raspberry describes. The article follows:

[From the Washington Post, Apr. 23, 1969]

POTOMAC WATCH: LAW DOOMS CARE PROJECT

(By William Raspberry)

Rosa Lee Gainey, who rents a large house on Kenyon Street, thought she had solved a lot of problems.

She and her sister needed work. Their elderly mother needed someone to be with her around the clock. Several neighborhood women needed day care for their children.

So Mrs. Gainey, whose children are grown and gone, set up a small-scale day nursery.

"We had ten children and we were charging $12 a week to pick them up, take them home, feed them and take care of them all day while their mothers worked," she said. She and her sister each grossed $60 a week, the mothers were able to hold regular jobs, and Mrs. Gainey's own mother had the care she needed.

"I thought things were working out pretty well," she said. "We weren't making much money, true enough, but it wasn't too bad.

"Then somebody reported us to the city, and the first thing we knew, the people from downtown were telling us that we didn't have enough windows and the rooms were too small and we didn't have a fire escape, even though all the children were on the first floor."

What Mrs. Gainey didn't know was that as soon as she took in the sixth child, she had become an "institution" under District law and was subject to the same rules that govern convalescent homes and similar institutions.

Officials told her that she could keep five of the children, but no more. That wouldn't permit her to earn enough to stay in business, however.

As a result, several of the mothers had to give up their jobs, even though Mrs. Gainey's place on Kenyon Street was a lot better than their homes. Mrs. Gainey herself is working as a domestic in Bethesda and earning $55 a week.

Her duties include taking care of her employer's children.

"That's how it is, I guess," she said. "We can get all the jobs we want taking care of white folks' kids, but we can't do it for our own people, and they're the ones that really need it."

The city doesn't deliberately set about to force people like Mrs. Gainey out of business, even if it must seem that way sometimes. It's just that the Bureau of Licenses and Inspections and the D.C. Health Department are concerned about the health and safety of small children, and their rules are pretty strict.

Too strict, perhaps, to be altogether realistic. Frame houses, for example, are out of the question. Houses with masonry walls and wooden joists are all right—if they have automatic sprinkler systems complete with alarms that ring the Fire Department. Run afoul of the rules of either agency, or of the Welfare Department, and you're out of business.

Some of the rules are based on such practical considerations as fire hazards, but many seem to be based on the assumption that the choices are between a not-quite-adequate day care center and the sort of middle-class homes one sees on television.

The real choice may be between a day nursery that isn't too bad and a bad home that will become worse when the mother is forced to quit work and go on welfare.

It is becoming more widely recognized that hundreds of Washington welfare mothers would gladly go to work if they could find someone to car for their children. The supply of day-care facilities, unfortunately, doesn't begin to meet the demand.

Tom Taylor, head of the National Capital Area Day Care Association, sees both sides of the problem. He knows the importance that early stimulation has for later education. He knows the value of good nutrition and adequate play space and all the other things that make for a good day nursery.

But he also knows what the real choices are. He is currently heading a committee set up to review day care standards for the city. "But the truth is, we'll probably wind up tightening as many standards as we relax," he said.

What Taylor and the Day Care Association ought to consider is some sort of quickie training program to teach interested women how to run small nurseries. The city would cooperate by relaxing some of its requirements. There are plenty of women who would love that kind of work, and hundreds more who need the service.

The real solution, of course, is modern, well-equipped day care centers that include nurses, nutritionists and educators. Taylor is working toward that end.

But in the meantime, people like Mrs. Gainey could perform a most useful stopgap service if the city would let them.

HARVESTING THE WHIRLWIND

HON. STROM THURMOND

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, May 8, 1969

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, Americans who are proud of the fine educational institutions in this country are becoming increasingly concerned about the program of systematic destruction currently being carried out by the SDS and other subversive groups.

This terrifying situation is put into clear perspective in an excellent article by Mr. Gilmore Iden, who writes for my hometown newspaper, the Aiken Standard and Review.

Mr. President, I commend this fine editorial to this body and to all constructive Americans who want to see our schools of higher learning maintained on the same levels which have made them so highly respected throughout the world.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the editorial entitled "Harvesting the Whirlwind" by Mr. Gilmore Iden be printed in the Extensions of Remarks.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

HARVESTING THE WHIRLWIND

(By Gilmore Iden)

Last year the radical organization known as the Students for a Democratic Society constituted the hard-core of the obstructionists on our college campuses. As a placating gesture the college trustees were persuaded not only to open their doors to black students but to campaign actively for their attendance. Although not legally compelled to, the establishments exposed these institutions to a new wave of unrest during the scholastic year now closing.

The Ivy League colleges have adopted a recruitment program for acceptable black students, unmindful of the trouble they have already reaped. These have endeavored to impress upon their patron schools codes of conduct and studies of their own devising. Their insistency, spurred by the sympathetic responses of the Students for a Democratic Society and other small radical groups, has erupted into riots and reprisals.

According to a survey made by the New York Times, these same Ivy League Schools have recently sent out acceptance notices to the students they are willing to enroll in their September classes. According to the response these same schools plan to matriculate next year nearly twice as many black students as they did last year. In many instances this will give the colleges and universities a percentage of black and Puerto Rican students larger than the relative importance of these same generic groups to the general public. If the new additions entering next September are indicative of what has been experienced during the current scholastic year, then the famous Ivy League universities may anticipate a much rougher year during the coming winter than they have so far experienced.

The Ivy League colleges will be further changed in their character not alone by the inroads of black and Puerto Rican students, but by their intention to go co-educational. Most of the famous all-women colleges will accept male students in September. Nearly all of the heretofore all-male colleges in the East will enroll women for the first time. The change that is now coming over these institutions is wider spread than was first thought

possible and no end to the change is yet in sight.

According to the experience of the current scholastic year, the blacks were quick to adopt disruptive tactics taught them by the radical Students for a Democratic Society, although they do not deliberately join with those radicals in all their troublemaking.

The doors of these universities have been opened to the new students as a concession, and that the blacks consider patronizing and therefore conceded by them to be a form of bias. The blacks want a voice in the selection of black students in the future and no longer would leave the selection of the old college establishments exclusively. Furthermore they have invariably demanded African studies or a special department in African affairs. Most colleges have been quite willing to grant that demand. Now they wish the African studies administered by black teachers only. Most of the Ivy League colleges have from time to time instituted special studies or schools related to one or another particular political group, such as Studies in Far Eastern Culture, or a special institute devoted to the study of Marxism and Soviet Affairs. These departments have been open to all students and not relegated to matriculates of a special nationality. In the case of the new school of African studies, an exclusive trend has been adopted.

In the South it has long been the practice to maintain separate colleges for the blacks. The blacks of today do not want separate colleges, would open all colleges to themselves but prefer to maintain a separateness from the whites.

With the growing pains which have been started by these experiments in the new open-door policy, our colleges have been going through some rough days. What may come out of all the turmoil is not yet clear. Scholars may wonder if the United States will ever be able to move back into the high ranks of academic freedom that once gave our colleges the high standing of days gone.

Some may commend our Ivy League institutions for their more than generous gesture toward the underprivileged. But the permissiveness involved has not reaped the reward of gratitude normally expected. Instead the assertiveness of the radicals has been unpredictable and distrubing. College trustees, unacquainted with such confrontations, seem to have become confused, and the executive officers unduly burdened with their duty to maintain peace and order on the campuses.

The lack of backbone has become quite obvious. The rewards are already ominous. According to the Chronicle of Higher Education at least 70 presidents of our universities and colleges have so far given notice of their retirement. Seventy new college presidents must be selected by next September. The problem of running an academic community is proving too much for these executives under the present circumstances. Permissiveness may be a sign of academic freedom, but we have seen that it can be carried too far and can seriously jeopardize our academic excellence.

HELP WITH THE ENFORCEMENT OF ALASKAN FISHING LAWS

HON. HOWARD W. POLLOCK

OF ALASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 8, 1969

Mr. POLLOCK. Mr. Speaker, today I have introduced a bill which would remove from the Posse Comitatus Act—18 U.S.C. 1385—restrictions which deny the use of naval aircraft and personnel to assist in the enforcement of State fishing laws.

In the State of Alaska this naval assistance would be greatly appreciated and would assist us in enforcement of our fishing laws which because of the area to be covered we are unable to do at the present. The enforcement of these laws has national as well as international implications and this act would be of great assistance to our department of fish and game.

HON. JAMES A. BURKE PRESENTED THE VFW LOYALTY DAY AWARD

HON. JAMES A. BURKE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 8, 1969

Mr. BURKE of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, on May 1, 1969, a most distinguished award was presented to me, the Veterans of Foreign Wars Loyalty Day Award. I will always cherish this award, and I am proud to join the prominent list of former recipients which include:

The Honorable J. Edgar Hoover, Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation.

The Honorable STROM THURMOND, Senator from South Carolina.

The Honorable Norman Paul, former Assistant Secretary of Defense.

The Honorable Thomas Clark, former Associate Supreme Court Justice.

The Honorable Dean Rusk, former Secretary of State.

The Honorable Frank Carlson, former Senator from Kansas.

The Honorable Robert Emmett Quinn, Chief Judge of the U.S. Court of Military Appeal.

Lt. Gen. Lewis Blaine Hershey, Director of Selective Service System.

Loyalty Day is the result of Public Law 85–529, a joint resolution enacted on July 18, 1958, which designates the first day of May of each year as Loyalty Day, and this first day in May is to be set aside as a special day for the recognition of the heritage of American freedom.

The VFW has initiated an annual award to be given to a man "who embodies in his personal and public career the constant practice in action of those American ideals, love of country, service to his fellow citizens, integrity of leadership in State and National affairs, and responsibilities in government at all levels."

This award rotates each year between the judicial, executive, and legislative branches of Government.

Mr. Speaker and fellow colleagues, I would like to take this opportunity to bring to the attention of the membership of the House of Representatives the Loyalty Day program, May 1, 1969:

PRESENTATION OF FLAG

DEPARTMENT OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA, LADIES AUXILIARY TO THE VETERANS OF FOREIGN WARS OF THE U.S.,

Washington, D.C., May 1, 1969.

Hon. JAMES A. BURKE,

U.S. Representative, 11th Congressional District of Massachusetts.

DEAR MR. BURKE: On behalf of the Department of the District of Columbia, Ladies Auxiliary to the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States of America, I present this flag to you for your outstanding work in your public career in your state (Mass.) and your outstanding record in the United States Congress.

It is indeed a great pleasure to honor an outstanding American, who stands for our ideals and is a champion for the American way of life.

Respectfully,

DOROTHY K. GUIBOA,

President, Department of District of Columbia, Ladies Auxiliary to the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States of America.

REMARKS OF CHAIRMAN A. LEO ANDERSON

Delighted to see so many of today's youth with us because it is a fact that this Nation's greatest single resource, is *not* our gross national product, our factories or our farms, but *our youth*.

Our American youths possess the talents, the ability, the skill and the vigor to carry America to continued greatness.

Our country has always expected much from its youth.

At 23: Alexander Hamilton commanded the artillery forces of the Continental Army.

At 33: Thomas Jefferson authored the Declaration of Independence.

At 43: John F. Kennedy was the youngest man to be elected the President of the United States.

Turning a moment at this time to our forces serving in Vietnam and Southeast Asia:

Over two years' ago, during Armed Forces Week, Eric Sevareid of CBS–TV News, posed the question as to what made the soldiers do so well in Vietnam . . . and I quote:

"The real answer must be deep in the tissues of whatever is the substance that keeps America from becoming unstuck. It must have something to do with their parents and teachers and pastors, with their 4–H Clubs and Scout troops and neighborhood centers and groups—it has to do with the sense of belonging to a team, with the dishonor of letting it down. But it also has to do with their implicit unreasoned belief in their country and in their natural beliefs in themselves as persons—whatever the full answer, it is a considerable thing they are doing when they stick at this kind of war . . . they provide an opportunity for the rest of us who are not covered with mud and weariness and nightly fear to pay a measure of respect."

PROGRAM—LOYALTY DAY, MAY 1, 1969

(Sponsored by District of Columbia Department, Veterans of Foreign Wars of the U.S.A.)

HON. JAMES A. BURKE, U.S. REPRESENTATIVE, 11TH CONGRESSIONAL DISTRICT OF MASSACHUSETTS

Congressman James A. Burke, a resident of Milton represents the 11th Massachusetts Congressional District, having been elected to the 86th, 87th, 88th, 89th, 90th, and 91st Congresses.

Congressman Burke, for ten years was a member of the Massachusetts General Court, four of which he served as Assistant Majority Leader. He was formerly Registrar of Vital Statistics for the City of Boston, and for the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, he served as Chairman of the World War II Veterans' Problems and Korean Veterans' Commission.

Congressman Burke earned Four Battle Stars and numerous Unit Citations during World War II in the South Pacific with the 77th Infantry Division during his 45 months of combat duty.

His keen interest in veterans programs is demonstrated in his long, active and accomplishment-filled V.F.W. membership in the William D. Doyle Post, Hyde Park, Massachusetts.

Congressman Burke was appointed during his first term in Congress to the important

Committee on Banking and Currency. At the beginning of his second term, he was elected to the powerful House Committee on Ways and Means, which among its other duties functions as the Committee on Committees in advising the Speaker of the House on all other Committee assignments. Ways and Means is the only Congressional Committee whose Members are actually elected by the full membership of their own party in Caucus. He is the only Member of Congress from New England who holds a seat on the Ways and Means Committee.

This year Congresman Burke moved up to the fifth position on this important Committee of the House which is also known as the "Salt-mines" of the Congress due to the long hours of hearing which are conducted and the extensive studies which must be made by each member.

Congressman Burke was the third Member of Congress in history to be appointed to this Committee in his second term; preceding him were House Speaker John W. McCormack and the Committee's present Chairman, Wilbur Mills.

Congressman Burke has repeatedly been cited for his 100% Roll Call and Quorum Call record in the House of Representatives. He has also been acknowledged for his perfect record of attendance at all public meetings and executive sessions of the House Ways and Means Committee, historically one of the busiest Committees in the Congress.

Congressman Burke embodies in his personal and public career the constant practice-in-action of those American ideals, love of country, service to his fellow citizens, integrity of leadership in State and National Affairs and responsibilities in Government at all levels.

His is an active participant in the programs, and activities which provide for growth, expanded social justice and economic security, and for the continued development of opportunity for all Americans.

PROGRAM

7:30 P.M.—Musical selections: United States Marine Drum and Bugle Corps, directed by—Staff Sgt. Allen C. Emerman.

8:00 P.M.—Master of ceremonies: A. Leo Anderson, Co-Chairman, V.F.W. Loyalty Day Committee.

Posting of colors: V.F.W. National Honor Guard, Captain, Francis C. Wood.

Invocation: Chaplain Wayne E. Soliday, Colonel, United States Army.

Loyalty Day proclamation: Read by Gervasio G. Sese, Department Senior Vice Commander.

Introduction of distinguished guests: A. Leo Anderson, Co-Chairman, V.F.W. Loyalty Day Committee.

Presentation of Komdat-Spedden Awards: Department Commander, Eli Cooper.

Flag presentations: Ruby L. Griffin, Coordinator.

Awards presentations to Cong. James A. Burke: Department Commander, Eli Cooper, Department Auxiliary Pres., Dorothy K. Guibao.

Principal address: Hon. James A. Burke, Member of Congress, Massachusetts.

Flag pageant: United States Marine Corps, Flag Pageant, directed and narrated by: Sgt. Major Lewis E. Tuttle.

Retirement of colors: V.F.W. National Honor Guard, Captain, Francis C. Wood.

PUBLIC LAW 85-529—85TH CONGRESS, HOUSE JOINT RESOLUTION 479, JULY 18, 1958

Joint resolution to designate the 1st day of May of each year as Loyalty Day

Resolved by the Senate and House and Representatives of the United States of American in Congress assembled, That the 1st day of May of each year is hereby designated as Loyalty Day and is to be set aside as a special day for the recognition of the heritage of American freedom; and the President of the United States is authorized and requested to issue a proclamation calling upon officials of the Government to display the flag of the United States on all Government buildings on such day and inviting the people of the United States to observe such day in schools and other suitable places, with appropriate ceremonies.

Approved July 18, 1958.

DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER,
President of the United States.

COMMITTEE

Department Commander, Eli Cooper.
Department Auxiliary President, Dorothy K. Guibao.
Chairman, V.F.W., Gervasio G. Sese.
Chairman V.F.W. Auxiliary, Ruby L. Griffin.

COMMITTEE MEMBERS

A. Leo Anderson, George Lange.
Francis Wood, David Wood.
Paul Wampler, Joseph Aronson.

ADDRESS BY CONGRESSMAN JAMES A. BURKE: "RESPECT FOR LAW AND ORDER WITH JUSTICE"

First, I would like to thank Leo Anderson for his kind words of introduction. He has an outstanding record of a lifetime of service to his community and Nation. A native of Massachusetts and a combat veteran of World War II, for over two decades he has closely associated himself with the mission of recognized veterans organizations as they affect veterans benefits programs and the changing social and economic needs of veterans and their dependents. He is currently the director of the Department of Veterans' affairs for the government of the District of Columbia and I am sure he will continue his good work through the years.

Order is the first objective of a sound government, lacking it no other goal can be attained. History illustrates this emphatically.

To cite one example: After the time of Joshua, the people of Israel were without law except as each tribe or faction conceived it. Anarchy reigned . . . chaos was rampant. Similar tragic situations have occurred at intervals down through the generations.

Disorder and disrespect for the law have rendered great and powerful governments impotent. Let us be warned by the past . . . Let us be aware of our troubled present . . . Let us strive for a future of peace! It is in times of tranquility that countries prosper, that plans are formulated and completed for the erection of great institutions for the arts and sciences. . . . That the dreams and aspirations of the people are achieved and that every man is assured the basic rights which are guaranteed by constitution and bill of rights.

No man living in human society can be his own law. If a man is free to disobey any law he thinks is not "good", to that extent he infringes upon the political rights of all men and the principles our government was founded on no longer prevail. *If the philosopher can make his own law, so can the fool.* Good laws must come from the genius of a whole people, based upon their traditions, their experience and their current needs. And they must be capable of practical application. The wise lawmakers of the Athenians admitted that they did not give their citizens the best laws they were capable of giving, but the best laws that the citizens were capable of receiving.

Virtue does not of itself lead to wisdom, and no man may by the assertion on his own superior virtues or wisdom put himself above the laws commonly imposed upon and accepted by his fellow citizens. To permit such is to court disaster. Rich and poor, powerful and weak men, . . . all must be the same before the law of the land.

When a tyrant is at one's throat and there are no peaceful means of redress, rebellion is necessary. Our first President, George Washington, took up arms when no peaceful solution was available. In so doing he became a hero and today his statue stands in Trafalgar Square, a tribute to the pursuit of liberty.

But in an open society, where all men are free to express themselves and select their Governors and legislators, rebellion is criminal!

An open society demands peaceful methods, and America *is* an open society, where everyone's views may be freely expressed and fully asserted at the ballot box. The more extreme a man's views, the more certain he is of attention from press, radio and television: He has a full hearing, even when advocating subversion of the government and of the due process of law. The news media give his utterings full coverage except when excluded, which is the procedure when subversives gang together. London's Hyde Park is set aside for free expression by cranks and splinter groups. America, too, has many such forums.

But the ballot box is secret and is made accessible to *all* the people—to taxpayers and those who pay no taxes, the intelligensia and to the most ignorant.

In all history there has never been a country that was as fully responsive to the popular will as expressed in the voting booth.

In a free society laws can be changed when the majority is convinced that they should be and expresses its opinion through the vote. When the people are aroused, no one can stand in their way. City ordinances, State statutes and acts of Congress are quickly changed when the public demands. The will of the people can change the Constitution, too, and quickly when they are aroused. In an open society, the *people* rule and cannot be denied. Through peaceful political process, not violence, their will is made law.

Mobbery is violence! Every right that a man enjoys carries with it a duty to observe the rights of others. We hear on every side men proclaiming their rights without seeming to realize that *duties* go hand in hand with them. The cries are sometimes loudest from those who are dedicated to the destruction of our Constitution and all that it stands for and yet they are the first to loudly claim the immunities and privileges which it assures.

There are those who already believe that our institutions are too generous to wrongdoers and that there are too many among us who have no regard for constitutions and who therefore should be denied its protection. *But* should that view prevail, and we reach a time where constitutional guarantees are suspended . . . we would be heading towards dictatorship and all men would lose their freeoms! We are not immune to the lessons of history an thus must find our remedy against lawlessness within our present constitutional system.

It is incumbent upon all of us who are in a position of responsibility and leadership to teach our young people first, a respect for the law, and second, the process by which the law can be changed legally and peacefully—through the right to vote.

Periodically elected officials and representatives stand for re-election. The measure of their service is reflected in their records and the people should investigate these records to determine whether nor not an official is fulfilling his duty to his people and whether or not his decisions reflect the desires and opinions of the majority. If they feel his job has been inadequate they can express this by their votes. This is the way to change the law. Elect officials that will bow to the convictions of the majority of those whom he has been elected to represent.

We are all aware of the many problems that this great nation of ours faces . . . divergent opinions, dissent, the poor, and we must all strive together in unity to build, improve and enact meaningful legislation which will be helpful in solving these problems.

We should always remember that our founding fathers set up a democracy in this

country and continue to face the tasks before us in the peaceful manner that the law provides.

As history has shown in the past, the *youth* of this great nation has always risen to the test: They have answered the needs of our country through its most trying ordeals: they have given of their hearts and their minds to the building of the greatest democracy in the history of mankind, and they have always been dedicated to the improvement of our nation's welfare.

As was so well stated in the inaugural address of the late beloved John Fitzgerald Kennedy and which is so apropos today, "now the trumpet summons us again, not as a call to arms, though arms we need, not as a call to battle, though embattled we are, but a call to bear the burden of a long twilight struggle, year in and year out, rejoicing in hope, patient in tribulation, a struggle against the common enemies of man: tyranny, poverty, disease, and war itself."

I think that on this first day of May which has been designated as loyalty day we should consider the great heritage of freedom which belongs to all Americans and that we should respect this freedom and support the right of all to life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness.

COSPONSORS OF H.R. 6278—BILL FOR CONGRESSIONAL REFORM

HON. W. E. (BILL) BROCK

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 8, 1969

Mr. BROCK. Mr. Speaker, I am today introducing the seventh duplicate copy of H.R. 6278, the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1969. Today's bill brings the total cosponsors of this legislation to 120.

Similar legislation introduced on April 22 by the gentleman from California (Mr. REES) has been cosponsored by 27 Congressmen from the Democratic side of the aisle.

Mr. Speaker, I dare say all of us have noted with interest the appointment by the House Rules Committee of a subcommittee to study the differences between pending reorganization bills and report back to the full committee. I hope this is an encouraging development in our struggle to enact a meaningful congressional reform bill in the 91st Congress. Speaking from my own side of the aisle, I am sure that the activities of the subcommittee will be carefeully noted. Republicans in the House have been consistent and insistent upon the need to have on the floor a bill at least as strong as the package of recommendations made by the 1965–66 Joint Committee on the Organization of the Congress, and to have that bill reported under a completely open rule for debate.

Mr. Speaker, I here attach a list of the names of cosponsors of H.R. 6278.

COSPONSORS OF H.R. 6278

Anderson, John B. (Ill.).
Andrews, Mark (N.D.).
Beall, J. Glenn, Jr. (Md.)
Bell, Alphonzo (Calif.).
Biester, Edward G., Jr. (Pa.).
Blackburn, Benjamin B. (Ga.).
Brock, W. E. (Bill) (Tenn.).
Broomfield, William S. (Mich.)
Brotzman, Donald G. (Colo.).
Brown, Garry (Mich.).
Broyhill, James T. (N.C.).
Buchanan, John (Ala.).
Burke, J. Herbert (Fla.).
Bush, George (Tex.).
Button, Daniel E. (N.Y.).
Byrnes, John W. (Wis.).
Cahill, William T. (N.J.).
Clausen, Don H. (Calif.).
Cleveland, James C. (N.H.).
Collier, Harold R. (Ill.).
Collins, James M. (Tex.).
Conable, Barber B., Jr. (N.Y.).
Conte, Silvio O. (Mass.).
Corbett, Robert J. (Pa.).
Coughlin, R. Lawrence (Pa.).
Cowger, William O. (Ky.).
Cramer, William C. (Fla.).
Cunningham, Glenn (Neb.).
Dellenback, John R. (Ore.).
Denney, Robert V. (Neb.).
Dennis, David W. (Ind.).
Duncan, John J. (Tenn.).
Dwyer, Florence P. (N.J.).
Edwards, Jack (Ala.).
Erlenborn, John N. (Ill.).
Esch, Marvin L. (Mich.).
Eshleman, Edwin D. (Pa.).
Findley, Paul (Ill.).
Fish, Hamilton, Jr. (N.Y.).
Frey, Louis, Jr. (Fla.).
Fulton, James G. (Pa.).
Grover, James R., Jr. (N.Y.).
Gubser, Charles S. (Calif.).
Gude, Gilbert (Md.).
Halpern, Seymour (N.Y.).
Hansen, Orval H. (Idaho).
Harvey, James (Mich.).
Hastings, James F. (N.Y.).
Heckler, Margaret M. (Mass.).
Horton, Frank J. (N.Y.).
Hosmer, Craig (Calif.).
Hunt, John E. (N.J.).
Hutchinson, Edward (Mich.).
Johnson, Albert W. (Pa.).
Keith, Hastings (Mass.).
Kleppe, Thomas S. (N.D.).
Kuykendall, Dan (Tenn.).
Kyl, John (Iowa).
Lloyd, Sherman P. (Utah).
Lujan, Manuel, Jr. (N.M.).
Lukens, Donald E. (Ohio).
McClory, Robert (Ill.).
McCloskey, Paul N., Jr. (Calif.).
McClure, James A. (Idaho).
McDade, Joseph M. (Pa.).
McEwen, Robert C. (N.Y.).
McKneally, Martin (N.Y.).
MacGregor, Clark (Minn.).
Mathias, Robert B. (Bob) (Calif.).
May, Catherine (Wash.).
Mayne, Wiley (Iowa).
Meskill, Thomas J. (Conn.).
Michel, Robert H. (Ill.).
Mize, Chester L. (Kans.).
Morse, F. Bradford (Mass.).
Morton, Rogers C. B. (Md.).
Mosher, Charles A. (Ohio).
Nelsen, Ancher (Minn.).
O'Konski, Alvin E. (Wisc.).
Pelly, Thomas M. (Wash.).
Pettis, Jerry L. (Calif.)
Pirnie, Alexander (N.Y.).
Pollock, Howard W. (Alaska).
Price, Robert (Tex.).
Quie, Albert H. (Minn.).
Railsback, Tom (Ill.).
Reid, Ogden R. (N.Y.).
Riegle, Donald W., Jr. (Mich.).
Robison, Howard W. (N.Y.).
Roth, William V. (Del.).
Roudebush, Richard L. (Ind.).
Rumsfeld, Donald (Ill.).
Ruppe, Philip E. (Mich.).
Sandman, Charles W., Jr. (N.J.).
Saylor, John P. (Pa.).
Schadeberg, Henry C. (Wis.).
Schneebeli, Herman T. (Pa.).
Schwengel, Fred (Iowa).
Sebelius, Keith G. (Kans.).
Shriver, Garner E. (Kans.).
Smith, Henry P., III (N.Y.).
Stanton, J. William (Ohio).
Steiger, Sam (Ariz.).
Steiger, William A. (Wis.).
Taft, Robert, Jr. (Ohio).
Teague, Charles M. (Calif.).
Thompson, Fletcher (Ga.).
Vander Jagt, Guy (Mich.).
Weicker, Lowell P., Jr. (Conn.).
Whalen, Charles W., Jr. (Ohio).
Whitehurst, G. William (Va.).
Widnall, William B. (N.J.).
Wilson, Bob (Calif.).
Winn, Larry, Jr. (Kans.).
Wold, John (Wyo.).
Wyatt, Wendell (Oreg.).
Wydler, John W. (N.Y.).
Wyman, Louis C. (N.H.).
Zion, Roger H. (Ind.).
Zwach, John M. (Minn.).

GREEN-THUMB LADY

HON. JULIA BUTLER HANSEN

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 8, 1969

Mrs. HANSEN of Washington. Mr. Speaker, the splendor of spring has never been brighter in Washington. The color and scent of flowers spread the message that beautification is possible and wondrous.

Even gray buildings and jammed boulevards can reflect a glow of majesty and warmth when they are edged with flowers. And in the Capital of our Nation, these things are appreciated. Indeed, flowers and gardens are essential.

The fresh look in Washington is the handiwork of a gracious and thoughtful lady who has left this city. I am sure, however, there is a ranch in Texas that is blossoming with beauty because of the "green thumb," and her belief in beauty.

When Lady Bird Johnson was our Nation's First Lady, it was my pleasure to help in her efforts to sprinkle brightness—not only upon this city, but across the land. Many mocked this devotion, and there were repeated remarks by a great many gentlemen about the waste of money, but today's blossoms and beauty are these critics' best answer.

I am inserting an editorial from the past weekend issue of the Christian Science Monitor, which tells of the city and the lady:

GREEN-THUMB LADY

From the capital of the United States, reports have been wafting out, all through the last few weeks, about how beautiful the nation's capital is in springtime. This spring time. Commentators have mentioned it. Columnists have waxed eloquent.

We know how lovely Washington can be when spring comes on with a rush. The daffodils, the tulips, the lilacs, the dogwood, the flaming azalea, the flowering trees, all seem to burst forth virtually on a single day. From cherry blossom time onward, it is breathtaking when the weather is right.

But we also know why, this year, the parks and the squares and those little sections of land and those centerpieces on the main streets are especially standing forth in their spring sheen, tended and cared for, imaginatively landscaped—truly a citywide beautification program. They are a legacy left by a charming lady who, while at the White House, made the beauty of Washington and the countryside her foremost concern. We salute Lady Bird Johnson and we thank her, deeply, for the wondrous spring bouquet which she has prepared for all of us who love our country and our Washington.

CHAIRMAN PERKINS CONDUCTS CRITICAL BATTLE FOR PRESERVATION OF CONSERVATION CENTERS

HON. HAROLD T. JOHNSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 7, 1969

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. Speaker, I rise to commend our colleague, the chairman of the distinguished House Committee on Education and Labor, for his comments here today on behalf of the Job Corps program and for the fine record which he has established through the hearings he and his committee are holding.

As I have made it clear in statements before Chairman PERKIN'S committee and here on the floor of the House of Representatives, I feel strongly that the closing of these 57 Job Corps centers throughout the Nation, and especially the conservation centers which are doing such a fine job of conserving natural and human resources, will in the long run prove to be extremely foolish economy.

I have visited each of the three conservation centers located in the Second Congressional District—the Toyon Camp operated by the Bureau of Reclamation and the Sly Park and Five Mile Centers operated by the Forest Service—and have been tremendously impressed with the fine work they are doing.

In each instance these centers have proven that good hard work when combined with a good basic education will provide our young men with an opportunity to become self-respecting, self-supporting, contributing members of society. In many instances, these young men have not had the opportunity to accomplish these goals, and this represents their last chance. At the same time we are saving people we are also conserving natural resources, as a corpsman learns by practical experience. This results in broad programs of resource development and protection.

During 3 years of operation, corpsmen at the Toyon Camp have completed some $1,328,000 in work projects, including some of the largest campground installations ever built in the National Park System. Additionally, the corpsmen provided some 10,000 emergency man-hours in firefighting, search and rescue work, and battling floods and storms. At the Five Mile Center, corpsmen have completed $946,250 in work projects beneficial to the national forests. Since 1966, corpsmen have spent 27,632 man-hours in fire suppression work, the value of which would amount to $55,260. At Sly Park the project value to the national forests and the local community amounts to $897,000 plus thousands of man-hours on the firelines and other disaster work.

These contributions do not reflect in the cold statistics upon which the decision to close these centers was apparently based.

For these reasons I feel very strongly that these centers should be maintained, and I again commend Chairman PERKINS for his outstanding efforts in this direction.

THE 178TH ANNIVERSARY OF POLISH CONSTITUTION

HON. WILLIAM E. MINSHALL

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 8, 1969

Mr. MINSHALL. Mr. Speaker, one of the most effective groups of spokesmen for the countries behind the Iron Curtain is the Polish American Congress. We are this month observing the 178th anniversary of the Polish Constitution, adopted on May 3, 1791. In doing so we pay tribute to those great Polish patriots who helped us achieve our own independence nearly two centuries ago, to the genuis of Poland which has flooded the world with great music, great literature, great art, and to the courage of latter-day Polish heroes who have suffered under the tyranny of two of the most despotic invaders the world has ever seen.

Anniversary celebrations were held May 4 by the Ohio Division of the Polish American Congress at Pulaski Plaza in Cleveland, and I am honored to include with my remarks the excellent resolution drawn up by the congress. In doing so, I wish to remind my colleagues in the House, and particularly those who serve on the House Committee on Foreign Affairs, of the urgent need for adoption of my House Concurrent Resolution 59, which calls upon the United Nations to insist that the Soviet Union abide by its charter provisions on national self-determination and colonialism.

May the day soon arrive when the Polish people are free once again to choose their own governmental destiny as formulated in their constitution of 1791:

All power in civil society should be derived from the will of the people, its end and object being the preservation and integrity of the state, the civil liberty and the good order of society, on an equal scale and on a lasting foundation.

The resolution adopted by the Ohio Division of the Polish American Congress follows:

RESOLUTION

Whereas, the Ohio Division of the Polish American Congress is celebrating the 178th Anniversary on May 4, 1969 at the Pulaski Plaza, Cleveland, Ohio.

Whereas, this was a most significant event in Poland's history;

Whereas, the Constitution of May 3, 1791 expressed freedom and democracy;

Whereas, these same freedoms do not exist in Poland today, therefore

Be it resolved, that the Ohio Division of Polish American Congress endorse the following principles to again restore freedom and individualism in Poland and to promote a program in the U.S. to stop the rise of lawlessness, violence, and dictatorship:

1. The U.S. should pursue a peaceful liberation policy to free Poland of Soviet Oppression.

2. The U.S. Government should expand and enliven our involvement with Poland in economic, cultural, and scientific exchange in a manner as not to aid Soviet rulers of Poland.

3. The U.S. Government should recognize and support the Oder-Neisse Line as the permanent border of Poland.

4. Poland should be continued to be classified as a most favored nation.

5. Polish currency owned by the U.S. should be used in Poland for humanitarian purposes.

6. The U.S. should revise the Immigration Laws in order to remove discriminatory provisions pertaining to immigrants from Poland.

7. To further work for the development of the Talent Bank established by the Polish American Congress of the U.S. which contains a list of the most qualified and talented Polish Americans available for government services at all levels and to encourage governmental leaders at all levels to utiize the recommendations of this Talent Bank.

8. To encourage the further involvement of Polish intellectuals in Polonia and community affairs.

9. To work for the success of the coming 25th Anniversary of the Polish American Congress of the U.S. which will be celebrated in Washington, D.C. in 1969.

10. To request that President Richard E. Nixon be encouraged to fulfill his pre-election campaign promises of restoring law and order.

11. To request that President Richard Nixon investigate university disturbances for foreign intrigue.

12. To request that university officials stiffen their opposition to student lawlessness, violence, and intolerance.

13. To oppose demands by any group if guns and violence are used to attain their ends.

14. To request that President Richard E. Nixon prepare the American people that lawlessness and violence must end on universities before chaos creates dictatorship. For the long term needs of American Democracy, the use of legitimate but violent police activities may be necessary to restore law and order to protect the innocent and the dedicated loyal majority.

15. In the shadow of Law Day, we, the Americans of Polish descent, break a silence of a generation and elect to speak in the interest of promoting greater understanding between ethnic groups in a nation of many origins, colors, and creeds. By this declaration, we seek to disseminate knowledge and understanding to hopefully eliminate ignorance and its consequence of prejudice, bigotry, and defamation particularly as they affect ethnic groups in this country.

16. We of Polish American heritage rededicate ourselves to "freedom under the law" and demand justice and fairness with respect to each man's public image. We allege that those who command the press and air waves that influence the masses should accept a just criticism for conduct diametrically opposed to the American concept of justice and equality when they fail to portray the heritage of Americans of various ancestry.

17. We, Americans of Polish Heritage, do hereby solemnly declare and proclaim that we will on every possible occasion expose, deplore, and denounce those powerful rulers of the pen and airwaves who use vicious ethnic humor and malicious misrepresentation of ethnic cultural heritage.

18. To declare to the Free World that the Ohio Division of the Polish American Congress is opposed to Communist oppression and tyranny. To this extent, we loyally as Americans first support the Viet Nam War until an honorable peace is negotiated.

Be it further resolved, that Richard Jablonski, president of the Ohio Division of the Polish American Congress and Al Mazewski, national president, be recognized and praised for their dynamic leadership in promoting Polonia aims and objectives by vigorously working to fulfill the rising role of Polonia in local, national, and international events.

Be it further resolved, that the Ohio Division of the Polish Congress endorse the afore-

mentioned principles and hereby directs the Board of Officers to forward copies of this resolution to President Richard Nixon, to the U.S. Secretary of State and other interested persons.

Released by Casimir Bielen, Public Affairs Officer, Ohio Division Polish American Congress, 3716 East 50th Street, Cleveland, Ohio 641-6056.

NORTH DAKOTA SECOND DISTRICT RESIDENTS OPPOSE VIETNAM PULLOUT

HON. THOMAS S. KLEPPE

OF NORTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 8, 1969

Mr. KLEPPE. Mr. Speaker, the first 7,500 responses received to a questionnaire I distributed among all postal patrons of North Dakota's Second Congressional District indicate that my constituents remain somewhat "hawkish" on Vietnam, oppose extension of the 10-percent Federal income tax surcharge by more than 2 to 1, and overwhelmingly favor cutting off Government assistance to college students who employ violent tactics.

If the Paris peace talks fail to produce agreement leading to at least some disengagement in Vietnam, 10 percent of those responding to the questionnaire said they would favor withdrawal of all U.S. military forces even though this might mean a Communist takeover.

Withdrawal of U.S. forces as rapidly as they could be replaced with South Vietnam forces, was selected as the best alternative by 47 percent.

Thirty-nine percent favored an all-out offensive against North Vietnam, utilizing full available military power, short of nuclear weapons, in an effort to win a clear-cut victory.

Undecided were 4 percent.

In a similar poll conducted 1 year ago, 41 percent favored going all out to win. At that time, 17 percent favored withdrawal of U.S. troops, while 23 percent advocated a halt in bombing of North Vietnam in the hope this would lead to a negotiated peace. The substitution of South Vietnamese troops for U.S. forces was not included in the 1968 questionnaire.

Two years ago, the west district poll showed 75 percent for stepping up the war effort against North Vietnam, with 16 percent advocating withdrawal.

Because the Vietnam questions in the three polls varied considerably, they are not exactly comparable. The responses, however, indicate increasing weariness with the war and a softening of "all-out-for-victory" support. It appears there is still no strong demand for a unilateral pullout of U.S. troops from Vietnam.

Following are percentage breakdowns of responses to 10 other questions:

1. The 10 per cent Federal surcharge on individual and corporate income taxes is presently scheduled to expire June 30, 1969. Do you favor?

(A) Extending it? 27%.

(B) Letting it expire? 64%.

(C) Undecided. 8%.

2. Would you favor replacing Federal health, education and welfare grants to the States with a block grant system which would permit State and local officials to determine how the funds should be spent? Yes 64%, no 22%, undecided 14%.

3. Would you favor replacing the present military draft system with an all-career defense force? Yes 44%, no 38%, undecided 18%.

4. Do you believe that college students receiving financial assistance from the government should have such aid cut off if they participate in demonstrations which cause property damage or interrupt the orderly pursuit of education by others? Yes, 95%, no 4%, undecided 1%.

5. Would you favor Federal legislation to strengthen collective bargaining power for farmers through their cooperatives and marketing organizations in order to obtain more faovrable prices for their products? Yes 65%, no 21%, undecided 14%.

6. How would you rate the kind of job Richard M. Nixon is doing as President? Good 48%, fair 28%, poor 5%, undecided 19%.

7. Should the Federal government try to slow down the migration from rural to urban areas through programs of economic incentives and aids to private business to help create jobs in rural areas? Yes 72%, no 16%, undecided 12%.

8. Do you favor transferring most functions of the Office of Economic Opportunity to other established agencies? Yes 51%, no 14%, undecided 35%.

9. Do you favor further and more stringent legislation to combat crime? Yes 91%, no 6%, undecided 3%.

10. Do you favor a government-guaranteed annual wage as a means of attacking poverty? Yes 14%, no 76%, undecided 10%.

A STUDY IN LOGIC

HON. GEORGE A. GOODLING

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 8, 1969

Mr. GOODLING. Mr. Speaker, boycotts of one kind or another seem to be the vogue today.

Just recently WSBA, a radio station serving the York-Harrisburg-Lancaster area in Pennsylvania, projected a significant editorial with respect to a particular type of boycott. Because this editorial deals with the subject of boycott in a unique manner and submits it in the light of logic, I insert the editorial into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD and commend it to the attention of my colleagues. It follows:

A STUDY IN LOGIC

Intro.: Recently, some protestors demonstrated at Dow Chemical Company against the Vietnam war and the use of napalm manufactured by Dow. The logic here is difficult for opinion to understand.

Ann.: The demonstrators urged an economic boycott of Saran Wrap, a Dow Chemical consumer product. By not using Saran Wrap, you put an economic squeeze on Dow Chemical. If this logic is correct—if you have boycotted Dow Chemical by refusing to buy Saran Wrap because Dow makes napalm, WSBA's opinion suggests an extension of this logic: You cannot buy or use an automobile . . . car makers build military vehicles! You cannot wear nylons or paint your house . . . DuPont makes explosives! You cannot use your Ski-Daddler, or bowl at an AMF Bowling Center . . . AMF builds rockets! You cannot use aluminum products . . . all major aluminum companies are on government war-related contracts! You cannot wear Rayban sunglasses . . . the manufacturer makes fine optical weapons of war! You cannot go hunting with any firearm . . . all gun companies are also government contractors! So if you are really serious about boycotting the American companies who "manufacture war-related products", you will have to abstain from virtually all activities . . . all purchases . . . all travel. You'll have to stay at your home and be completely inactive. Oh yes, if your telephone rings, don't answer it . . . AT&T makes army field telephones!

PENTAGON HIRING BIAS STARTLES CONGRESSMEN

HON. GLENN M. ANDERSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 8, 1969

Mr. ANDERSON of California. Mr. Speaker, I would like to call to the attention of my colleagues a most interesting and disturbing article by well-known columnist, Carl T. Rowan, which appeared in the May 4, 1969, edition of the Washington Evening Star.

My colleague GUS HAWKINS and I are quite upset at the kind of double talk the Defense Department seems to be giving to "equal employment opportunity" when the largest employer in the Nation employs only three Negroes in policymaking positions with two of them in "civil rights" jobs.

The article follows:

PENTAGON HIRING BIAS STARTLES CONGRESSMEN

(By Carl T. Rowan)

A few weeks ago I wrote that the Defense Department, the largest employer in the nation and the biggest spender of the public's money, is also the biggest racial discriminator in employment.

I didn't know how bad things really were.

But thanks to Reps. Gus Hawkins and Glenn M. Anderson, both California Democrats, the Defense Department has come up with some facts that Anderson's office calls "hard to believe."

Referring to my earlier column, Anderson asked Defense Secretary Melvin Laird just how many civilian "policy-making" jobs Defense has and precisely how many such posts are filled by black Americans.

Roger T. Kelley responded for Laird. He said that as for "super-grade" positions (GS-16, GS-17, and GS-18—not to mention executive level jobs), the Army has 136, not one of which is filled by a Negro. The Navy has 88 such posts, with one black GS-17. The Air Force has 96 super-grade posts, none of which is filled by a Negro American. The office of the Secretary of Defense and the defense agencies have 203 super-grade slots. Two are filled by black men.

So of a total of 523 super-grades in the military complex, only three Negroes are employed, and two of them are in "civil rights" jobs.

None can really be called a policy-maker. Of 48 executive positions, none is held by a Negro.

Yet, Kelley wrote on behalf of Laird: "Please accept our assurance that affirmative action, to assure equal employment opportunity at all levels within this department, is a matter of first priority."

And with that Kelley sent the two congressmen mimeographed copies of Laird's "equal employment" directive that no one seems to take very seriously.

I must point out, however, that Laird and President Nixon are not solely responsible for the appalling employment picture at Defense. It was just as pathetic during the tenures of Clark Clifford and Lyndon Johnson, of Robert McNamara and John F. Kennedy.

It seems no one has ever had the guts or the inclination to do anything about it.

After my earlier column there was a lot of hand-wringing in the Pentagon, but not over the question of who was going to take steps to at least create a pretense of fair hiring policy. The hand-wringing arose from a fear that what I had written would be mailed to black GIs in Vietnam, in Thailand, and Korea and intensify the racial unrest that has been building among our troops in the Far East.

The Pentagon has tried to keep this seething racial discontent from the public, but some of the facts have leaked out in recent weeks.

The truth is that more and more black troops feel that they are getting the dirtiest, most dangerous jobs, are being wounded and killed in numbers larger than their proportion of our fighting force in Vietnam, yet they have a harder time getting a promotion in the military or a fair chance once they return to civilian life.

Some of the 300,000 black men in the military are clearly in a mood to rebel.

This column has never advocated anything other than that young men of all races face up to and discharge the responsibilities of citizenship, onerous though they become on occasion.

But nothing encourages a "hell no, we won't go" attitude on the part of young black more than knowledge of the kind of civilian hiring policy the Defense Department is following.

NO COMPROMISE

HON. JOHN M. ZWACH

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 8, 1969

Mr. ZWACH. Mr. Speaker, I was shocked at the disclosure that one of the members of our august Supreme Court had accepted, and returned 11 months later, according to reports, a fee of $20,000 from a man who was having difficulties with the law.

At a time when many people are displaying a shocking disrespect and low regard for our Government, especially its courts, this disclosure is bound to give rise to doubts of the integrity of this most important branch of our Government.

Our Supreme Court must be above suspicion. The action of the Supreme Court Justice in this instance cannot be condoned or our very system of government, already under attack, will be in jeopardy.

I have had but one political philosophy in the 35 years that I have been in public office: There can be no compromise with integrity and high ethical conduct in public office.

This applies across the board, to men and women, Republicans and Democrats, to all nationalities and races.

Because of that belief, I introduced an ethics bill in the 90th Congress which was helpful in the creation of the House Committee on Standards of Official Conduct.

I sincerely regret the involvement of a Supreme Court Justice in this matter of fee acceptance and other acts of questionable conduct. It is an affront to the integrity and dignity of our highest court.

I hope the Justice will have the courage to undo this damage by tendering his immediate resignation.

CLIFFORD ALEXANDER DID HIS JOB TOO WELL

HON. MARTHA W. GRIFFITHS

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 8, 1969

Mrs. GRIFFITHS. Mr. Speaker, the Nixon administration has appointed fewer women to office than any administration in the last 30 years. This is bad enough, but even worse, they are now trying to get rid of the only man ever appointed to any post in the Federal Government that I know about who has spent any time attempting to give equal employment opportunities to women. I refer, of course, to Clifford Alexander, Chairman of the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission.

It was shocking to read in the press a threat from a leading Republican to go to the highest office in the land to get Chairman Clifford L. Alexander, Jr., fired for doing his job. It was shocking to read the next day that a White House spokesman said that Clifford Alexander would be removed. The threat and the White House response were, from what I read, based on Mr. Alexander's doing his job too well in enforcing the antidiscrimination law. Mr. Alexander submitted his resignation as Chairman on April 9 documenting his charge that the administration refused to support this Commission's vital work but he agreed with counsel, from within and outside Government, that he would stay on as a member of the Commission as long as he could continue to make a contribution to that work.

The inconsistencies of this administration in the area of civil rights were made abundantly clear, however, when another administration spokesman on April 22 recommended that Mr. Alexander quit the Commission entirely because, he said, the Chairman was not doing his job well.

So we have the high ranking Republican saying EEOC is doing too much at the same time that we have the assistant to the Attorney General in charge of civil rights in the Justice Department saying that EEOC is not doing enough.

The Equal Employment Opportunity Commission, under the leadership of Clifford L. Alexander, Jr., deserves the support of the Congress and the American people. As the Commission's third Chairman in the 3½ years of its existence, Mr. Alexander has initiated new and effective programs in the area of equal employment as well as speeding up the compliance process to bring redress to aggrieved individuals.

Under his leadership, the Commission, through its 1967 public hearings on discrimination in white collar employment, the first ever held, helped to dispel the myth that qualified minorities and women are not available for high-level jobs. EEOC's meetings with drug industry leaders and the executives of the Nation's largest utilities in 1968 along with its followup programs, are producing dramatic results in terms of new job opportunities.

I want to commend Mr. Alexander and the Commission for enlightening not only employers but the American people of the need for action in the area of equal employment. I also want to commend him for his recognition that sex discrimination is a real problem throughout this Nation, along with race, color, religion, and national origin. Prior to Clifford L. Alexander's chairmanship, sex discrimination was almost completely ignored or, even worse, ridiculed.

During the past 20 months, EEOC has made significant interpretations and issued important guidelines in the area of sex discrimination that forecast important new gains for women in employment. These guidelines establish the principle that nondiscrimination requires individuals to be considered on the basis of individual capacities and not on the basis of any characteristics generally attributed to the group. They make it an unlawful employment practice to classify a job as "male" or "female" or to maintain separate lines of progression or separate seniority lists based on sex where this would adversely affect any employee unless there is a bona fide occupational qualification—BFOQ. The leading Commission opinion in the area of BFOQ was issued in February 1968 when the Commission found that sex was not a BFOQ for the position of flight cabin attendant, more commonly referred to as steward or stewardess, and that an airline which hires only women as stewardesses or men as stewards and pursers thereby violates title VII. The Commission indicated by its opinion that when a job is involved which both men and women are able to perform satisfactorily, employers may not lawfully restrict that job to women because of their assumptions about the personality characteristics of men or women as a class.

As of January 24, 1969, EEOC's historic guideline concerning sex discrimination in job advertising became effective. The guideline states that the placement of job advertisements under separate male and female column headings violates the law unless sex is a BFOQ for the position advertised.

Other significant guidelines on employment discrimination because of sex that have been issued by the Commission establish standards of equal pay for equal work; make preemployment inquiries unlawful in connection with prospective employment when they express directly or indirectly any limitation, specification, or discrimination as to sex and make differences in optional or compulsory retirement ages unlawful when based on sex.

EEOC has negotiated conciliation agreements with industry that have benefitted many women and established precedents. For example:

A single complaint filed with EEOC by a woman charging she was denied a job on the basis of sex brought these benefits through a conciliation agreement: wage increases for 150 female employees and new job opportunities, the charging party got her job, and the company agreed to equalize its pay rates for men and women in comparable jobs, amounting to a collective annual increase of $37,440 for the women. In addition the company agreed to merge its male and female seniority rosters. Another agreement mediated by the Commission resulted in an estimated $500,000 in annual

wage increases for 2,000 women employees in 44 west coast paper mills. In the agreement, the company deleted all references to separate women's jobs and pay scales to insure equal pay for men and women in equivalent jobs.

Most women work for the same reason that men do; many are heads of households and they need the jobs. While educational opportunity has enlarged women's skills, job opportunity has not kept pace with the increasing abilities and preparation of women to hold jobs for which they are qualified and to which they are entitled.

Clifford Alexander has repeatedly stated that sex discrimination in employment is a serious matter. The Commission has found as a result of its studies that women are seriously underutilized in many top management and professional jobs. Mr. Alexander has said that—

> The Commission intends to continue its vigorous efforts to eliminate discrimination on the basis of sex, as well as discrimination on the basis of race, religion, and national origin.

I want to commend EEOC and its chairman for its vigorous efforts to enforce the laws on employment discrimination. The Commission does not have the kind of authority that it should have and I certainly hope that this administration will see to it that the EEOC gets "cease and desist" authority so that it can properly do its job. The administration must assure a continuation of the same forward thrust in all areas of employment discrimination as carried out by Clifford L. Alexander, Jr. if we are to end the wasteful underutilization of womanpower and manpower.

ERNIE PYLE COMMEMORATIVE STAMP

HON. W. E. (BILL) BROCK

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 8, 1969

Mr. BROCK. Mr. Speaker, as one of the many citizens interested in honoring the memory of War Correspondent Ernie Pyle, I have written Postmaster General Winton Blount urging him to issue a commemorative stamp on Memorial Day, May 30.

As a skilled reporter, a man of courage, and most of all, a man of great compassion, Ernie Pyle earned recognition as the best of America's combat correspondents during World War II.

The late Gen. Dwight Eisenhower spoke for thousands of American GI's and their families when he said of Ernie Pyle:

> We have lost one of our best and most understanding friends.

On his writing, President Truman remarked:

> No man . . . has so well told the story of the American fighting men as American fighting men want it told. He deserves the gratitude of all his countrymen.

And Ernie Pyle has won that gratitude. Today, thousands visit his grave in Honolulu, proving that his memory is still alive in the hearts of the men whom he wrote about and served with.

Each year, the Ernie Pyle Award is given to a leading war correspondent for keeping alive the traditions of courage and integrity that Ernie Pyle brought to his profession—characteristics that have found a new testing ground in the steaming jungles of Vietnam.

Ernie Pyle has our gratitude but we still owe it to him to preserve his memory for future Americans. I can think of no better way of doing this than by the issuance of a commemorative stamp in his honor.

Accordingly, I have asked the Postmaster General to consider April 1970, the 25th anniversary of Ernie Pyle's death, as an alternative date for issuing the stamp if this Memorial Day is not a workable goal. I urge my colleagues to join me in support of this effort to commemorate a great American.

BROCKTON, MASS., ONE OF THE FASTEST GROWING U.S. CITIES

HON. JAMES A. BURKE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 8, 1969

Mr. BURKE of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, Mr. Vincent A. Choate, manager of the Brockton, Mass., Regional Chamber of Commerce, has called my attention to a fine article in the U.S. News & World Report magazine which focuses on Brockton, Mass., as one of the fastest growing cities in the United States. Mr. Speaker, I would like to have this article appear in the RECORD and I hope all Members of the House have a chance to read this excellent analysis of our urban centers:

FASTEST-GROWING CITIES: LATEST CENSUS ESTIMATES

(NOTE.—Broad shifts in population of cities. . . . Urban areas in South and West showing biggest gains. . . . Big cities losing appeal, smaller ones growing faster. . . . These changes, now reported officially, hold important keys to Government, business planning.)

If you're wondering which U.S. cities are growing the fastest—

Urban areas in the South and the West are attracting people more rapidly than those in other regions.

It's the smaller or medium-sized cities, not the huge ones, that are gaining at the fastest clip.

The big metropolises of the North and East, in particular, with their problems of crime, congestion and racial tension, seem to be losing their appeal as places in which to live.

These and other trends are pinpointed in a new forecast, by the U.S. Census Bureau, of population patterns in metropolitan areas.

Changes of far-reaching significance are coming—changes that will affect businessmen and public officials in their planning for the future.

City versus countryside. The urge to move toward cities, on the whole, is slackening. Population still is rising faster in urban areas. But the "growth gap" is narrowing as migration from the countryside slows to a crawl.

In 1975, the proportion of Americans living in urban areas—64 per cent of the expected 215 million population—will be little different than it was in 1965.

In fact, the official figures suggest the big movement of people in coming years will be not from farm to city, but from the cities of the North and East to those of the South and West.

The nation's huge financial and commercial centers, such as New York, Philadelphia and Chicago, will still be attracting more people than they lose. But the net gain will be scanty.

Actually, in some of the major industrial and manufacturing centers—Pittsburgh, Detroit, Buffalo, Cleveland, Cincinnati and St. Louis, as examples—more people will be leaving than entering, if the Census Bureau is right.

In all these cities except Pittsburgh, however, population will still be higher in 1975 because of natural increases due to births.

Of the biggest cities, only Washington, D.C., with expanding Government, and Los Angeles are expected to grow much faster than average.

You can see from the charts on these pages how your city fits into the shifting population pattern now under way.

All but two of the 25 fastest-growing urban centers are located either in the South or west of the Mississippi River. And 15 of these metropolitan areas now have populations of less than 600,000.

Among the 25 leading gainers, California and Texas each boast five cities, Florida four. Climate is a major factor favoring these States, particularly for retired people. So is a holdover of the "frontier spirit," with opportunities for new ventures in business and trade.

Rapid expansion expected in Tucson, Phoenix and Albuquerque reflects the appeal of the desert country of the Southwest, now that air conditioning provides relief from the heat.

America's space program, involving billions in spending each year, is a factor in predictions of fast growth for Huntsville, Ala., Houston, and Orlando, Fla.

Many cities with big universities performing research work promise to develop rapidly, too—such as Madison, Wis.; Ann Arbor, Mich., and Columbus, Ohio.

On the other hand, many urban centers serving farm areas are losing population or gaining little. Sioux City and Des Moines, Iowa; Wichita, Kans., and Spokane, Wash., are cases in point.

Among cities expected to lose people by 1975 are those in mining areas, such as Johnstown and Scranton, Pa.; Wheeling, W. Va., and Duluth, Minn.-Superior, Wis.

The 25 urban areas that lead the growth parade

[Based on percentage growth in population from 1965 to 1975, as estimated by the U.S. Census Bureau]

	Increase
1. Fort Lauderdale-Hollywood, Fla	51.9
2. Santa Barbara, Calif	51.6
3. San Jose, Calif	51.4
4. Huntsville, Ala	51.4
5. Las Vegas, Nev	46.6
6. San Bernardino-Riverside-Ontario, Calif	35.2
7. West Palm Beach, Fla	34.5
8. Phoenix, Ariz	34.2
9. Sacramento, Calif	32.4
10. Orlando, Fla	31.2
11. Tampa-St. Petersburg, Fla	28.1
12. Washington, D.C	25.9
13. Los Angeles-Long Beach, Calif	25.6
14. Lexington, Ky	25.2
15. Tucson, Ariz	23.8
16. Houston, Tex	23.4
17. Lubbock, Tex	23.2
18. Dallas, Tex	23.1
19. Atlanta, Ga	23.0
20. Denver, Colo	22.5
21. Madison, Wis	22.3
22. Albuquerque, N.M	22.2
23. Amarillo, Tex	22.0
24. Brockton, Mass	22.0
25. Austin, Tex	21.5

These figures show a key change in population patterns now under way: a large-scale shift of people toward smaller and medium-sized urban centers in the South and West. Of the 25 fastest-growing cities, all but two—Brockton, Mass., and Madison, Wis.—are either in the South or west of the Mississippi River.

Percentages versus numbers. One thing to keep in mind is that percentage rates of rise in population do not accurately reflect the actual number of people added to population.

A relatively small urban area such as Santa Barbara, Calif., for example, with only 244,000 people in 1965, can boast a 51.6 per cent rate of growth by adding only 126,000 people in 10 years.

Yet metropolitan Chicago, with almost 6.7 million inhabitants in 1965, will show only a 9 per cent gain in population even though it is expected to add 600,000 people by 1975.

Despite wide variations in percentage rates of increase, changes come slowly in the relative rankings of cities according to actual population.

Today's 10 largest urban areas will still be the 10 largest in 1975, although the ranking of a few of these cities will change slightly. New York and Los Angeles will remain first and second in population, though the gap between the two is fast narrowing. Chicago, Philadelphia and Detroit will follow, maintaining their present positions.

But San Francisco will overtake Boston and move into sixth place. Washington will remain in eighth, though closing fast on Boston. St. Louis will move from tenth to ninth, displacing Pittsburgh.

HOW YOUR CITY WILL GROW BY 1975, AS ESTIMATED BY U.S. CENSUS BUREAU

	Population of metropolitan areas—		
	In 1965	Expected in 1975	Percent change
NEW ENGLAND			
Boston, Mass	3,205,000	3,334,000	Up 4.0
Bridgeport-Stamford-Norwalk, Conn	745,000	874,000	Up 17.3
Brockton, Mass	296,000	361,000	Up 22.0
Hartford-New Britain, Conn	768,000	884,000	Up 15.1
New Bedford-Fall River, Mass	411,000	421,000	Up 2.4
New Haven-Waterbury-Meriden, Conn	703,000	775,000	Up 10.2
Pittsfield, Mass	144,000	147,000	Up 2.1
Portland, Maine	197,000	209,000	Up 6.1
Providence, R. I	739,000	756,000	Up 2.3
Springfield-Chicopee-Holyoke, Mass	550,000	582,000	Up 5.8
Worcester-Fitchburg-Leominster, Mass	608,000	633,000	Up 4.1
MIDDLE ATLANTIC			
Albany-Schenectady-Troy, N.Y	697,000	745,000	Up 6.9
Allentown-Bethlehem-Easton, Pa	514,000	542,000	Up 5.4
Altoona, Pa	137,000	132,000	Down 3.6
Atlantic City, N.J	179,000	202,000	Up 12.8
Binghamton, N.Y	221,000	235,000	Up 6.3
Buffalo, N.Y	1,320,000	1,349,000	Up 2.2
Erie, Pa	255,000	254,000	Down 0.4
Harrisburg, Pa	364,000	389,000	Up 6.9
Jersey City, N.J	619,000	607,000	Down 1.9
Johnstown, Pa	270,000	246,000	Down 8.9
Lancaster, Pa	288,000	305,000	Up 5.9
Newark, N.J	1,851,000	2,045,000	Up 10.5
New York, N.Y	11,366,000	12,078,000	Up 6.3
Paterson-Clifton-Passaic, N.J	1,307,000	1,491,000	Up 14.1
Philadelphia, Pa	4,659,000	5,080,000	Up 9.0
Pittsburgh, Pa	2,385,000	2,306,000	Down 3.3
Reading, Pa	283,000	290,000	Up 2.5
Rochester, N.Y	644,000	733,000	Up 13.8
Scranton, Pa	226,000	203,000	Down 10.2
Syracuse, N.Y	606,000	686,000	Up 13.2
Trenton, N.J	296,000	338,000	Up 14.2
Utica-Rome, N.Y	346,000	376,000	Up 8.7
Wilkes-Barre-Hazleton, Pa	345,000	324,000	Down 6.1
York, Pa	252,000	267,000	Up 6.0

HOW YOUR CITY WILL GROW BY 1975, AS ESTIMATED BY U.S. CENSUS BUREAU—Continued

	Population of metropolitan areas—		
	In 1965	Expected in 1975	Percent change
SOUTH ATLANTIC			
Asheville, N.C	143,000	158,000	Up 10.5
Atlanta, Ga	1,216,000	1,496,000	Up 23.0
Augusta, Ga	237,000	250,000	Up 5.5
Baltimore, Md	1,854,000	2,045,000	Up 10.3
Charleston, S.C	248,000	278,000	Up 12.1
Charleston, W. Va	246,000	228,000	Down 7.3
Charlotte, N.C	312,000	373,000	Up 19.6
Columbia, S.C	289,000	335,000	Up 15.9
Columbus, Ga	260,000	268,000	Up 3.1
Durham, N.C	123,000	141,000	Up 14.6
Fort Lauderdale-Hollywood, Fla	441,000	670,000	Up 51.9
Greensboro-High Point, N.C	267,000	307,000	Up 15.0
Greenville, S.C	218,000	235,000	Up 7.8
Huntington, W. Va.; Ashland, Ky	260,000	262,000	Up 0.8
Jacksonville, Fla	499,000	579,000	Up 16.0
Lynchburg, Va	119,000	138,000	Up 16.0
Macon, Ga	201,000	227,000	Up 12.9
Miami, Fla	1,061,000	1,288,000	Up 21.4
Newport News-Hampton, Va	271,000	305,000	Up 12.5
Norfolk-Portsmouth, Va	637,000	681,000	Up 6.9
Orlando, Fla	372,000	488,000	Up 31.2
Pensacola, Fla	224,000	257,000	Up 14.7
Raleigh, N.C	195,000	232,000	Up 19.0
Richmond, Va	451,000	535,000	Up 18.6
Roanoke, Va	173,000	201,000	Up 16.2
Savannah, Ga	192,000	195,000	Up 1.6
Tampa-St. Petersburg, Fla	873,000	1,118,000	Up 28.1
Washington, D.C	2,409,000	3,034,000	Up 25.9
West Palm Beach, Fla	281,000	378,000	Up 34.5
Wheeling, W. Va	187,000	180,000	Down 3.7
Wilmington, Del	414,000	490,000	Up 18.4
Winston-Salem, N.C	207,000	238,000	Up 15.0
NORTH CENTRAL			
Akron, Ohio	545,000	592,000	Up 8.6
Ann Arbor, Mich	187,000	224,000	Up 19.8
Bay City, Mich	109,000	114,000	Up 4.6
Canton, Ohio	356,000	375,000	Up 5.3
Cedar Rapids, Iowa	149,000	165,000	Up 10.7
Chicago, Ill	6,688,000	7,288,000	Up 9.0
Cincinnati, Ohio	1,125,000	1,185,000	Up 5.3
Cleveland, Ohio	1,871,000	1,956,000	Up 4.5
Columbus, Ohio	769,000	895,000	Up 16.4
Dayton, Ohio	757,000	843,000	Up 11.4
Decatur, Ill	122,000	129,000	Up 5.7
Des Moines, Iowa	270,000	276,000	Up 2.2
Detroit, Mich	3,987,000	6,174,000	Up 4.7
Duluth, Minn.; Superior Wis	267,000	255,000	Down 4.5
Flint, Mich	413,000	449,000	Up 8.7
Fort Wayne, Ind	259,000	294,000	Up 13.5
Gary-Hammond-East Chicago, Ind	596,000	644,000	Up 8.1
Grand Rapids, Mich	390,000	424,000	Up 8.7
Hamilton-Middletown, Ohio	208,000	230,000	Up 10.6
Indianapolis, Ind	739,000	789,000	Up 6.8
Jackson, Mich	137,000	149,000	Up 8.8
Kalamazoo, Mich	181,000	208,000	Up 14.9
Kansas City, Mo	1,116,000	1,200,000	Up 7.5
Kenosha, Wis	114,000	134,000	Up 17.5
Lansing, Mich	336,000	389,000	Up 15.8
Lima, Ohio	112,000	122,000	Up 8.9
Lincoln, Nebr	161,000	170,000	Up 5.6
Lorain-Elyria, Ohio	240,000	281,000	Up 17.1
Madison, Wis	260,000	318,000	Up 22.3
Milwaukee, Wis	1,231,000	1,302,000	Up 5.8
Minneapolis-St. Paul, Minn.	1,611,000	1,814,000	Up 12.6
Muncie, Ind	117,000	127,000	Up 8.5
Omaha, Nebr	516,000	588,000	Up 14.0
Racine, Wis	160,000	185,000	Up 15.6
Rockford, Ill	226,000	254,000	Up 12.4
Saginaw, Mich	208,000	229,000	Up 10.1
St. Louis, Mo	2,198,000	2,356,000	Up 7.2
Sioux City, Iowa	102,000	93,000	Down 8.8
South Bend, Ind	237,000	241,000	Up 1.7
Springfield, Ill	153,000	160,000	Up 4.6
Springfield, Mo	140,000	164,000	Up 17.1
Springfield, Ohio	147,000	166,000	Up 12.9
Terre Haute, Ind	107,000	108,000	Up 0.9
Toledo, Ohio	473,000	489,000	Up 3.4
Topeka, Kans	149,000	158,000	Up 6.0
Waterloo, Iowa	124,000	128,000	UP 3.2
Wichita, Kans	350,000	348,000	Down 0.6
Youngstown-Warren, Ohio.	523,000	543,000	Up 3.8
SOUTH CENTRAL			
Abilene, Tex	126,000	146,000	UP 15.9
Amarillo, Tex	168,000	205,000	Up 22.0

HOW YOUR CITY WILL GROW BY 1975, AS ESTIMATED BY U.S. CENSUS BUREAU—Continued

	Population of metropolitan areas—		
	In 1965	Expected in 1975	Percent change
SOUTH CENTRAL—Con.			
Austin, Tex	247,000	300,000	Up 21.5
Baton Rouge, La	255,000	306,000	Up 20.0
Beaumont-Port Arthur, Tex	313,000	334,000	Up 6.7
Birmingham, Ala	644,000	652,000	Up 1.2
Chattanooga, Tenn	292,000	303,000	Up 3.8
Corpus Christi, Tex	237,000	248,000	Up 4.6
Dallas, Tex	1,288,000	1,585,000	Up 23.1
El Paso, Tex	344,000	395,000	Up 14.8
Fort Worth, Tex	627,000	713,000	Up 13.7
Galveston-Texas City, Tex	157,000	178,000	Up 13.4
Houston, Tex	1,494,000	1,843,000	Up 23.4
Huntsville, Ala	183,000	277,000	Up 51.4
Jackson, Miss	211,000	243,000	Up 15.2
Knoxville, Tenn	390,000	405,000	Up 3.8
Lake Charles, La	135,000	139,000	Up 3.0
Lexington, Ky	159,000	199,000	Up 25.2
Louisville, Ky	771,000	820,000	Up 6.4
Lubbock, Tex	185,000	228,000	Up 23.2
Memphis, Tenn	688,000	764,000	Up 11.0
Mobile, Ala	337,000	375,000	Up 11.3
Monroe, La	112,000	129,000	Up 15.2
Montgomery, Ala	174,000	180,000	Up 3.4
Nashville, Tenn	435,000	496,000	Up 14.0
New Orleans, La	973,000	1,107,000	Up 13.8
Oklahoma City, Okla	585,000	673,000	Up 15.0
San Antonio, Tex	774,000	862,000	Up 11.4
Shreveport, La	289,000	300,000	Up 3.8
Tulsa, Okla	433,000	450,000	Up 3.9
Tuscaloosa, Ala	118,000	135,000	Up 14.4
Waco, Tex	156,000	164,000	Up 5.1
Wichita Falls, Tex	130,000	145,000	Up 11.5
FAR WEST			
Albuquerque, N. Mex	288,000	352,000	Up 22.2
Bakersfield, Calif	320,000	373,000	Up 16.6
Colorado Springs, Colo	176,000	192,000	Up 9.1
Denver, Colo	1,075,000	1,317,000	Up 22.5
Eugene, Oreg	194,000	234,000	Up 20.6
Fresno, Calif	404,000	485,000	Up 20.0
Honolulu, Hawaii	571,000	646,000	Up 13.1
Las Vegas, Nev	232,000	340,000	Up 46.6
Los Angeles-Long Beach, Calif	7,877,000	9,893,000	Up 25.6
Ogden, Utah	120,000	136,000	Up 13.3
Phoenix, Ariz	818,000	1,098,000	Up 34.2
Portland, Oreg	897,000	1,003,000	Up 11.8
Pueblo, Colo	119,000	123,000	Up 3.4
Sacramento, Calif	584,000	773,000	Up 32.4
Salt Lake City, Utah	440,000	528,000	Up 20.0
San Bernardino-Riverside-Ontario, Calif	1,016,000	1,374,000	Up 35.2
San Diego, Calif	1,138,000	1,378,000	Up 21.1
San Francisco-Oakland, Calif	3,081,000	3,625,000	Up 17.7
San Jose, Calif	885,000	1,340,000	Up 51.4
Santa Barbara, Calif	244,000	370,000	Up 51.6
Seattle, Wash	1,178,000	1,328,000	Up 12.7
Spokane, Wash	267,000	263,000	Down 1.5
Stockton, Calif	274,000	322,000	Up 17.5
Tucson, Ariz	307,000	380,000	Up 23.8

CUSTOMS BUREAU NEEDS ADEQUATE FUNDING TO DO ITS JOB: BUREAU BRINGS IN FAR MORE THAN ITS COST

HON. THADDEUS J. DULSKI

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 8, 1969

Mr. DULSKI. Mr. Speaker, the congressional appropriations subcommittees are putting in long hours these days in their consideration of the budget to run the Federal Government in fiscal 1971.

The subcommittees have momentous tasks—which unfortunately too many people do not fully appreciate—in culling the vast background information necessary upon which to make their decisions.

At the same time that they are making decisions on individual items or agencies, they also must take into account the overall budget, seeking to hold down Government spending in every way possible.

I commend each and every member of these subcommittees for their diligence and for their devotion to duty. Their conclusions, I am convinced, are reached upon the basis of the best information which they have at hand.

If there is any fault, beyond sincere differences of opinion, it probably should be chalked up to the magnitude of the responsibility which we impose upon these members.

The foregoing is intended to clearly set forth my respect and admiration for the work of the appropriations subcommittees, as a preface to pointing up an area where I feel the subcommittee involved may well consider more leniency which will in turn increase the inflow of money to the Federal Treasury.

Mr. Speaker, there are some agencies of Government which develop considerably more in revenue to the Federal Treasury than their cost of operations. Indeed, adequate staffing works to increase the income to the Treasury.

Two excellent examples come to mind: the Internal Revenue Service and the Bureau of Customs.

As a former field employee of the Internal Revenue Service, I am well aware that the recovered revenue by an agent is limited only by the time he has available to devote to studying and investigating cases.

The Bureau of Customs has a fantastic workload today, and is doing an admirable job despite limited staff and facilities.

The National Customs Service Association, composed of employees of the U.S. Customs Service, has developed a comprehensive memorandum, filled with impressive statistics, which spells out the task facing the Bureau today and its limitations because of inadequate funding.

Mr. Speaker, the memorandum by Association President John J. Murphy tells the story very well to the appropriations committees, and I include the text with my remarks:

MEMORANDUM BY THE NATIONAL CUSTOMS SERVICE ASSOCIATION REGARDING FUNDING FOR THE BUREAU OF CUSTOMS, MAY 1, 1969

The Bureau of Customs is in the position of being chronically understaffed and forced to operate with a completely inadequate budget. This is a condition that has existed for many years, going back in fact to the days when Calvin Coolidge was President.

The Bureau has struggled along through the years; never having the resources to carry out its mission in the manner that Congress originally intended when it laid upon Customs the obligation of protecting the revenue of the United States.

The Bureau of Customs is caught in a squeeze between the continually increasing workload, a static work force, and a completely unrealistic budget.

For the past several years, the Bureau requests for funds have shown an increase of four per cent (4%) per year, while the actual requirements of the Service have been at a rate above eight per cent (8%) annually. From this simple comparison of figures, it is obvious that Customs is waging a losing battle.

Our purpose at this time is to bring to you a personal appeal from the employees who are on the firing line. We seek your help in alleviating the Customs' plight which is brought about simply and solely by the lack of staff and funds to do an effective job.

INCREASED WORKLOAD OF CUSTOMS IS CATASTROPHIC

The record of previous hearings on appropriations for the Customs Service show a steady increase in workload in every category. They show also a steady increase in the amount of duties and excise tax collected, and a steady drop in the cost of collection. We wish to bring to your attention the following analysis of the almost unbelievable increase in workload. The functions of entries filed, passengers processed and collection of duties and taxes, the yardstick by which Customs measures its workload, reveal dramatic increases.

	For 1945	1965 increase (percent)	1966 (percent)	1967 (percent)	1968 (percent)	Cumulative 1968 over 1945 (percent)
Collections	358,138,757	478.0	14.6	8.5	8.4	712.4
Passengers	59,284,421	200.0	4.9	5.2	5.8	260.6
Entries	417,910	301.0	10.0	7.0	6.5	448.3

In spite of this amazing expansion of all categories, the number of employees on our payroll has risen by less than eight per cent (7.9%) from 8,500 back in 1945 to 9,169 in fiscal year 1968.

The cost of collecting $100 in revenue in fiscal year 1968 was only $3.09, despite rising salaries and administrative overheads. This is the seventh consecutive year that this cost has remained below $4.00. Customs is plainly one of the most profitable of the Federal Government's operations.

We today perform many functions not dreamed of a few years ago, or which were performed on a minor scale. For example: air traffic, which we were able to process with only a handful of personnel in 1945, now requires more than 600 full time inspectors and other support personnel.

The increased emphasis upon other programs, such as the enforcement of antidumping laws, the collection of import statistics, quotas, munitions control, export control, foreign assets control—activities which are of great importance to the economy and well-being of the United States—do not produce revenue but demand highly trained people and substantially increase the Customs' workload.

NATURE OF CUSTOMS ACTIVITIES AND INCREASE THEREIN

The most recent figures available concerning Customs' activities (covering the fiscal year 1968), show the continuing dramatic increase in Customs' transactions and collections.

1. The total collection of duties and excise tax for the general treasury by the Bureau of Customs reached a record total of $2,909,540,528 during the fiscal year 1968. This figure represents *an increase of nearly eight and one half per cent (8.4%)* over the 1967 total of $2,684,010,465.

2. The cost of collecting each dollar for the general treasury fell during 1968 to $0.0309, the lowest figure on record. The Bureau's total operating budget for the fiscal year 1967–1968 was less than $90 million.

3. The number of persons entering the United States and processed through Customs rose to 213,806,189 *an increase of five and eight-tenths per cent (5.8%)* over the previous year's figure of 202,029,245 and is virtually equal to the total population of the United States.

4. The number of formal Customs entries, another significant barometer of the workload, *jumped by six and one-half per cent (6.5%)* from 2,152,190 in 1967 to 2,291,241 in 1968.

5. The number of mail packages received from abroad *increased by two per cent (2.0%)* from 55,052,498 to 56,126,729.

6. Arriving aircraft *increased by thirteen per cent (13%)* from 275,623 to 312,712. The total number of carriers processed by the Customs Service *rose from 60,543,308 to 64,118,762.*

The Commissioner of Customs, in commenting on Bureau statistics, has stated "We have absorbed much of the sharp increase in our workload with our present staff, but we are hard pressed to meet the demands placed upon us. *Workload increases continue to outrun the manpower available.*"

THE CUSTOMS SERVICE IS FACED WITH A SERIOUS CRISIS

It is becoming impossible for the Bureau of Customs to do an effective job with the funds and staff at its command. As has been said, extraordinary increases in workload are occurring in all areas while the number of people to do the job has not kept pace.

For example, it is our understanding that the number of inspectors available today to process the greatly increased number of travelers and the tremendous growth of import cargo is actually less than we had thirty (30) years ago. As has been pointed out, thirty years ago many of our present responsibilities were non-existent or the process was in its infancy.

It is no answer to say that we are doing the job. Actually we are doing the job but under greatly altered circumstances. Because of lack of money, we have to operate with a reduced staff.

The net result of this is that in order to keep the job going—to process passengers, baggage and cargo; and to handle the avalanche of paper work, has meant some dangerous and unjustified corner cutting.

What has happened is that the employees have been subjected to constant severe pressure to get the job done despite personnel shortages. While this has resulted in a tremendous increase in productivity, it has been accomplished at the expense of proper protection of the revenue.

Spot checks which were formerly used only to keep the operation moving during peak periods have now become the order of the day. This is a pragmatic decision. There is really no other way to do it.

Travelers are waiting to be processed and it is unthinkable that they should be put to inconvenience because of the inadequacies of the Customs Service. This applies likewise to importers. The burden should not be shifted to the importing business because Customs has insufficient help to do the job.

Because of spot checks, corner-cutting and other variations of the so-called "calculated risk," the Customs Service has been reduced to carrying out only the form of its responsibilities while the substance is completely lacking.

From outward appearances, we are doing what we are supposed to do, while in point of fact, we are not, simply because it is impossible for us to do so.

Despite the reorganization of Customs, great emphasis on streamlining operations, constant attempts to eliminate unnecessary or duplicating functions, it is a physical impossibility to cope with the increasing workload without additional manpower.

There is nothing wrong with the Customs Service that additional personnel cannot correct.

No amount of changes in procedures, short of changing the Tariff Act itself, will bring our responsibilities and their accomplishment into balance.

Customs operations have been studied and restudied, analyzed and re-analyzed ad infinitum. The conclusion in every case is that the work is there; and has to be done, in some fashion, by someone.

EFFECTIVE CONTROL OF NARCOTICS MENACE IMPOSSIBLE UNDER EXISTING CONDITIONS

It is our view, based on the studies and opinions of career Customs employees of long service, that the present state of affairs in the Customs Service is at such a dangerous point that something drastic must be done before the Service deteriorates into complete impotence.

We are accomplishing the service functions of our job in a perfunctory and ineffective manner. This is because we must of necessity move people and cargo without regard to revenue protection.

The enforcement aspects of Customs have been reduced to a sort of hit and miss screening. We do not know, and will never know, what the loss in revenue is because of this way of doing things. Neither will we ever know the extent to which our many loopholes have been used to introduce prohibited material from entering the United States.

It is the firm conviction of our members that there is a direct connection between inadequate enforcement by Customs and the widespread availability and use of narcotics, particularly heroin.

It is acknowledged by all concerned that this narcotic and other drugs are produced abroad and that they, or their ingredients, must be smuggled into the United States.

It is obvious that the narcotics traffic is increasing to an extent never before seen. Despite an inadequate staff, Customs has been doing an heroic job in trying to prevent the introduction of narcotic drugs into the United States.

The narcotics menace, now receiving so much belated attention, has long been known to the Customs Service which has the primary responsibility for the prevention of smuggling.

Although the responsibility for the prevention of the entry of narcotics is imposed by law on the Bureau of Customs, the funds and personnel necessary to do the job have never been sufficient.

In fact, the amount of funds has been completely unrealistic when one considers that narcotics activities have been steadily increasing.

One point in the study of the narcotics problem upon which there is complete agreement is that they are imported into the United States. The shocking accounts of teenage addiction have aroused the public from its lethargy in some quarters.

However, the public generally is not aware of the value of a dollar appropriated at the Customs enforcement level. Customs officers seize the narcotics before they enter the country and while the shipment is in its pure unadulterated form.

Try to visualize a large shipment of narcotics as a pillow filled with tiny feathers. When seized by Customs men the entire load is taken in one swoop.

Once the bag of feathers is loosed on the country and enters into the commerce of the underworld, it takes, literally, thousands of federal, state and local enforcement agents to ferret out the little individual feathers which have blown away and are now scattered in countless directions.

It is safe to estimate that the difference in costs of detection is a thousand to one in dollars alone.

RECORD REVENUES MISLEADING

The fact that Customs is now collecting $100 in revenue at a cost of $3.09 (the lowest figure on record) is not necessarily an indication of the effectiveness of the job.

This simply means that revenues are constantly increasing because of the upward spiralling of imports and that the work in connection with the collection of this amount of revenue is being done by a completely insufficient workforce.

It should be borne in mind that this cost of collection includes also all of our enforcement operations which do not directly bring in any revenue.

The fact of the matter is that we would be doing an infinitely better job in every respect if the cost of collection were as high as $1 or $2 more.

We have hoped through the years, that the Congress would take a business approach to the needs of the Customs Service, quite apart from any service or law enforcement consideration. This would be a plain dollar approach from the standpoint of what return can we get from our investment.

To our mind, it would be a lucrative business indeed, that could return to its treasury $100 for every $3.09 invested. The plain fact is that with additional funds, Customs could collect a great deal more revenue besides having the muscle to do a far superior enforcement job.

The Customs Service is the oldest in the government of the United States, having been formed in 1789, antedating the Treasury Department itself. It is also one of the most sensitive agencies in government standing as it does on the threshold of our country.

It is the first line of defense against smuggling of all sorts. It prevents the introduction of narcotics, dangerous insect pests that ravage our agriculture, pornographic material that undermines the moral fiber of our citizens, and fraud and undervaluation of imported merchandise which encroach upon the legitimate business of American importers.

The myriad duties of the Customs Service cannot be effectively carried out without an efficient, experienced and highly trained staff. We know of no area where the saying "penny wise and pound foolish" applies so aptly as it does to the Bureau of Customs.

RECOMMENDATIONS OF NCSA

The members of NCSA respectfully and earnestly appeal to you as key members of the Appropriations Committee, to use your good office to bring about a realistic appraisal of the serious problems that currently confront the Customs Service and require *immediate* attention.

The employees of the Customs Service traditionally have been a dedicated group, but we cannot effectively carry out the mission charged to us by Congress when it passed the Tariff Act in our present understaffed condition.

We repeat that the Customs Service is the Nation's first line of defense against our now critical and ever growing drug menace. Congress has always made funds available for defense against foreign enemies, and it should now adopt a similar attitude toward the protection of our citizens against the menace of drug addiction that threatens thousands of our citizens from within.

In furtherance of this end, we have made a survey through our national officers in an effort to estimate the number of additional employees we feel is necessary to more effectively carry out the Customs' mission.

The estimates have been made by knowledgeable employees who are close to the problem and have to contend with the day to day issues brought about by understaffing.

The following figures represent what we believe to be minimum requirements:

Processing persons (baggage examination, borders, piers, airports, etc.)	550
Processing cargo (all locations)	700
Processing mail	400
Enforcement activities (all areas)	700
Total	2,350

In addition to the above, additional personnel is needed to properly handle administrative needs at Regional Headquarters and at Bureau Headquarters in Washington. For this purpose, we estimate an additional 100 employees is required.

It should be pointed out that in the area of enforcement, the above figures are an absolute minimum requirement, in our view, to have any realistic impact on smuggling operations, particularly narcotics.

In conclusion, we wish to reiterate that a very substantial portion of the funds now being made available by Congress to health agencies to treat persons afflicted with drug addiction, and to law enforcement agencies to reduce the traffic in drugs, would not be needed if effective means were made available to the Customs Service to reduce the flow of drugs into the country. We therefore respectfully request that our recommendations be given your careful consideration at this critical time.

CHALLENGE OF NEW HORIZONS MET BY CORN MILLERS MAY ARROW THE WAY TOWARD CURING MALNUTRITION AT HOME

HON. ROBERT H. MICHEL

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 8, 1969

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, in line with the President's stirring message to the Congress, which amounts to a declaration of war on hunger, I would like to pass on to my colleagues some news about an exciting development in food production. I am speaking of a product called CSM—corn, soya, milk—which has been developed by the corn milling industry in this country. It is a real breakthrough in the problem of finding enough food for starving millions all over the world as well as some of our own undernourished citizens.

I can attest to the good taste of CSM since I have eaten it often and, in fact, ate nothing else for 1 week. I found it to be more than satisfying and received a fringe benefit in that I was able to drop a couple of pounds of weight which I will not miss at all.

An article by Mr. George E. Swarbreck appearing in the May 1969 issue of the Northwestern Miller magazine points out some interesting highlights of the CSM story and I noted with pleasure the contribution to this very worthwhile endeavor on the part of my good friend, Mr. Bert Tollefson, Jr., who, as many of you know did an excellent job for the Eisenhower administration in the Department of Agriculture. He has just been confirmed by the Senate for the position of Assistant Administrator of the Agency for International Development and very likely will be in a position to further expedite an even wider and more effective distribution of this product to those countries where hunger is a daily fact of life.

I insert the article in the RECORD at this point:

CHALLENGE OF NEW HORIZONS MET BY CORN MILLERS MAY ARROW THE WAY TOWARD CURING MALNUTRITION AT HOME

(By George E. Swarbreck)

Corn millers have been making newspaper headlines. Deservedly so, too. They have been pioneers in the work of developing new foods for the needy peoples of the world who number in the millions. One product, known as CSM, has gone to more than 100 countries with shipments since 1966 approaching the billion pound mark.

The headlines came after CSM—corn, soya, milk—was mentioned at the recent congressional hearings on hunger presided over by Sen. George McGovern (D., S.D.). CSM has made a substantial contribution to the problem of relieving the world's hunger, as have many other corn-based products. And the corn millers have reason to be proud of their contribution. Sen. McGovern's interest was aroused—on behalf of the poor people of America.

PRAISE FROM OFFICIAL

Richard W. Reuter, when he was special assistant to former Secretary of State Dean Rusk, working on the Food for Peace program, said in the early stages of the development of food for the hungry: "No commodity group has done more to help meet world food needs than the American Corn Millers Federation. Using their own resources, the corn millers have cooperated closely with the U.S. Department of Agriculture and the Agency for International Development to develop formulated foods, rich in proteins and vitamins, for use overseas in America's Food for Peace program."

That was said nearly three years ago. The corn millers' contribution has increased many-fold since then.

The question now being raised today is how can those corn-based foods, such as CSM, be directed into domestic channels to help feed the needy of the U.S. The needs of people overseas, particularly infants and children, are still dire, but the problem is equally serious here at home.

CSM is already on a limited domestic test pattern by USDA in order to judge its acceptability. Corn millers are quick to pay tribute to the members of USDA's Agricultural Research Service for the work done in building CSM into an acceptable product abroad. It contains a well-balanced assortment of necessary nutrients and approaches the optimum desirable cereal-protein ratio. It is specifically designed for infants and children in low-protein status who require prolonged feeding to achieve normal levels of metabolism.

CSM's basic cereal component is processed corn meal with added defatted toasted soyflour, nonfat dry milk, calcium carbonate and a vitamin-mineral premix. The result is a 20% protein food with an adjusted protein efficiency ratio of 2.42 to 2.48 and a nutritionally approved amino acid balance. It is virtually bran-free, has a bland flavor and smooth texture. Produced in powder form, it is precooked and ready for infant or child feeding after 1 min. broiling time. It can be fed also as a gruel, as a cereal and even made into bread or cookies.

It has been described as a marriage of flavors—the flavor of corn with the flavor of soy flour—and in this happy union, processed corn meal functions as one of the most effective protein carrier foods ever produced by the cereal processing industries of America.

OTHER CORN-BASED FOODS

The corn millers don't stop at CSM. There are other similar, imaginative foods, all based on corn meal, and all have had varying degrees of success around the world, depending upon local dietary requirements. In these, too, is hope for curing the malnutrition that is America's besetting sin today.

Regular corn meal is still a basic, proven, acceptable product and it is in demand in many parts of the country, baked or cooked, as may be required, says Bert Tollefson, Jr., president of the American Corn Millers Federation, which has its headquarters in Washington, D.C. Mr. Tollefson joined the federation in the summer of 1966, just as the new foods started to attract official attention as a means of filling the needs of the hungry abroad. First as executive director, now as president, he has responsibility for over-all federation activities, including government relations, domestic and foreign marketing staff and operations, financial management and administration of industry-sponsored research programs.

The personable Tollefson came to ACMF well-equipped for the job. From 1957 to 1961, for instance, he was assistant to the then Secretary of Agriculture Ezra Taft Benson, acting as program liaison officer for the department. He was a member of Mr. Benson's 11-member policy staff and initiated several management innovations and agricultural marketing promotions, including participation in the establishment of the Food for Peace program. In November 1957, he was a member of the U.S. 12-member delegation to the Food and Agriculture Organization Conference in Rome and was the U.S. representative to the public affairs session. He traveled with Mr. Benson as his aide on many domestic and foreign trips and in this capacity made a trade development and goodwill trip to the Soviet Union, Yugoslavia, West Germany, Poland, Finland, Sweden and Norway.

But Bert Tollefson is no dyed-in-the-wool government official—and there's nothing wrong about being dyed-in-the-wool for official caution has its values—because his experience in the business world has included service with some dynamic major organizations.

And it is to government officials, particularly the ARS people, that Mr. Tollefson likes to point when awarding credit for what the corn millers have achieved.

In talking enthusiastically about CSM, Mr. Tollefson does not overlook corn products. He mentions the time-tried and tested degermed enriched corn meal, a basic product of the U.S. corn miller, and itself a vital part of aid programs abroad. Enriched corn meal is both economical and nutritious and lends itself to use in hot breads, main dishes and desserts. Extra food values flow with the use of enrichment.

Processed corn meal, also enriched, is useful for people with no ovens and only the minimum of fuel on call, he explains. Its unique characteristic is that when mixed with water it forms a corn dough. Incidentally, processed corn meal is the only cereal acceptable for the widely popular and nutritious corn beverages which are a staple food throughout Latin America where they are known as *atol, pinolillo, chicheme, colada* and *chicha dulce*.

INGENIOUS CEPLAPRO

Another product is Ceplapro, a high protein, enriched corn-based food in kernel form resulting from the ingenuity of corn millers and outstanding nutritionists. It is of particular interest whether this is the staple in short supply, and, additionally, it is adaptable to the many meat and fish dishes peculiar to Southeast Asian and Latin American eating habits. Ceplapro is composed of degermed corn meal, durum flour, defatted toasted soy flour, nonfat dry milk, calcium carbonate and a vitamin-mineral premix. Ceplapro's protein content ranges from 18% to 20% by U.S. government specification, with an adjusted protein efficiency ration in excess of 2.25.

There are others. Incaparino, a corn meal, sesame, cottonseed flour blend is being produced and marketed in Colombia and Central America. A corn-based blend called Supro is being sold commercially in Kenya. Pronutro, another high protein blended food with corn meal base, is being marketed in South Africa.

STEEPWATER USE SUGGESTED

A development of recent origin comes from a suggestion by Robert C. Liebenow, president of the Corn Refiners Assn. He has asked USDA to investigate steepwater, a first step byproduct of corn refining, as a new source of nutrition-building protein for humans. It is, he says, a good source of available protein, amino acids and minerals necessary for proper nutrition. Recent tests rate protein content at about 7.5%. For years steepwater has been added to corn gluten feed which is vital in beef, poultry and egg production, and is used extensively in the production of antibiotics.

Mr. Liebenow says the role of steepwater "has never been fully explained and a number of growth factors remain unidentified. Research on these questions could lead to the identification of valuable components and methods for recovering them which in turn could provide an important new source of protein."

IS CORN THE KEY?

Is corn the key to solving the problems of malnutrition in America? There are many observers who believe that it could be.

Hubert H. Humphrey, then Vice President of the U.S., speaking at the second international conference on the War on Hunger in Washington last year, discussing the opportunities and responsibilities of the U.S. in meeting world food needs said: "In a world where the majority of men still lead a hand-to-mouth existence, where hunger and malnutrition still destroy mental and physical powers, where war, pestilence and famine still ride hand-in-hand, there can be no peace. Nor can there be real security or full development for any of us."

Today, Mr. Humphrey could use those same words in describing the situation in the U.S. Until the specter of malnutrition is laid, there can be no peace in this land. The Nixon administration shows signs that it recognizes this, while still casting a sympathetic eye towards the impoverished abroad.

CHANGING DIETARY HABITS

How can the undernourished people of the U.S. be persuaded to change their dietary habits? That is the crux of the problem.

Nobody knows until we try. USDA is trying. CSM is being given to poor Americans in two limited tests, primarily among Indians on a California reservation. The officials have to proceed cautiously. The question is will the undernourished peoples eat it. Will they accept it? More importantly, will they ask for more?

Cost of CSM for export works out at about 8¢ lb., f.a.s. Taking into account regular commercial operation, including distribution, the cost to the American consumer might be in the area of 65¢ for a 5 lb. sack, according to Mr. Tollefson.

Production of these foods represents a substantial investment for the corn miller. Before expensive capital development programs can be introduced, there must be some guarantee of a market. The foreign market is developing fast, but how permanent will it be as countries learn to fend for themselves? The domestic consumer is crying out for help. That's why the USDA tests are so important. They should provide an answer. But speed is of the essence.

The products of the corn milling industry can be made acceptable. The industry itself has distributed hundreds of thousands of copies of recipes printed in many languages—Turkish, French, Spanish, Malay, and even Kiswahili—and this effort has had beneficial results in gaining acceptance. Such a program might have similar success at home.

Recently, introducing S. 6, the Domestic Food Assistance Act of 1969, Sen. Walter Mondale (D., Minn.) said that "the time

for a complete overhauling of our food programs for the poor is long overdue." He pointed to what he described as the shocking testimony presented by the U.S. Public Health Service in which it was said that "the American poor are crippled by malnutrition as seriously and in some cases more seriously" than the people of under-developed nations in Africa and Asia.

The solutions provided by the corn millers—and the wheat flour millers have provided solutions also—must be examined carefully because the future internal peace of the U.S. depends upon adequate food for all.

PRESIDENT NIXON AND HUNGER

HON. WILLIAM A. STEIGER

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 8, 1969

Mr. STEIGER of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, President Nixon has made a major new commitment to end hunger and malnutrition in America, a commitment which was seriously lacking in previous administrations. His forthright and eloquent challenge to the Congress to meet the urgent nutrition needs of every American deserves our fullest measure of support.

The President's legislative and administrative recommendations constitute a truly comprehensive approach. The food stamp and commodity distribution programs which provide the bulk of current efforts are in need of an extensive overhaul. Substantial numbers of poverty-stricken families cannot afford the financial contribution required to take part in the food stamp program, and the present system of commodity distribution results in only very limited quantities and varieties of foods reaching those who most urgently need them. Several hundred counties still do not have any kind of food supplement program and others have administered them in such a manner as to exclude large numbers of malnourished individuals.

The reforms which the President has suggested, will bring a measure of rationality to these programs which they have lacked in the past. His suggestion that we consider the establishment of a separate agency to administer the programs will give proper emphasis to the purposes of the programs, just as his recommendation for special emphasis on the nutrition needs of expectant mothers and infants will insure a focus for the programs on those who stand to suffer most from inadequate diets.

Especially noteworthy is the calling of a White House Conference on Food and Nutrition for executives of the Nation's leading food distributing and processing companies and trade unions. Our present food industry is extremely efficient at serving the needs of the vast majority of Americans. Our goal is not to replace it with a public system or to superimpose another public system on what is already an excellent private one. We must continue to seek ways to extend the quality services which most of us enjoy to those who live in poverty. I am confident the food industry will respond with the vigor and imagination of which they are capable.

Finally, I believe the President's establishment of a special committee of the Urban Affairs Council to promote coordination between the food and nutrition programs and the programs of other agencies concerned with health, education and poverty is an essential ingredient to a comprehensive attack on the problem. It would be indeed shortsighted of us to expect to be able to continue to operate our nutrition and food supplement programs in a vacuum, independent of our needs and activities in other policy areas.

In President Nixon's words:

More is at stake here than the health and well-being of 16 million American citizens who will be aided by these programs . . . Something very like the honor of American Democracy is at issue.

The President has responded in an imaginative and responsible manner. I would urge the Congress to do the same.

QUESTIONNAIRE

HON. M. G. (GENE) SNYDER

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 8, 1969

Mr. SNYDER. Mr. Speaker, for the benefit of other Members and readers of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I include the response of my constituents to a recent questionnaire:

[In percent]

1. Do you favor legislation which would return to the States for use as they see fit, a percentage of the money now collected in Federal Income Tax?

Yes	70.3
No	21.3
No opinion	8.4

2. Do you believe the Federal Government should guarantee an annual income to heads of families, whether or not they are working?

Yes	4.1
No	91.2
No opinion	4.7

3. Do you support the proposal to convert the Post Office into a government-owned corporation to operate on a self-supporting basis?

Yes	71.3
No	20.0
No opinion	8.7

4. Viewing the economy as it now stands, do you favor renewing the 10% surtax when it expires on June 30?

Yes	35.0
No	57.7
No opinion	7.3

5. Do you favor a comprehensive study to determine the advisability of replacing the draft with a voluntary army and a ready reserve?

Yes	65.0
No	29.0
No opinion	6.0

6. Should the United States continue its membership in the United Nations?

Yes	70.6
No	20.7
No opinion	8.7

7. Generally speaking, are you favorably impressed with the first three months of the Nixon Administration?

Yes	62.8
No	26.4
No opinion	10.8

8. Do you believe that Foreign Aid should be reduced or eliminated?

Yes	80.0
No	10.1
No opinion	9.9

9. Do you believe the "war on poverty" has been worth the cost?

Yes	8.4
No	81.0
No opinion	10.6

10. Do you favor a resumption of bombing in North Vietnam by the United States?

Yes	61.1
No	21.8
No opinion	17.1

11. Should the U.S. stay out of the Middle East conflict between Israel and the Arab States?

Yes	75.2
No	18.5
No opinion	6.3

12. Do you favor holding spending within revenues and a real effort to reduce the public debt even if it means cutting expenditures in *your* favorite government program?

Yes	92.0
No	3.9
No opinion	4.1

13. Do you favor repeal of the 1968 "gun law" as it applies to long gun (rifles and shot guns)?

Yes	45.9
No	34.0
No opinion	20.1

CHANGE NEEDED IN BROADCAST LICENSE RENEWAL REQUIREMENT

HON. DONALD G. BROTZMAN

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 8, 1969

Mr. BROTZMAN. Mr. Speaker, today I reintroduce a bill to amend the Communications Act of 1934 to extend the maximum period for broadcasting licenses from 3 to 5 years.

Under present law, each broadcaster in the United States must apply for renewal of his license every 3 years. Those governmental agencies such as police, forestry, and fire departments who use safety and special radio service licenses must apply for renewal every 5 years.

These procedures are time consuming and costly to both the applicant and the Government. Furthermore, the present regulations governing license renewals are outmoded and unrealistic as applied to today's communication needs.

Mr. Speaker, my bill would correct these problems and would also abolish the necessity of renewals for licenses in the safety and special services category which now imposes a useless burden on the Federal Communications Commission and on the licensees. At the same time, the bill will preserve authority in the Commission to grant licenses for a fixed term of years in the safety and special services category, where the public interest would, in the Commission's judgment, so require.

ANOTHER LOOK AT THE ALLIANCE

HON. EDWARD R. ROYBAL

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 8, 1969

Mr. ROYBAL. Mr. Speaker, as a member of the House Committee on Foreign Affairs, I have always maintained a keen interest in developments in Latin America, and, particularly, in the work being done under the banner of the Alliance for Progress.

This effort at close hemispheric cooperation among the sister Republics of North and South America is the subject of an excellent article written by Mr. F. J. Aguirre-Sacasa, appearing in a recent edition of the Boston Herald Traveler, which I would like to include in the RECORD at this point:

ANOTHER LOOK AT ALLIANCE

(By F. J. Aguirre-Sacasa)

WASHINGTON.—Since its inception in 1961, the Alliance For Progress has been subjected to an ever increasing amount of criticism. Now, at a time when this country's overall foreign aid program has sunk to the nadir of its popularity, Congressman Dante Fascell's House subcommittee on inter-American affairs has undertaken a probe which is examining "every premise and assumption of the Alliance For Progress as well as its performance and future."

The Fascell investigation follows closely on the heels of a controversial study released in early February by Sen. J. W. Fulbright's foreign relations committee. This Senate report sought to identify the pitfalls besetting the Alliance For Progress by focusing on the program's operations in Colombia from 1962 to 1967.

Colombia was chosen for the analysis because it faces most of the social, political, and economic difficulties plaguing Latin America. In addition, that nation of 20,000,000 inhabitants has been the third largest recipient of U.S. aid in the hemisphere. Since 1962, approximately $750,000,000 in Alliance For Progress funds have been channeled into its economy.

The detailed study prepared by Fulbright's committee was hardly encouraging. It pointed out, for example, that despite the massive infusion of American capital, Colombia's per capita Gross National Product barely inched forward at an annual rate of 1.2 p.c. during the span considered. That same five-year period also saw the Colombian peso plunge from its 1961 level of 8.50 per dollar to its present exchange peg of 16.45 to the dollar.

After reviewing the United States educational program in Colombia, the survey concluded that it, too, was a disappointment primarily because U.S. and Colombian planners vacillated between an approach which stressed aid to elementary schools and one which favored stimulating higher education. As a result, little progress was achieved on either level and Colombia's illiteracy rate remained constant during the years examined.

The American agricultural assistance program was also criticized in the analysis. The report noted that the project's main goal was to increase production of cash crops for export. Consequently, the principal beneficiaries of the program were the "latifundistas" or large land owners who have traditionally grown these crops. At the same time, roughly 450,000 rural families remained landless due to the low priority assigned by the program to agrarian reform.

The committee's document recognized that the Alliance For Progress may have attained its basic political objective, namely, a democratic Colombia. Nevertheless, it charged that most of the socio-economic targets set for the country were not met.

Although the report laid most of the blame for this failure on the doorstep of United States policy makers and administrators, it also indicted the Colombian governments of former chief executive Guillermo Leon Valencia and current president Carlos Lleras Restrapo. It accused their regimes of foot-dragging in the implementation of basic reforms and charged that they literally misused the time which Alliance funds bought for Colombia's experiment in democracy.

This condemnation has resulted in a furor in that South American republic. Virtually every Colombian leader has denounced the study's conclusions as inaccurate and offensive. President Lleras Restrepo, for example, declared that the report was obsolete in the light of his country's accelerated growth rate during 1968. His foreign minister, Alfonso Lopez, concluded that the survey was faulty because its authors were ignorant of actual conditions in Colombia.

Public criticism of the review made by the foreign relations committee was so vociferous that the U.S. State Department decided to issue a statement through its Bogota embassy disavowing the study's conclusions and reminding Colombians that the committee print did not reflect the official views of the United States. In addition, the State Department release went to great lengths to praise the recent economic achievements of President Lleras Restrepo's government.

HARRY SHEPPARD

HON. LIONEL VAN DEERLIN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 30, 1969

Mr. VAN DEERLIN. Mr. Speaker, the passing of Harry Sheppard has removed a giant from our scene. In the San Diego area, a portion of which I represent, Mr. Sheppard is well remembered for his statesmanlike work as chairman of the House Appropriations Subcommittee on Military Construction. Within our California delegation, he will always be recalled for his services as our dean and for his sound advice to our younger Members.

The fact that San Diego today has such a mighty military establishment is due in large measure to the tireless efforts of Harry Sheppard. Most of the Navy and Marine Corps installations in the area bear his imprint. He was an authentic expert on the subject that fell within his purview—military construction—in the best tradition of the House of Representatives. He would not allow a project to be funded unless it could be fully justified; by the same token, he would never stint if a facility were truly needed to sustain our military preparedness.

When I came to the House as a first-term Member in the winter of 1963, Mr. Sheppard, then a veteran of 26 years of distinguished service in this body, went out of his way to counsel me on some of the political realities of life in Washington. His advice is as valid today as it was then.

And whenever it appeared that the Defense Department might be giving San Diego shabby treatment, as in the delicate matter of base closings, Mr. Sheppard would invariably offer his assistance—if he thought our case had merit.

His performance in Congress on behalf of his own district is legendary. San Bernardino County, which he so ably represented for 28 years, abounds with monuments to his effectiveness. But his greatest work was on behalf of the Nation, to whose defense he contributed so significantly.

A perfect epitaph for our late colleague was provided, I think, by one of San Diego's leading editors, Capt. E. Robert Anderson, of the Copley Press. He wrote:

Harry Sheppard was truly a Congressman for all America.

QUESTION OF COSTS

HON. JOSEPH M. GAYDOS

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 8, 1969

Mr. GAYDOS. Mr. Speaker, in a recent editorial from the McKeesport Daily News, Mr. John Orr presents an interesting and thought-provoking suggestion for the financing of the proposed "Safeguard" ABM system. He suggests economies be made within the present defense budget to provide the billions necessary for its deployment.

I invite the attention of my colleagues to the editorial and submit it for insertion in the RECORD:

QUESTION OF COSTS

The Senate Armed Forces Committee hearings failed to resolve in the public mind the advisability of undertaking the "Safeguard" anti-ballistics missiles program as proposed by President Nixon.

Eminent men appeared on both sides of the issue. Several of them were scientists who disagreed sharply on what should be the most fundamental question of all—whether the Safeguard system actually will work.

Certain witnesses approached the matter from political directions. Some thought the project would antagonize the Soviet Union, which happens to have a number of AMB's of its own, and make disarmament negotiations more difficult. Others such as Prof. Williams G. McMillan of the University of California couldn't have cared less. Said he:

"I cannot understand the sophisticated arguments that conclude it is somewhat bad to defend ourselves. We are told, in effect, to stop our provocation action of punching the Soviets in their fist with our eye."

Perhaps, so. But the most telling moment of the hearings came when one of the Senators raised the subject of costs. He pointed out that the American people have a trillion of their dollars in insurance, pension funds and the like and that increased federal spending is threatening these investments. He implied that to add billions for the ABM to the already staggering Pentagon outlays would crumble the eventual buying power of the investor's dollar even further—in other words, that ABM could generate a new wave of inflation.

When the Senator brought up this topic, he found, as might have been expected, the scientists silent in their witness chairs. Also the global-minded politicians. None elected to take up the issue he set forth because, undoubtedly, the costs and the effect of another multi-billion expenditure on the economy generally had been little considered.

And yet, there is a ready answer to the cost matter and it is this: If the Pentagon thinks we must have an ABM system to defend us, then let it construct the system out of present funds, making economies elsewhere in its budget to provide the billions needed. There are many places where this can be done. One which readily comes to mind is in the vast sums we spend to maintain NATO troops in Europe. If our survival depends on ABM installations here, then U.S. soldiers are not needed on some useless battle line in Europe. In fact, it can be argued that they never have been needed there except for "window-dressing" and to fuel the European economies with our dollars.

THE NATIONAL TIMBER SUPPLY ACT

HON. WALTER FLOWERS

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 8, 1969

Mr. FLOWERS. Mr. Speaker, many Members of this distinguished body have risen in the last several days to speak to the merits of the National Timber Supply Act. I am pleased to be among the sponsors of this legislation. It is unnecessary for me to repeat in detail the carefully developed expositions of my colleagues.

They have said the Nation needs more wood for housing.

They have pointed out that private forest management is more productive than public forest management.

They have clearly identified the lag in public management as inadequate funding for reinvestment in improved management.

The have related productivity to investment as an element of sound management.

They have, without exception, advocated early passage of the National Timber Supply Act so that Federal timber management could be brought up to the level of the excellent private forest management which we enjoy in the South.

I can only echo their scholarly words.

I know that houses in America are made of lumber and plywood.

I know that lumber and plywood comes from trees.

I know that trees come from forests.

I know that forests will grow again.

I know that trees can be managed like a crop so that faster growing and higher quality trees can spring up where one grew before—with the advantage of man's help through genetic selection, spacing, fertilization, and adequate care and attention.

These are obvious matters and do not warrant a lengthy examination.

One thing I am aware of, however, may not be common knowledge. In the South we are on the verge of a forest renaissance such as has never been known in the world before. It will revolutionize the production of wood fiber in the South and will guarantee a future for farmers and manufacturers and consumers as they have never known.

The one ingredient we cannot buy in the South, however, is time. It will take an estimated 15 years before we can stimulate wood production on our southern Federal lands, and industrial lands, and private woodlots to the extent that we can rely on a constant flow of wood fiber forever to meet the Nation's needs.

The Federal Government can provide us that time by carefully releasing its vast inventory to commercial use. I am not advocating whole scale logging of the national forest. I am advocating a calculated development program so that timber now going to waste in the Federal forests will be available to relieve the pressures on our growing southern forests. I am advocating the reforestation of the Federal Government's vast landholdings so that timber harvested today will be replaced by better trees more quickly.

I am, in brief, advocating the adoption of modern methods by our Federal Government so that all the people can benefit forever.

In that context I urge that every Member of the House act at once to support the National Timber Supply Act and vote for its passage so that we can realize more immediately the bounty from our storehouse and the application of techniques which will guarantee those benefits forever.

EXPANDING LAW ON SOLID GROUND

HON. CLARENCE E. MILLER

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 8, 1969

Mr. MILLER of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, the Supreme Court continues to find new legal technicalities with which to overturn convictions of known criminals. At a time when crime statistics are soaring, it is frightening that our ultimate judicial body has apparently taken a pro-crime position.

Within the past few months a new flicker of hope has appeared on the High Bench. Justice Hugo Black has recorded some opinions indicating that he believes the Court has reached a limit in favoring the violent and criminal elements in our society.

An editorial in the Lancaster, Ohio, Eagle Gazette comments on Justice Black and a recent court decision. I submit the editorial for inclusion in the RECORD at this point.

EXPANDING LAW ON SOLID GROUND

It's regrettable that the U.S. Supreme Court didn't take the suggestion of its Justice Black that it make a "new appraisal of the language and the history of the Fourth Amendment to cut it down to its intended size."

The Fourth Amendment protects citizens from unreasonable searches and seizures.

That's all it says, but over the last few years it has become so barnacled with Supreme Court interpretations, all to the advantage of accused criminals, that—in Justice Black's words—its "original authors would be hard put to recognize their creation."

The corner stone of the Supreme Court's enlargement of the Constitution is its so-called exclusionary ruling, which bars "illegally" seized evidence from admission at trial.

Under it, persons literally seized with the goods can get off.

The court has been pyramiding other decisions that extend the scope of the meaning of "illegal" search and seizure.

The latest, which provoked Justice Black's call for a new look at the Fourth Amendment, found that the taking of fingerprints of a person rounded up in a dragnet, even though he did not object, was unconstitutional because there was no warrant or even probable cause for the suspect's detention.

The court thereby overlooked the hard evidence of guilt—that the suspect's fingerprints matched those found of the scene of a rape of an 86-year-old woman, a crime for which he had been convicted.

Justice Black is on solid ground in urging that a restoration of the original meaning of the Fourth Amendment would "make our cities a safer place for men, women and children to live."

KEEPING AMERICA BEAUTIFUL—WESTERN PENNSYLVANIA CONSERVANCY

HON. WILLIAM S. MOORHEAD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 8, 1969

Mr. MOORHEAD. Mr. Speaker, conservationists and nature lovers everywhere will be heartened by the New York Times article of May 4 describing the program of the Western Pennsylvania Conservancy, headquartered in my city of Pittsburgh.

This organization, of which I was proud to be a former member of the board, received the National Wildlife Federation Award in 1967 as "Conservation Organization of the Year" for its outstanding efforts in preserving and protecting the natural beauty of our land.

I include the article herewith for the attention of my colleagues, whom I also cordially invite to visit the area:

THE VISIBLE BENEFITS OF A CONSERVANCY PROGRAM

(By David Jones)

PITTSBURGH.—Weary nature lovers seeking escape from the hustle of urban life are enjoying new opportunities to savor nature's pleasures in the heart of this coal and steel country.

The chance is being provided by the Western Pennsylvania Conservancy, a nonprofit organization dedicated to preserving the natural beauty of this rolling Appalachian Mountain region against industrial and urban blight.

The fruits of the effort are now going on dramatic display at the conservancy's nature centers as spring presses across the Pennsylvania woodlands to awaken the wildflowers there. Over the next two months, the four centers will be awash with waves of delicate pinks and whites, dazzling reds and purples and bright yellows.

MILLIONS OF FLOWERS

This spring's show already is under way at the conservancy's Wildflower Reserve on U.S. 30 about 25 miles west of Pittsburgh, where spring beauties, bluets and hepatica are in bloom. Within the next 10 days to two weeks, blooming will begin at the three other nature centers. They are populated by millions of flowers, such as trout lilly, coltsfoot, trillium, trailing arbutus, bloodrot, dogwood, mountain laurel and rhododendron.

Some species of wildflowers in the reserves—such as twinleaf—come and go in two or three days. But most have a blooming period of several weeks, and new flowers come into bloom throughout the summer and fall. A list of the current flowers is posted on reserve bulletin boards each weekend.

The Wildflower Reserve is a 30-acre tract that is situated in a stream valley adjacent to Raccoon Creek State Park. The wooded area also offers opportunities for bird-watching and picnicking.

"This seems to be one of the largest concentrations of wildflowers growing naturally in the Eastern United States," says Joseph B. C. White, the conservancy's educational director, who supervises its extensive programs for area schools.

POPULAR NATURE TRAILS

About 20,000 visitors walked the reserve's 4.5 miles of nature trails last year, viewing its 300 varieties of wild-flowers. "Once we get the people on the trails, it's hard to get them off," Mr. White says.

About 50 miles southeast of Pittsburgh, in another conservancy nature center, 87 varieties of trees and shrubs have been found. Ferncliff Nature Reserve, a 100-acre tract on State Route 381 at Ohiopyle, has two miles of trails that take visitors through large stands of mountain laurel, which bloom for two weeks in late June, and rhododendron, which blooms for two weeks in early July. The reserve is lush with fragile green fern and includes the umbrella tree, a form of magnolia that reaches its northernmost known limits there.

Ferncliff sits on a peninsula formed by a horseshoe curve in the Youghiogheny River, and is adjacent to 18,500-acre Ohiopyle State Park. Scenic overlooks from the reserve offer views of the 40-foot Ohiopyle Falls and the churning rapids above.

THE BLAZING STAR

Jennings Nature Reserve, a conservancy property about 40 miles north of Pittsburgh, is a 350-acre tract whose main feature is eight acres of the Blazing Star, a Western prairie flower that clings tenaciously to an eastern foothold. The reserve is on State Route 8, at the intersection with State Routes 528 and 173, and about 12 miles north of Butler.

The Blazing Star is a brilliant pink and pink-purple flower about 12 to 14 inches long that blooms at the end of a three-to-four foot-high stalk in late July and early August. It is a descendant of a plant that made its way east in the post-glacial age, perhaps 4,000 years ago.

The conservancy's newest property is the Bear Run Nature Reserve on State Route 381, about 3.5 miles north of Ohiopyle. It was opened last October and is adjacent to Fallingwater, the renowned Frank Lloyd Wright house built over a waterfall in 1937–39. The House, owned by the conservancy, is open to the public.

The Bear Run center consists of 1,500 acres of woodland on the western slope of Laurel Ridge. More than 9.5 miles of nature trails thread through the dense growths of rhododendron, hemlock groves and oak-maple forest. A bird sanctuary will be opened there later this year.

PROTECTING NATURAL BEAUTY

The four nature centers are only one facet of the vast conservation program being pushed by the conservancy, whose 8,000 members are credited with doing much to develop the natural resources of western Pennsylvania. A successor to a parks association formed in Pittsburgh in 1931, the conservancy was reorganized in 1958, and since then has vigorously acquired land to protect the region's natural beauty.

"The primary objective of the conservancy is to preserve open space—in areas both large and small—in order that western Pennsylvania may increasingly become a better place in which to live, to work and to enjoy the good earth that sustains our life," says Charles F. Lewis, its president.

Since 1958, the conservancy has acquired more than 33,000 acres in 11 counties, of which nearly 28,000 have been or are being transferred to the state as a nucleus for five new parks. Most of the remainder comprises the four nature centers and Fallingwater.

The conservancy now is developing two more reserves northwest of Pittsburgh. One is Schollard's Wetlands, a 900-acre tract of marsh and swampland with two waterfalls, and teeming with wildlife and waterfowl. It is on State Route 19, about eight miles south of Mercer, and it will be opened later this spring.

HEAVILY GLACIATED LAND

The second new reserve will be about 15 miles to the west—at Buchanan Run, near Pulaski. It will consist of 100 acres of unusual, heavily-glaciated land, and it will be opened in the early 1970's.

The conservancy also has been buying property in river areas to protect shore lands and hillsides above waterways. It has been a moving force behind development of Ohiopyle State Park, having accumulated 10,000 acres for the 18,500-acre park and having sold them to the state at cost.

One of its most ambitious ventures has been the acquisition of 11,230 acres of land along Laurel Ridge, one of the state's most scenic mountain ridges, and transferring the tract, at cost, to the state. The property will serve as the heart of a 15,000-acre state park that will open in the early 1970's.

PROPOSED HIKING TRAIL

This ambitious program to preserve this entire mountain ridge includes plans for a 58-mile hiking trail from the Conemaugh River, near Johnstown, to Ohiopyle. The conservancy's land acquisition was financed with aid of a $1-million grant from the Richard King Mellon Charitable Trusts.

About 70,000 persons from more than 30 states visited the four conservancy nature centers last year, and more are expected in 1969. Guided tours are available for casual visitors on weekends, but reservations are needed on weekdays, or for groups of 15 or more at any time.

The centers are open from 10 A.M. to sundown daily, but are closed Mondays. There is no admission fee.

Information on the centers, as well as nearby recreational and tourist facilities, can be obtained by writing the Western Pennsylvania Conservancy, 204 Fifth Avenue, Pittsburgh.

TAX RELIEF FOR SERVICEMEN IN KOREA

HON. WILLIAM D. FORD

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 8, 1969

Mr. WILLIAM D. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I have joined with over 130 Members of the House to put before the Congress legislation to provide servicemen in Korea with tax benefits similar to those provided for our GI's in Vietnam. Our tax laws now provide appropriate exemptions to servicemen stationed in and around Vietnam.

Recent events show that the level of danger for members of our armed services serving in Korea is high enough to make the provision of such tax benefits logical. The recent downing of an American EC–121 plane and the consequent loss of American lives, the U.S.S. *Pueblo* incident and the stepped-up North Korean action near the demilitarized zone should show us that Korean military duty constitutes duty "in an area of combat."

Our Nation's efforts to maintain the delicate truce that exists in Korea should be continued. But we need also to be realistic enough to admit that we are in many cases asking American servicemen to risk their lives in Korea. Military pay, especially for the enlisted man, is far lower than the wage scale for those working at home.

Our tax structure is now peppered with needless loopholes for the rich and for large corporations. In light of this, a tax break to military personnel, while they serve in areas of combat does not seem out of line. The danger to American soldiers serving in Korea is high. Tax benefits extended to those serving in other areas where they must risk their lives for their country should be extended to our servicemen in Korea.

FOUR MARYLANDERS DIE IN VIETNAM

HON. CLARENCE D. LONG

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 8, 1969

Mr. LONG of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, 1st Lt. William Racca, U.S. Army; Pfc. Robert L. Bittinger, Jr., U.S. Army; Sgt. Michael E. Gordy, U.S. Marine Corps; and 2d Lt. Anthony E. Kupka, U.S. Marine Corps, four fine young men from Maryland, were killed recently in Vietnam. I would like to commend their courage and honor their memory by including the following article in the RECORD:

FOUR MARYLANDERS DIE IN VIETNAM—TWO ARMY MEN AND TWO MARINES REPORTED KILLED IN ACTION

Four Maryland servicemen—an army first lieutenant, an Army private, a Marine Corps second lieutenant and a Marine sergeant—have been killed in action in Vietnam, the Defense Department has announced.

Reported killed were:

1st Lt. William Racca, USA, husband of Mrs. Jean Racca, of 5201 25th avenue, S.E., Hillcrest Heights, Md.

Pfc. Robert L. Bittinger, Jr., USA, son of Mr. and Mrs. Robert L. Bittinger, Sr., of 211 Springdale street, Cumberland.

Sgt. Michael E. Gordy, USMC, son of Mr. and Mrs. L. Edward Gordy, of Snow Hill, Md.

2d Lt. Anthony E. Kupka, USMC, husband of Mrs. Jeanne Kupka, of Silver Spring, Md.

Lieutenant Racca, who was 22, was killed April 17 while on a combat mission near Saigon. He was with the 1st Cavalry Division.

Although he was born in Providence, R.I., Lieutenant Racca spent most of his life in Maryland suburbs of Washington, was graduated from Surrattsville High School, and attended the University of Maryland.

He was drafted into the Army in September, 1966, and attended Officer Candidate School at Fort Benning, Ga. Shortly afterward he was commissioned a 2d lieutenant.

He received the commission of 1st lieutenant a few days after arriving in Vietnam, in August, 1968, and had planned to make a career of the military.

Besides his wife, he is survived by a daughter, Michelle Ann; his parents, Mr. and Mrs.

William Racca, of Mesa, Ariz.; and two brothers, James and Richard also of Mesa.

Lieutenant Kupka died from wounds he received on a long-range reconnaissance patrol April 16, 16 miles southwest of Da Nang, exactly a month after the 23-year-old officer arrived in Vietnam.

Lieutenant Kupka was born in Washington, and attended a private boys' school in Bethesda before attending Trinity College in Hartford, Conn., where he received a bachelor of science degree in electrical engineering.

After attending Officer Candidate School in the summer before his senior year in college, Lieutenant Kupka was commissioned a 2d lieutenant the day after his graduation.

He was married last June to the former Jeanne Sullivan. His only child, a daughter, Christine, was born three days before his death.

He is also survived by his parents, Mr. and Mrs. Anthony Kupka, of Falmouth, Mass.

Sergeant Gordy, 22, was killed Friday in Quong Tre, Vietnam, where he was stationed with the 3d Marine Division. He was scheduled to return to the United States May 25.

He was born in Worcester County, and attended Snow Hill High School. He enlisted in the Marine Corps in June, 1966.

Besides his parents, he is survived by his wife, Mrs. Martha L. Gordy, of Westminster, Cal.; a brother, Airman 1st Class Dennis W. Gordy, also in Vietnam; and three sisters, Rhonda, Belva and Abby, all of Snow Hill.

CLEMENCY AND PRESIDIO MUTINY CHARGES

HON. EDWARD I. KOCH

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 8, 1969

Mr. KOCH. Mr. Speaker, I think that the Nation was heartened on Tuesday when Secretary of the Navy, John H. Chafee, acted with compassion and announced that no disciplinary action would be taken against the *Pueblo* crew.

Stanley Resor, Secretary of the Army, has a similar opportunity; and I submit that he too should act with charity and immediately order that all the mutiny charges related to the Presidio incident be dropped. I am writing to Secretary Resor today urging this course of action; my letter follows:

MAY 8, 1969.

Hon. STANLEY RESOR,
Secretary of the Army, the Pentagon, Washington, D.C.

DEAR SECRETARY RESOR: I very much appreciate receiving a letter on March 26 from your General Counsel, Mr. Jordan, who enclosed a comprehensive fact sheet concerning the Presidio trials. I am sure that you have monitored the continuing trials and are prepared to see that justice is done in these matters.

I would, however, like to call to your attention how speedily Navy Secretary John H. Chafee acted on May 6 when, upon receiving the recommendations of the court of inquiry charged with the responsibility of investigating the Pueblo incident, he overruled the court of inquiry and announced that no disciplinary action will be taken against anyone involved. He could have awaited the outcome of the court martial which would have ensued and let the matter work its way up the military trial calendar until it reached him and then exercised clemency. If he had done that, think of the months and perhaps years of trial and tribulation which everyone involved would have had to suffer.

Surely, the powers vested in Navy Secretary Chafee do not exceed those vested in you with respect to the Presidio incident. I urge you to direct that all pending mutiny charges be dropped and to remit or suspend all unexecuted portions of any sentence as a matter of clemency.

I believe that you would be rendering a great service to the young men involved and to the country at large if in your wisdom you emulated the very charitable act of Navy Secretary John H. Chafee.

Sincerely,

EDWARD I. KOCH.

POLITICAL ACTIVITIES OF TAX-EXEMPT ORGANIZATIONS

HON. BENJAMIN B. BLACKBURN

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 8, 1969

Mr. BLACKBURN. Mr. Speaker, early in this session of Congress, I had the privilege of introducing legislation that would curb the political activities of tax-exempt organizations.

In light of the fact that tax-exempt organizations enjoy a form of subsidization by the Government since they are not compelled to pay taxes, I feel that it is improper for them to be allowed to engage in political activity which is not directly related to their own survival or the reason for their tax exemption.

Recently, Mr. Reed Larson, executive vice president of the National Right to Work Committee submitted a statement to the House Ways and Means Committee with regard to the need to control political activities of labor organizations. For the information of my colleagues, I hereby insert Mr. Larson's statement into the RECORD:

STATEMENT SUBMITTED TO THE COMMITTEE ON WAYS AND MEANS, U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES BY REED LARSON, EXECUTIVE VICE PRESIDENT, NATIONAL RIGHT TO WORK COMMITTEE, WASHINGTON, D.C., APRIL 21, 1969

The National Right to Work Committee appeals to the Congress to halt widespread abuses of present tax laws by denying tax exemptions to labor unions which use compulsory dues for political purposes. It will thereby close a tax loophole of gigantic proportions. Exploitation of the loophole, in effect, compels all of the nation's taxpayers to subsidize the massive political programs promoted by union officials.

Today officials of many labor unions which have been granted tax exemptions by the Federal government are brazenly violating the political freedom of conscripted members—and also flouting recent decisions of the U.S. Supreme Court—by spending mandatory dues for political purposes.

Union spokesmen would have everyone believe that their political action is supported entirely by "voluntary" contributions. This fallacy is refuted by an abundance of evidence on the public record. It was most convincingly exploded by a group of Georgia employees who successfully waged a legal fight to prevent the use of their compulsory dues for political purposes.

In this particular case—*International Association of Machinists, et al v. Street, et al*, 367 U.S. 740 (1961)—officials of 15 defendant unions admitted using union dues "to support ideological and political doctrines and candidates which plaintiffs . . . were, are and will be opposed to and not willing to support voluntarily."

This lawsuit was filed in 1953. In 1958 the Georgia trial court invalidated the compulsory "union shop" agreement between the unions and several companies. Its decision was later upheld by the Georgia Supreme Court, but an appeal to the U.S. Supreme Court by the defendant unions prolonged the battle.

The nation's highest Court, evading the constitutional issues raised by this litigation, simply ruled in 1961 that dues paid to labor organizations cannot legally be used for political purposes over the objections of duespayers. It ordered the trial court to resolve the controversy in a manner which would safeguard the workers' political freedom and also preserve the compulsory "union shop" agreements.

Ultimately officials of the unions were instructed to produce their financial records so that an auditor appointed by the trial court could determine what percentage of the dues they collected had been diverted into political channels.

The court order required the union officials to either permit examination of their books or exempt the protesting workers from the compulsory "union shop" provisions and also refund to them the money they had been compelled to pay in the form of dues, fees and assessments.

Finally, in February 1965 officials of the defendant unions chose the second alternative. They thereby prevented the court from learning exactly how much money they had invested in blatant politicking.

The Street case proved conclusively that union political action is *not* financed entirely by "voluntary" contributions. This litigation provided relief for oly a tiny fraction of the wage-earners across the country whose money is fueling the unions' political machines And it underscored the prohibitive cost of restraining those union officials who are preoccupied with political matters.

Unfortunately, the remedy prescribed by the Supreme Court is meaningless and impractical because it places relief beyond the reach of aggrieved employees. The Court's remedy entails costly litigation and pits employees with modest incomes against union officials who control overflowing treasuries. The fact that "justice delayed is justice denied" was underscored by the Street case, which the courts required 12 years to resolve.

Justice Hugo Black dissented from the Supreme Court's 1961 decision in the Street case. He objected strenuously to the refusal of the Court's majority to face up to obvious constitutional questions. He wrote, in part:

"The stark fact is that this Act of Congress (the National Railway Labor Act) is being used as a means to exact money from these employees to help get votes to win elections for parties and candidates and to support doctrine they are against. If this is constitutional, the First Amendment is not the charter of political and religious liberty its sponsors believed it to be."

Although this cited case involved compulsory "union shop" agreements under the National Railway Labor Act, the very same constitutional problems are created by compulsory "union shop" agreements authorized by the National Labor Relations Act.

There can be no valid objection to the political activities of a labor organization which is comprised exclusively of voluntary members. The individual worker can preserve his own political freedom, if he is free to either maintain or withdraw his membership from a union without fear of discharge or other reprisals.

The fact is, however, that a large part of the money used by union officials for political activity is collected from rank-and-file employees under compulsory "union shop" arrangements. Consequently, large numbers of workers are required to pay money over to the union against their will with knowledge that it will be used to support candidates and causes which they themselves oppose.

There is the further fact that in spending their members' money in this manner, the union officials are engaging in unlawful activity in direct violation of the Federal Corrupt Practices Act. This act makes it a crime for any union to make any contribution or expenditure in connection with any election to Federal office, including President, Vice President, Senator or Representative. It provides for punishment by fine and imprisonment for any union officer responsible for making, and any candidate who receives, any such contribution.

This criminal statute has been on the books since 1947, but no serious effort has been made to enforce it and, as a result, union officials make believe it doesn't exist.

Unions enjoy a tax-exempt status under the Internal Revenue Code, and this alone should disqualify them from engaging in political activities. Section 501(c) of the Internal Revenue Code lists various categories of exempt organizations, among which are labor unions, fraternal clubs, chambers of commerce, civic associations, religious, charitable and educational organizations and so on. Of the more than two dozen groups listed, there is only one that can engage in political action without being disqualified for tax exemption, and that group is labor unions. A chamber of commerce, for example, that spends any part of its funds for political purposes would quickly—and properly—lose its exemption status, and the same would happen to a religious or educational organization, a public welfare organization, a social club or any of the others.

Now, the interesting point is that there is nothing in the statutory language which would authorize this special treatment for unions, nor is there any legislative history to support it. It is purely and simply a position that has been followed by the Internal Revenue Service and officially articulated for the first time in 1966. In other words, this arm of the Treasury Department says, "We will recognize a union as tax exempt no matter how much of its money it spends for political purposes, and notwithstanding the fact that the Federal Corrupt Practices Act makes such expenditures a Federal crime."

The flagrant political activities of tax-exempt labor unions have produced a loud and continuing chorus of objections from the American people. Polls by reputable research firms have consistently shown overwhelming public opposition to the use of union dues for political purposes. Not surprisingly, union politicking is also opposed by a majority of the nation's union members.

This is an abuse which seriously jeopardizes our system of representative government. It dilutes every citizen's political freedom and outrageously violates the basic rights of workers whose money is being misused. It does violence to the "one man-one vote" concept.

In contrast to the favored treatment which it gives labor unions under the Internal Revenue Code, the IRS in 1965 and 1966 subjected the National Right to Work Committee to an exhaustive investigation for the acknowledged purpose of finding nonexistent evidence of political spending by our organization. If it had discovered such evidence, the IRS would have justifiably deprived the National Right to Work Committee of its tax-exempt status. However, the IRS obviously is not applying that same standard to labor unions.

Therefore, the National Right to Work Committee respectfully recommends that the Congress amend existing laws to deny tax exemptions to labor organizations which use mandatory dues for political purposes.

LONG-RANGE VIEWS ON TAX POLICY NECESSARY

HON. GEORGE P. MILLER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 8, 1969

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, recently a thought-provoking editorial appeared in the Alameda Times Star, a newspaper published in my district. In it, the editor points out that in adopting measures to effectively solve our present inflationary difficulties, we must consider the long-range economic implications of our actions. At this point in the RECORD I insert this timely editorial:

[From the Alameda (Calif.) Times Star, May 5, 1969]

INVESTMENT TAX CREDIT BAN COULD PROVE INFLATIONARY

A close study of price gains in the past decade indicates President Nixon's major anti-inflation tax proposal to Congress will be inflationary over the long run, whatever its short-run benefits.

That is, the government's own statistics, analyzed in detail, clearly suggest the President's move to end the investment tax credit for industrial modernization is likely to be self-defeating.

By and large, prices have risen only moderately in industries which have invested in modernization.

In manufacturing, where the liberal application of new equipment has increased output per man-hour almost 40 per cent, wholesale prices have risen but 10 per cent in the past decade.

In industries in which modernization has moved slowly, prices have risen more rapidly. This has produced the inflation that concerns Nixon and the nation.

Service costs generally are up 37 per cent, medical care 60 per cent, housing and home maintenance 31 per cent.

The investment credit Nixon would do away with was designed to produce the kind of modernization that seems to have kept prices down in those companies in which it has been applied. The evidence cited above suggests this credit was very successful indeed.

Presumably then, over the long run, the removal of the investment tax credit will result in somewhat less modernization than there would have been. If the past 10 years serve as a measure, that will, in turn, mean costs and prices in the industries concerned will go up more rapidly than otherwise.

A number of industries utilizing investment tax credits are in heavy competition with foreign countries. Steel, for one.

If these companies are less able to compete, the U.S. trade balance will suffer. This would put additional pressure on the already-shaky U.S. balance of payments. It could weaken the dollar.

In many cases, as in utilities, the loss of investment tax credit will be passed on to the consumer in higher (inflationary) rates.

Why then the proposal to reduce the investment tax credit? Talks with economists and political strategists suggest this reasoning behind the Nixon strategy:

1—Anything that reduces spending will have a short-term effect on inflation. The long-term problem can be handled later.

2—Psychologically, a strong move like this one has a shock effect. It convinces industry the administration means business. It thus discourages unnecessary expenditures hopefully over a much wider range than affected by the investment tax credit.

3—Politically, there's a strong feeling in Congress against the credit. Some legislators consider it a favor to big business at a time when the public is burdened by high taxes.

SENATOR ERNEST GRUENING TELLS HOW PRESIDENT NIXON CAN END THE WAR IN VIETNAM

HON. WILLIAM F. RYAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 8, 1969

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Speaker, during the several years in which the Vietnam war has been an issue of controversy and debate in the Congress, Ernest Gruening, former Senator from the State of Alaska, has constantly sought to sharpen our awareness of the tragic consequences of that conflict. Senator Gruening was one of the few Members of Congress who opposed the Johnson administration's escalation of the war from the beginning.

Senator Gruening very early recognized that the results of perpetuating our military involvement in Vietnam could only be tragic for Vietnamese society as well as our own. It is most unfortunate that Senator Gruening no longer serves the U.S. Senate, for his counsel and insights were invaluable to all of us.

In the May 5 issue of The Nation, Senator Gruening shows that he is continuing to carry on the fight against the war—which he did so much to initiate—and that his insights and recommendations are as sharp and persuasive as ever. In his article Senator Gruening offers specific steps through which the war in Southeast Asia could be ended—steps which I believe provide a workable strategy for extricating ourselves from the morass in Southeast Asia.

If President Johnson had listened to Senator Gruening in 1964 and 1965, America would be very different today. President Nixon would do well to remember how his predecessor's policy in Vietnam brought about his retirement, then listen to the former Senator from Alaska, and end the war immediately.

I commend Senator Gruening's arguments to my colleagues and urge them to give the steps he urges their careful consideration:

[From the Nation, May 5, 1969]

HOW PRESIDENT NIXON CAN END OUR WAR IN SOUTHEAST ASIA

(By former Senator Ernest Gruening)

It is, and for some time has been, obvious that the most important issue facing our nation is to get out of the war in Southeast Asia. All our other issues and problems are slighted, impaired and unresolved until we halt the fighting, stop the concomitant continuing drain of blood and treasure, and turn to the long-neglected and pressing needs at home.

During his election campaign Richard Nixon told the American people that he had a plan to end the war, but did not want to disclose it for fear of interfering with the

negotiations in Paris. After three months in office President Nixon gives us no indication of any formula or proposal for achieving that widely desired objective.

On the contrary, draft calls are undiminished, casualties mount and we continue, as we have for the last five years, to be winning the war only in the optimistic pronouncements of our military leaders and their supporting newspaper columnists. The President has shown a commendable restraint in not re-escalating the battlefield activity, having no doubt learned that every time our military propose just one more upmanship we get in that much deeper. But the prospect is for continued warfare.

A new approach is desperately needed, and I offer it in the fervent hope that President Nixon who, I doubt not, would like to rid his Administration of the albatross bequeathed him by President Johnson, will lay aside his preconceptions and the assumptions that have underlain our policies to date. For that purpose a review of what has happened is appropriate.

Five years ago, on March 10, 1964, I delivered the first major opposition speech on this issue made in Congress. It was entitled, "The United States Should Get Out of Vietnam." With exhibits, it occupied 30 pages in the *Congressional Record*. It would have been easy for President Johnson to accept that counsel and to withdraw at that time, since no United States units had been committed to combat, and the casualties had been very few.

The opening sentence of that March 10 address was: "The mess in Vietnam was inherited by President Johnson." That holds true for President Nixon today; he is under no more obligation than was President Johnson to perpetuate his predecessor's policies.

That we have lost some 34,000 young Americans killed in action, several thousand more through other causes, more than a quarter of a million wounded, some horribly crippled for life, have killed tens of thousands of innocent noncombatants, created more than a million homeless refugees, sunk in excess of $125 billion unrecoverably in the Asian quagmire, and sacrificed our moral standards before the conscience of mankind, does not lessen but increases the need for an alternative course. To continue to permit our men to die in vain—as they all have died in this war—is not short of criminal.

The extent of our folly, despite official propaganda and the ever optimistic and misleading reports of military and diplomatic experts in the scene, has dawned increasingly on the American people. The desire and need to disentangle ourselves have been widely expressed, and as widely countered with the hopeless and unimaginative retort: "Well, maybe we shouldn't have gone in but we're there now," with the accent on the "there," implying that we have to keep on with what we have been doing.

More recently, this has been refined by acknowledgments that, while we must find a way out, it must be an "honorable" way—which can be translated to mean victory for our position. The "unthinkable" proposal that we withdraw unilaterally (why not, since we barged in unilaterally and in violation of all our treaty commitments?) is met with the loaded cliché, "You wouldn't scuttle and run, would you?" I'll examine that in a moment.

Let me urge that any way out would be more honorable than to continue the needless slaughter, and the ever deepening submergence of our nation's interests and values. But actually the most honorable way out would be to repudiate the whole dishonorable episode (made even more demonstrably so, since the Fulbright committee hearings last year revealed that the Tonkin Gulf incident was spurious), to make an "agonizing reappraisal" and confess error.

Defense Secretary Laird has recently revived the shopworn proposal that we strengthen the South Vietnamese army and turn the war over to it—Congress to appropriate additional millions of dollars for that purpose. This would mean merely further subsidy to the corrupt and dictatorial Saigon regimes which have been successively self-imposed by military coups or by electoral fraud, thereby justifying the struggles of the anti-Communist opposition, as well as of the Vietcong against puppet regimes which have no popular support and are maintained solely by American armed might and financial aid.

On February 26 of last year, addressing the Senate shortly after the rigged South Vietnamese elections and the sentencing to years at hard labor of the defeated non-Communist opponents of the Thieu-Ky ticket (it was as if President Nixon after his victory had ordered Mr. Johnson and Mr. Humphrey to the chain gang!), I made a specific recommendation to the President. It appeared in the *Congressional Record* under the heading, "One Possible Solution to the Vietnam Dilemma," and follows:

"Recommendations for extrication of the United States from its Vietnamese folly are not the responsibility of those who for years have dissented from United States policy in Vietnam. It is the responsibility of those who got us into the Southeast Asia mess.

"However, if President Johnson really wants to get the United States out of the morass in Vietnam, and save us from ever-mounting and ever-deepening disaster and the increasing slaughter of the flower of our youth and of thousands of Vietnamese noncombatants, his opportunity is here and now.

"He could go on nationwide radio and television and, in effect, say to the American people:

"My fellow citizens, I have tried for four years and my predecessors have tried for a decade previously to bring a semblance of self-government and democracy to the people of South Vietnam. It has become clear beyond peradventure that it is not their desire, and that the United States, despite its prodigious efforts in manpower and money, and the sacrifice of thousands of American lives, cannot achieve these desired results for them.

"I have today ordered the unconditional cessation of all bombing of North Vietnam and of all offensive operations in South Vietnam. In addition, I have directed there be an immediate in-place cease-fire in South Vietnam on the part of the United States and I have requested the South Vietnamese Armed Forces to do likewise, with only defensive action authorized. I have called upon the forces of the National Liberation Front and of North Vietnam in South Vietnam to do the same. It is my purpose, which I now declare, to initiate a phased military withdrawal which should be completed within a year. In the meantime, behind the shield of American military forces with the leverage afforded by U.S. military and economic aid, U.S. representatives in South Vietnam will insist that the Thieu-Ky government broaden the base of its government to include their non-Communist opponents, represented in large measure by those whom they have now jailed and put in protective custody, and that this broadened South Vietnamese Government begin immediate negotiations with the National Liberation Front so that all these Vienamese components can work out their own destinies.

"In addition, I have directed our Ambassador to the United Nations to work with other nations there to find places of refuge in other lands for those who would not want to live in South Vietnam under the new regime which will be formed and I will ask the Congress for such additional authority as may be needed to admit such refugees to the United States and to assist in their resettlement elsewhere.

"Further, I have instructed our Ambassadors to Great Britain, the Soviet Union, Canada, India and Poland to propose a greatly strengthened International Control Commission to supervise any elections to be held in South Vietnam to obtain an expression of the people's will.

"The United States will assist in the reconstruction and rehabiltation of the burned villages, destroyed buildings and defoliated fields, and give suitable fiscal assistance to economic development. But our military efforts will cease. We will make every effort to assist the people of both North and South Vietnam to establish whatever form of government they can develop."

Here lies a solution which both Americans and Vietnamese, I am confident, will welcome.

This proposal in substance—with a few minor emendations because of changed conditions and its enunciation by a different President—is as valid for President Nixon today as when I proposed it to President Johnson fourteen months ago. President Johnson, of course, turned a deaf ear to it as to all other proposals for U.S. extrication. Instead, he extricated himself by announcing his withdrawal from office, a move which averted his certain defeat at the November elections.

This withdrawal was a confession of error even if he could not bring himself to admit such. He was lucky to have escaped impeachment proceedings which might have been his not undeserved fate, because of his betrayal of his campaign pledges, but was never a possibility because a supine Congress with its Democratic majority with a *particeps criminis* in the whole Southeast Asian affair.

Johnson's withdrawal, however, diminished the tension at home and allayed the mounting opposition to the war based on the hope that the "peace talks" in Paris could bring peace. This is an utterly vain hope because the premises of the two adversaries are diametrically opposed and irreconcilable. We have proceeded on the premise that we are there to repel aggression. Our adversaries maintain that the United States is the aggressor—a view substantiated by an objective review of the facts, many of them kept from the American people. That being so, our adversaries will naturally insist that we withdraw from Asia and let Asians settle their own problems. I doubt whether this proposition is negotiable and that peace by negotiation will be achieved. We should ask ourselves by what right we are there; what we have to gain by maintaining that presence, and whether the price is worth the costs—human, material and spiritual—which will haunt us for generations.

As for the secondary justification for our military intrusion to Southeast Asia—we must halt communism—it should be clear by now that we are actually aiding communism; that if the rulers of Communist Russia and Communist China desire our nation's debilitation and downfall, they could not devise a policy more likely to achieve that objective than the one our country is pursuing. To date, neither the Russians nor the Chinese have committed a single soldier to combat. And if our aim was to prevent the southward expansion of mainland China we have pursued the worst possible policy; we have weakened and sought to destroy Vietnam, which has been hostile to the Chinese for centuries and would fight their aggression as it has successively fought that of the French, the Japanese and the Americans.

What would be the consequences of a unilateral American withdrawal? It would not be "scuttle and run." A phased withdrawal would require months and could be replaced by a nation-wide coalition government more responsive to the Vietnamese Nationalist aspirations.

Would there be a blood bath? One is going on now and it will continue as long as the United States clings to its present policies. We can be confident that long before our withdrawal was far advanced the few hundred corrupt Vietnamese officials would have retired to Paris or the Riviera, to enjoy in luxury and ease the fortunes they have filched from our bounty. If some thousands of others would prefer to leave Vietnam, it would pay handsomely to arrange for their relocation and sustenance, if necessary for life, in other climes. It would be far less costly and more humane than the present $3 billion monthly military bill.

The others—the peasantry—would be absorbed and return to the life they had anticipated in the independent countries of Laos, Cambodia, and reunited Vietnam which the Geneva Agreements predicated and we had agreed to support.

President Nixon has the opportunity to end the war and end it honorably by readherence to principles upon which our nation was founded and through which it grew to greatness until a faulty leadership began to abandon them and got us into the present tragic disaster. That disaster—already great—will only be magnified and intensified unless President Nixon reverses the policy that has brought our nation to unfathomable depths. The Congress, too, has a responsibility to change its course and stop voting the military authorization and appropriations which have supported Presidential misleadership.

A STUDY OF HEADSTART

HON. JAMES H. SCHEUER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 8, 1969

Mr. SCHEUER. Mr. Speaker, it has been with a considerable amount of distress that I have been reading the recent newspaper accounts of a study of the Headstart program, which has been carried out by the Westinghouse Learning Corp.

Let me rephrase that: a preliminary study which has been carried out by the Westinghouse Learning Corp. I think it is important to emphasize that; despite the fact that every page of the some 350-page work is stamped "Preliminary Draft," it has apparently been interpreted at being the definitive, unqualified opinion as to the merits and demerits of the Head Start program.

It is my understanding that the final version of this study is not due until May 31, and its authors indicate that additional work now being carried out may provide new insights.

However, the conclusions already arrived at in the study, and the manner in which they were arrived at, give me cause for great concern. As I turned the pages of the report I read, with seemingly relentless consistency, that in learning readiness, in academic achievement, in self-concept and classroom behavior, the full-year Headstart graduates now in the elementary grades, showed no significant gains over their non-Headstart classmates. The 8-week summer session graduates appeared to have lost every ounce of gain by the time they reached the second or third grade.

To me, the shopping list of negatives arrived at by the Westinghouse study provides graphic and dramatic evidence of the need for the further strengthening, expansion and improving of the program. Its conclusions are in many ways similar to those of the Wolff and Stein study of 2½ years ago, on which I commented at the time. This study, based on 179 New York City children, reported disappointment in the durational effects of Head Start, although it was careful to note that children who went into good primary teaching situations continued to show improvement.

It is for this reason that I was happy to read Secretary Finch's statement that HEW's budget for 1970 includes an increase to $60 million—from $30 million—for the Follow Through program. This will enable Follow Through, designed to continue the benefits of Head Start into the early elementary grades, to be extended in some communities into the third grades, as well as be initiated in other communities. Secretary Finch is also calling for an expansion in the use of title I funds for Follow Through.

It is unreasonable to believe that the generations of poverty, ignorance, neglect, and absent opportunity which have produced today's child of poverty, can be counteracted by 1, 2 or even 3 years of special treatment.

Should we not now be addressing ourselves, reasonably and practically, to the kind of programs we are providing for children when they leave Headstart? It is my belief that every effort should be made, every resource mobilized, and every talent conscripted to improve and adapt the early elementary grades to meet the needs of these children. I believe that every educator, be he a State school superintendent, or the principal of a little red school house, should stand back and take a good hard look at the type of programs and supportive service which are being provided to children from disadvantaged homes.

Maybe some of the old traditional, comfortable methods of piloting children through these years should be discarded or revamped. Children must be regarded as individuals with individual needs, desires, and potentials, and this cannot be done within an inflexible, uniform system. We should never be afraid, or too lazy to experiment. Only in this way will we learn what works and what does not. And what more responsive subjects could there be for such experimentation, provided it is always remembered that the children are subjects to be served, and not instruments to be used in perpetuating outmoded techniques, and the discredited operating principles of the past.

Every effort should be made to improve and expand the Follow Through program and the quality of the elementary grades; thus, it is particularly unfortunate that the unfinished results of a study using questionable measures of evaluation should be allowed to cast a shadow over the effectiveness of the nationwide Headstart program. In reading the study several questions spring immediately to my mind: while the Headstart children were tested in first grade or after completion of second or third grades, were these findings examined against a similar evaluation of the same children before they entered Headstart, and immediately after leaving the program.

What basis is there for assuming that the control group of children used by the study had experienced the same level of physical, mental, and emotional deprivation in their preschool years as had the Headstart children? Headstart children are drawn from poverty families, with accompanying deficiencies in these three vital areas of early growth and development. A true evaluation, of necessity, would have to be based upon a perfectly matched group.

Where is there, in the Westinghouse study, a careful examination of the Headstart child in his relationship to his home, his environment and, most important of all, to himself, before and after he completed Headstart? He is, it seems to me, being judged on his sustained ability to put square pegs in square holes, to draw a picture, and to color it green.

And where is there a definitive assessment of the conditions under which he is being asked to do these things in first, second, and third grades? Where is the caliber of the school program described?

A child entering Headstart, from whatever level of poverty he comes, is drawn into an environment where he is offered individual, specialized attention: one teacher, plus one nonprofessional aide and a volunteer for every 15 or 20 children at most. The curriculum is molded to the child, not the child to the curriculum.

From this experience, in all too many cases, he is summarily ejected into a world which consists of 30 or 40 children, supervised by one harassed, overworked, underpaid teacher. Where previously he has been given the time and opportunity to express himself, he now takes his turn, which may never come, or come too late. Where previously he has learned that he could expect the undivided attention of a caring, thoughtful adult when he was troubled, he must now share her with 40 others. These are traumatic experiences for a very young child, but it was under subjection to what might well be these conditions, that the Headstart graduates have been evaluated by the Westinghouse study.

It is incredible to me that any professional researcher would expect a child, particularly those now enrolled in a ghetto classroom, to maintain and sustain the same rate of progress as he did under infinitely more favorable conditions. A well-motivated Headstart child, on the other hand, may very well suffer more in this situation than the non-Headstart child, and this will inevitably be reflected in this testing.

The Westinghouse study, like several other studies, shows that Headstart programs have their greatest impact in Negro males from rural poverty areas, or from big city ghettos. This is the same group that would ordinarily be expected to have the greatest dropout and failure rate in school. Therefore, and most importantly, the most significant improvement is occurring in children with the greatest need.

Headstart offers a great deal more than what is provided during the classroom hours. While admittedly the study takes no account of the program's nutrition and medical and dental services, it similarly omits reference to two other cornerstones of Headstart, namely the social services and parent involvement. For nearly 4 years now, the parents of more than 3 million children have been brought into the early years of their children's development in a unique way. They have been invited into classrooms as aides, as volunteers and as spectators. They have gained insights into their role as parents and homemakers; they have received educational and training opportunities; and they have served on policy advisory boards which determined the administration and operation of the program in which their children were enrolled.

Parents, with the cooperation of a wide range of human service professionals, with local businesses, voluntary organizations, and countless other resources, have made Headstart truly a family program, with a 24-hour-a-day influence, not just confined to the classroom.

AID FOR THE PORT OF NEW YORK

HON. MARIO BIAGGI

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 8, 1969

Mr. BIAGGI. Mr. Speaker, the Port of New York is the busiest port facility in the United States. More goods pass over her docks than through any other port in the Nation. The Port of New York, in 1966, imported a higher tonnage than all the gulf coast ports combined, or all the Pacific coast ports combined, including Alaska and Hawaii. In 1968, the Port of New York handled just over 15 million long tons of general cargo, or 17.5 percent of the country's import-export tonnage.

While the Port of New York still handles a large percentage of the general cargo imported and exported from this country, her position in relation to other ports in the United States has been slipping in recent years. Ten years ago New York handled 27.6 percent of the Nation's import-export tonnage, or 10.1 percent more than she did in 1968.

In order to help reverse this trend, and to prevent New York from slipping further behind, I urge full support for requests for: First, $8.6 million to deepen New York's anchorage facilities; second, a policy of the Navy to use New York shipyards for repair work; third, a $20 million harbor cleanup project; and fourth, greater use of New York pier facilities for Government cargo shipping.

These measures will help reverse the trend which has led to a decline in dock jobs and income for residents of New York. Between 1961 and 1967, an estimated 5,400 dock jobs were lost in the city as well as an estimated $13 million in income in port operations in Brooklyn and Manhattan. These figures do not include losses in jobs and wages in port-related activities, and are only a portion of the losses the city has sustained because of its decline as a port. It has been estimated by economists that there are four to five jobs generated in other areas for every dock job. These include the functions related directly to dock work, such a truckdrivers who deliver and pick up goods, and others who inspect and handle goods. There are also those jobs which fulfill the personal needs of dock workers; for example, restaurant jobs to serve lunch, or car salesmen selling these men cars.

These requests, which have my wholehearted endorsement, will promote New York's economy. They will help create jobs in the city, jobs the city badly needs since its job supply has been adversely affected by the shift of manufacturing enterprises out of the city, and a consequent loss of 140,000 manufacturing jobs in the last 10 years. They will help make New York more competitive with other harbors. Developments, such as the St. Lawrence Seaway, which has opened the Midwest to ocean traffic, have undercut New York's position. The new facilities will help restore the city's position, and will allow her to better capitalize on the opportunities for additional port business such as containerization.

I urge prompt support for these proposals for improving the Port of New York. They are urgently needed to insure New York's leadership as a port, and to encourage the development of the city's economy.

GEORGE GOW: KANSAS BROADCASTER OF THE YEAR

HON. GARNER E. SHRIVER

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 8, 1969

Mr. SHRIVER. Mr. Speaker, on Saturday, May 10, 1969, the Kansas Association of Radio Broadcasters will present its first "Broadcaster of the Year Award" to George Gow, of Wichita. George Gow was a "radio habit" for thousands of Kansans for many years. Although he is now retired, Mr. Gow worked in Wichita radio newscasting for 20 years.

He is remembered here in the Nation's Capital, too, where he covered the White House for Associated Press during World War II. He covered every Democratic and Republican Convention from 1920 to 1960. Mr. Gow has known many Presidents and his interviews have included President Nixon, the late Speaker Sam Rayburn, and the late Gen. Dwight D. Eisenhower.

It is appropriate that he should receive this first award from his fellow broadcasters in the State of Kansas. He has contributed significantly to both newspaper and radio journalism. I extend personal congratulations and best wishes to my friend, George Gow, for this most deserved honor.

Under the leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following feature article written by Rae Jean Matlack which was published in the Wichita, Kans., Beacon:

BROADCASTING VETERAN RECALLS "BACK WHEN"

(By Rae Jean Matlack)

At the tender age of 10, George Gow, 1932 High St., earned his first by-line on the front page of his stepfather's newspaper in Wilmington, Del., for covering a local fire. As a youngster then, little did he know that some years later in his work as a radio newscaster he would be involved in his widespread "red check mark" fire prevention program.

The now retired newscaster who worked in Wichita radio for more than 20 years has been named first recipient of the Kansas Association of Radio Broadcasters "Broadcaster of the Year" award. He will receive a plaque commemorating the honor on May 10 during the 19th annual KARB convention in Salina.

Gow recalled the events of his first major news story as a youth when he was assigned to the fire in Delaware. "Dad sent me out to cover a fire that had resulted from an explosion of a building in which fireworks were made. I had to take a streetcar to and from the fire since I was to young to drive and besides, there weren't many cars back then. They printed my story on the front page, word for word just as I had written it."

In 1895, Gow was born in Leadville, Colo., moving to Denver as an infant where he lived until he was nine years old. During a recent interview, he sat back in his easy chair as he relaxed at home in his living room amidst several honorary wall plaques as well as a couple of gold paperweights presented to him as an honorary member of the Lions' Club, and taxed his memory a bit as he reminisced about his boyhood. "I was always interested in news. As a kid I played marbles, jacks and had a little red wagon. That was so long ago."

His wife, Lee, added, "He was just an average young squirt."

Gow used to set type as a youngster working for his stepfather's newspaper. "I started work there in grammar school. When I was in high school, I used to work two or three hours a day setting type. They used to call me 'nimble fingers,'" he added modestly.

Gow began his radio career in Cincinnati, Ohio on station WLW. He explained that his radio work actually came about by accident. He became involved in a radio series for a research company at which time he started to consider the possibilities of a career in radio.

The veteran newscaster came to Wichita in 1944 as news director for KFH radio, where he remained for five years before working for station KANS for nearly 11 years. He also worked for KFBI and KSIR.

Gow's fire prevention campaigns, known as the "red check mark" fire prevention promotion, won five consecutive "gold medal awards" from the National Board of Fire Underwriters for public service. He was also made Honorary Fire Chief of both the Sedgwick County and Witchita fire departments. As a result of the program, fire prevention booths were constructed by many large Wichita plants in their facilities, "Red check mark" stickers and buttons were also distributed.

"I used to close my nightly 10 o'clock newscast by saying, 'Right now, check your house against fires before you go to bed,'" said Gow.

Other campaigns with which Gow was associated included the Wichita flood control project, Red Cross drives, War Bond sales and the Lion's Club "Drive to Arrive Alive" safe driving appeal. He received citations from CROP, the Heart Association and the Cerebral Palsy Association.

Gow has been honored by the Wichita Downtown Lions Club by being voted a lifetime honorary membership in 1946. Until his

retirement, he annually presented a five-minute round-up of the previous year's news at the first January luncheon of the club. Gow was also awarded a citation of appreciation by the International Lions Club.

Upon his retirement from teaching at Wichita State University in 1965, Gow was awarded a plaque from the Radio and Television Journalism Education Department.

Another fond memory for the retired newsman is the Good Neighbor Club, which he helped organize. "Radio listeners would write letters in about the nice things people they knew had done. A 15-minute segment was presented daily and there was a winner every day. I would read the winning letter over the radio and a poem we used entitled 'I Know Something Good About You.' Then each daily winner was given an orchid."

Gow graduated from Aquinas College in Columbus, Ohio, "the class of '17." He worked his way through school and wrote a column called "As I See It" for a newspaper. His column dealt with current topics of the day.

While Gow feels schooling is important for a student in radio journalism, he said that "on the job training" is most definitely of the greatest value. "The more he gets his feet wet," as he put it, the better it'll be for him."

The newsman discussed how radio has changed since the early days. "Back then, everything was live. There were lots of studios and all different kinds of shows going on at once. Sometimes it was confusing but it was also exciting."

At one time he did some television commercials, live, naturally. "I remember doing commercials for Killion's Fresh Gas, that's how they always referred to it. Each week we'd do a different one, using different props," Gow said.

The retired radio veteran spent the years during World War II in Washington, D.C., covering events and personalities for "the old Blue Network." In 1945, he was at the United Nations charter meeting in San Francisco for Wichita's KFH and the CBS network. He was the only news commentator accredited to the UN conference from Kansas.

It was then that Gow out-scooped Walter Winchell. He telephoned the Wichita Eagle at midnight and reported that "tomorrow Russia will declare war on Japan," beating Winchell by several hours.

At the time of Gow's noteworthy scoop, he was among 14 correspondents who chartered a boat out of San Francisco and journeyed to a destroyer-type Russian vessel.

"They were painting the boat gray and white to make it blend in with the waves," Gow recalled. "They camouflaged the cannons by aiming them upwards and painting them also to look like smokestacks."

Gow was also at one time a White House correspondent. "I held an AP card," he said.

From 1920–1960, he covered every Democratic and Republican Convention.

"I knew all the presidents from Harding on up." His wife would also accompany him to the national conventions and contribute to the reporting of them by giving the woman's view of the conventions.

Mrs. Gow commented, "I have always been news-minded." She talked about how important she feels it is for a wife to understand and follow her husband's career.

"I never used to miss a newscast when he was on the radio. I stayed right with him. I think a wife should be vitally interested in her husband's work."

Gow gave his wife an appreciative nod as he added "She's been a lot of help."

During his career, Gow was billed as "the man who knows the men who make the news." He became personally acquainted with countless news personalities throughout his years of radio broadcasting. His interviews have included the late General Dwight D. Eisenhower, the late House Speaker Sam Rayburn, President Richard Nixon and Dr. Norman Vincent Peale, who he interviewed four years in a row on the radio.

Gow remembered when he first started his radio career in Cincinnati. "I started at the top, and that was a mistake," he said. Later he took the advice of a friend and moved to a smaller radio station, "where I really learned about radio from the ground up." When asked if there is a larger demand for newscasters today, Gow replied, "It depends on the area. In a metropolitan area, you need more newscasters for radio and television."

He talked about editorial comment in newscasting. "When a newscaster gives a view, he should keep it short. A one-line editorial usually covers the bill."

Gow is still interested in the news. "I'm interested mostly in national and international events. Yes, I sometimes miss my work. I wish I could still do it," he said.

When a man retires from a lifelong profession which had become so much a part of him, he ceases the familiar daily work of his career, but he doesn't cease to remember it.

Certainly radio broadcasting has left its mark on Gow, but even more certainly, Gow has left his mark in radio broadcasting.

THE 1970 CENSUS, THE BIG BROTHER APPROACH

HON. LARRY WINN, JR.

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 8, 1969

Mr. WINN. Mr. Speaker, today I submitted the following statement to the Census and Statistics Subcommittee of the House Post Office and Civil Service Committee. I wish to bring my remarks and the resolution of the Kansas Legislature to the attention of my colleagues:

Mr. Chairman, and distinguished members of the committee, I wish to express my strong support of H.R. 20, and my own bill, H.R. 7078, to amend Section 221 of Title 13, U.S. Code, to limit the categories of questions required to be answered under penalty of law in the 1970 census.

I would like to take this opportunity also to bring to your attention House Concurrent Resolution No. 1048, adopted by the Kansas Legislature on April 7, 1969. This resolution clearly and firmly endorses our efforts. I submit it as a permanent part of the hearing record as an expression of the feelings by the citizens of the State of Kansas regarding the proposed census questionnaire for 1970.

May I make it clear that I do not object to the taking of a census. Over the years, this information has been invaluable in measuring the growth of the United States, and in determining necessary improvements in our standard of living. But, the bulk of the questions in the 1970 census form, to my way of thinking, constitute an invasion of privacy and a breach of individual freedom.

I have not lost faith in the American people. It is not necessary to have a jail sentence and fine hanging over their heads to answer honest, rational questions in a census form. It is simply not the traditional American way to coerce cooperation from our citizenry and I will continue to fight this Big Brother approach by the Federal government.

HOUSE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 1048

A Concurrent Resolution memorializing the congress of the United States in regard to legislation pertaining to the conduct of a census

Whereas, A census of the entire population of the United States will be taken in the year 1970; and

Whereas, The residents of the state of Kansas are vitally concerned with the census that will be conducted; and

Whereas, The proposed census questionnaire for 1970 contains a great number of questions, many of which are of a very personal nature, and such questionnaire will prove to be quite cumbersome and burdensome; and

Whereas, Legislation has been introduced in the 1969 session of the congress of the United States which would remedy this problem by limiting the categories of the census questionnaire to six items; and

Be it resolved by the House of Representatives of the State of Kansas, the Senate concurring therein: That the legislature of the state of Kansas respectfully petitions the congress of the United States to give serious consideration to the legislation which is now before such body in reference to the categories and items to be considered in the conduct of a census. Such consideration should take into account a thorough review of the proposed census questionnaire for the year 1970 which contains a tremendous number of items, many of which are of a strictly personal nature. There is now a bill before the 1969 congress, which is House Resolution 20, which would limit the categories and items that a census would be concerned with to six in number. The legislature of this state respectfully requests that the members of the 1969 congress study this problem and direct their attention toward the legislation now before the congress or to other legislation of a similar nature and import.

Be it further resolved: That a duly attested copy of this resolution be immediately transmitted by the secretary of state to the secretary of the Senate of the United States, the clerk of the House of Representatives of the United States and to each member of the congress from this state.

ENGLISH LANGUAGE CASUALTIES

HON. THOMAS J. MESKILL

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 8, 1969

Mr. MESKILL. Mr. Speaker, yesterday I received a copy of an editorial that was delivered by Leonard Patricelli, president of Broadcast Plaza, Inc., on WTIC–TV, channel 3, Hartford, Conn., on May 2, 1969. It is a powerful commentary on the casualties of the English language on the college campus.

Under unanimous consent, I submit this editorial for inclusion in the RECORD for my colleagues to read:

A WITC EDITORIAL COMMENT

Among the many casualties of college campus violence is the English language. As used by youthful dissenters, words simply don't mean what they once meant.

Take, for example, the world *liberate*. It brings to mind American soldiers marching into a French or Belgian village and freeing the cheering citizens from Nazi oppression. Today, a campus building seized by students is said to be liberated—although the liberation consists of destroying property that doesn't belong to the liberators.

Demand is another word heard with increasing frequency on the campus. A demand is what used to be a request—back in the days when deans and college presidents commanded some respect from students. Demands, of course, are always *non-negotiable*. But non-negotiable really means that discussion is suspended until the food runs out, the police arrive, or a face-saving device is

found for both the demonstrators and the dean.

In the demonstrator's jargon, a policeman is a *pig*. But in olden days, a pig was someone who dressed in a slovenly fashion, didn't bother with niceties like haircuts and baths and tended to be profane and obscene in his speech.

Segregation is a word that used to mean separating black people from white people and it was wrong. But now, segregation has become respectable because it has been enshrined in Afro-American Institutes.

And finally, there are two words used by members of the SDS when they try to explain just what it is they're after. The words are *participatory democracy*. In the hands of student radicals, participatory democracy is practiced by seizing buildings, blocking job interviews, shouting down those with differing points of view, and committing acts of vandalism. In an earlier time, there was another word for participatory democracy. That word was fascism.

FOREIGN SERVICE REFORM

HON. JOHN M. ASHBROOK

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 8, 1969

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, the New York Times of May 7 and 8 contained two articles by Peter Grose concerning proposed changes in the Department of State's Foreign Service. It has been generally conceded that conditions in the Foreign Service justified a review of its operation to better utilize its potential. As one who has introduced in the past, legislation dealing with the Foreign Service, I am encouraged to learn that Under Secretary Elliot Richardson is taking steps to effect changes in that agency. The legislation which I introduced last year would have provided an appeals procedure for Foreign Service personnel in the case of those who are selected out of the Service. This proposal has yet to be put into effect, and could, perhaps, be taken under consideration by the new administration.

As indicated in the Times articles, included among the various recommendations on reforms is the report last year by the American Foreign Service Association entitled, "Toward a Modern Diplomacy." This report was reviewed in the December 11, 1968, issue of the Government Employees Exchange, a publication which has for many years closely followed issues and problems peculiar to employees in Federal service.

Admittedly, the task at hand is no easy one, and only an exhaustive and objective appraisal of recommended changes will insure any chance of success. For this reason, I insert at this point the two above-mentioned articles from the New York Times by Peter Grose and the review of "Toward a Modern Diplomacy" from the Government Employees Exchange of December 11, 1968:

[From the New York Times, May 7, 1969]

NIXON IS CHANGING FOREIGN SERVICE—YOUTH AND ABILITY STRESSED IN PROMOTIONS AT STATE

(By Peter Grose)

WASHINGTON, May 6.—The Republican leadership has started a series of changes in the State Department, where President Nixon, during the campaign last year, promised voters a thorough "housecleaning."

But instead of the partisan political purge implied in some campaign statements, this week's reorganization measures looked more like the sort of reforms that professionals of the Foreign Service themselves have been urging.

The opening move in the reform came four days ago in a formal two-page memorandum from Under Secretary Elliot L. Richardson to the assistant secretaries and other bureau chiefs of the department.

He instructed them to "identify younger [career] officers of exceptional ability" and move them into positions of higher responsibility.

The unstated corollary was that more senior Foreign Service officers might be passed over in promotions to higher diplomatic posts and thus encouraged to retire.

Tomorrow, Mr. Richardson is expected to announce a second step of reorganization, a reconstituting of the long-dormant Board of the Foreign Service to take control of personnel and staffing decisions, not only in the State Department but also in other Government agencies with overseas operations.

Subsequently, there is to be a reorganization of the top-level analytical staff around Secretary of State William P. Rogers, pulling together the work of the once-influential Policy Planning Council of the State Department with the policy and budgetary planning of the United States Information Agency, the Agency for International Development, the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency and the Peace Corps.

One purpose behind this move is to give the Secretary of State the bureaucratic machinery necessary for him to carry out his legal responsibility of coordinating foreign operations, rather than letting this function fall by default to the smaller National Security Council staff at the White House, headed by Henry A. Kissinger, Presidential assistant for national security affairs.

PLANS TO CLEAN HOUSE

On Oct. 14 last year, three weeks before the election, Mr. Nixon told newsmen in Key Biscayne, Fla. that "we are going to clean house up there" at the State Department.

"It has never been done," he said. "It wasn't even done during the Eisenhower Administration.

"It's going to be a Nixon-oriented State Department," he said.

"There are some good men in the State Department, and I know who they are," he went on, "but the routine men that have been the architects of the past—they will have other assignments and we are going to bring new men in with a fresh approach."

This sort of campaign statement struck terror into much of the career diplomatic service. Though many of the younger officers, in particular, agreed with the need to "clean house," the remarks from the Republican candidate were taken by many to point toward a shakeup as bitter as the loyalty and security investigations of the McCarthy era of the early nineteen-fifties.

RICHARDSON'S DIRECTIVE

Mr. Richardson translated the President's campaign rhetoric into the language of a formal directive in his May 2 memorandum.

"This Administration is committed to a thorough re-examination of the foreign affairs establishment with a view toward a more effective use of the unique human resources found there," the Under Secretary wrote.

"We desire to examine the size, shape, functions and purposes of the career services, to review the processes for selection, promotion and assignment of personnel and to develop comprehensive policy objectives for our personnel system."

This approach is expected to find wide endorsement among many career officers, including a number of prominent retired diplomats who have been encouraging Mr. Rogers and Mr. Richardson in their planning of the reforms.

The American Foreign Services Association, a professional society of the career diplomats, proposed a sweeping reform of the foreign affairs machinery in a 185-page report last August. Their program included several of the measures the Administration is now putting forth.

FIRST STEPS LISTED

Mr. Richardson's memorandum itemized several "first steps" in the reorganization of the foreign affairs machinery.

Beyond the encouragement through promotions for younger career officers, he called for greater flexibility in interchanging personnel among the various foreign affairs agencies.

He proposed to "increase the opportunities for career officers to move temporarily into other disciplines—business, universities, foundations and the like—without loss of career contact with the Foreign Service System."

[From the New York Times, May 8, 1969]

UNITED STATES OPENS REVIEW OF ITS DIPLOMACY—RICHARDSON IS NAMED HEAD OF FOREIGN SERVICE BOARD

(By Peter Grose)

WASHINGTON, May 7.—Secretary of State William P. Rogers appointed Under Secretary Elliot L. Richardson chairman of the Board of the Foreign Service today, making that largely inactive body the chief instrument for changing the foreign affairs establishment.

Mr. Richardson promptly opened what was called a "major and comprehensive review" of foreign policy machinery, which has long been criticized as cumbersome and stultified through years of unplanned expansion.

As one example of what might come out of his review. Mr. Richardson pointed to the possibility of achieving a unification of the foreign services of the State Department, the United States Information Agency, the Agency for International Development, the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency and the Peace Corps.

Leaders of the American Foreign Service Association, the nongovernmental professional society of diplomatic career officers, called an open meeting for next Monday to discuss the implications of the Richardson move.

BEGINNING OF BEGINNING

Lannon Walker, chairman of the so-called "young Turks" heading the association, said, "We are tremendously encouraged," but he added that the measures announced "represent only the beginning of a beginning."

The association, in which many prominent retired diplomats are active alongside the junior officers, has long been pressing for a modernization of the personnel and bureaucratic structure of the State Department.

The initiative for the present drive for change, however, has come from the Nixon Administration. Mr. Richardson said the views of the young Turks would be considered in the review, along with those of more senior careerists and other interested groups.

As chairman, Mr. Richardson replaces Idar Rimestad, the Deputy Under Secretary of State for Administration, who remains as one of the four State Department members of the board. Others named today were Martin Hillenbrand, Assistant Secretary of State for European Affairs, and Phillip Trezisf, soon to be sworn in as Assistant Secretary for Economic Affairs. Both are career diplomats.

Representatives of A.I.D., U.S.I.A., the Departments of Commerce and Labor and the Civil Service Commission also sit on the board.

Ever since the Foreign Service Act of 1946, the career system and its governing board

has theoretically enjoyed an independent status. Last year's report of the American Foreign Service Association described the board as an "anachronistic vestige," which no longer served an effective purpose.

[From the Government Employees Exchange, Dec. 11, 1968]

A REVIEW OF "TOWARD A MODERN DIPLOMACY"

(NOTE.—In a recent issue of The Exchange, October 30, 1968, the newspaper made reference to an American Foreign Service Association special report, "Toward A Modern Diplomacy," and promised a critique of the report by an analyst at the Department of State. For obvious reasons the name of the employee is withheld from publication. References to this newspaper by the analyst were not solicited.)

A committee headed by Ambassador Graham Martin recently made 17 recommendations, including placing the U.S. Information Agency within the State Department as an autonomous unit and integrating its personnel into the Foreign Service, for an organizational improvement of the nation's foreign affairs. In submitting the committee's 60-page report entitled "Toward a Modern Diplomacy," which forms Part 2 of the November issue of the *Foreign Service Journal*, Ambassador Martin declares that the report is intended to serve the incoming Nixon Administration "in creating, at long last, a stable foreign affairs personnel system designed to adequately meet the needs of the nation in the 1970's." The *Journal* is published monthly by the Foreign Service Association.

The report was prepared in response to a request made more than a year ago to Ambassador Martin by the Board of Directors of the American Foreign Service Association. Lannon Walker, Chairman of the AFSA board, in an introductory note to the report, explains that it is "in no way an official report" and reveals that John D. Rockefeller 3rd "generosity" made its publication possible.

Although the recommendations cover a wide range of subjects, the report takes no position on the vital and controversial selection-out or removal procedure applying to Foreign Service Officers. This omission is surprising and curious, because the report of the Subcommittee on Personnel Selection and Development makes detailed comments and specific recommendations on separation procedures.

The Subcommittee maintains that the broad policies by which some officers are selected out by reason of the maximum-time-in-grade requirement are "an essential part of the Foreign Service personnel system." Conceding that "We have some doubts about the way in which they are implemented," they add, however: "Our doubts do not extend to the fairness with which the system as it now stands is being administered. Our consideration of the various review procedures at work—at the post, in Washington, by the selection board action—*has convinced us that gross inequity is highly unlikely. We do not, therefore, consider that an appeals arrangement is called for.*" (italics for emphasis).

The Government Employees' Exchange, which has been advocating the establishment of an appeals system for many months, categorically rejects the subcommittee's conviction that "gross inequity is highly unlikely" and that an appeals arrangement is consequently unnecessary. As the readers of *The Exchange* are fully aware, this newspaper has persistently and vigorously supported the efforts of Stephen A. Koczak, a former Foreign Service Officer who was selected out, to obtain an appeal.

The Exchange has argued that the selection-out procedure violates the principles of justice and human rights, because it denies a person "due process" as guaranteed by the Constitution. "Due process" is not mentioned in the subcommittee's report. In urging that due process be established in the State Department, *The Exchange* proposes that any person designated for dismissal be insured the right to be informed in advance of the specific charges against him in writing; the right to a speedy and fair hearing; the right to engage counsel in his defense; the right to confront the witnesses against him; the right not to be a witness against oneself, and the right to appeal.

"The decline in promotions and the increased number of separations were probably necessary to restore a balance, but they reflect a defect in the operation of the personnel system over the past few years," the subcommittee candidly admits. "*We believe selection boards should be asked to identify the facts that led them to put an officer in the low 10% category,*" thus subjecting him to selection out, it emphasizes. Letters in this category, the report suggests, should be more than a form letter. The letter should give the officer some idea of his deficiency so that he may make an effort to correct the problem.

Recognizing that the system inflicts both psychological and financial hardship on those selected out, the subcommittee recommends more satisfactory retirement arrangements for middle-grade officers voluntarily or involuntarily separated, perhaps analagous to the military retirement system. The prospect of shortened careers, it says, makes it "mandatory" for the State Department to improve its outplacement facilities. In this connection, it recommends the use of contract agencies specializing in the placement of executive and professional employees. For a better understanding of how the system operates, it proposes that a brief layman's version of the system be made available to all officers on entry and periodically thereafter as changes are made, and that the key elements of selection board precepts and rating officers' guides be highlighted to all officers as revisions are effected.

Bernard Weisman, president of USIA Lodge 1812 of the AFL-CIO American Federation of Government Employees, has strongly denounced the Martin committee's recommendation that USIA be placed within the State Department. He has accused AFSA of evidently "blithely seeking" to reconstitute the scheme embodied in the Hays Bill, which was thwarted two years ago and which would have created, in Mr. Weisman's words, "a pseudo FS system to permit hiring-assigning-and-firing at will of employees of all foreign agencies." Contending that "it is the Crockett scheme all over again," he cited as proof the "feverish effort" made at the AFSA meeting on Sept. 6 "to halt the implementation of USIA FS career legislation until after a new Administration arrives." The Crockett plan was sponsored by William J. Crockett, who was the Deputy Under Secretary of State for Administration before resigning to join a major business organization.

In addition to suggesting that USIA be given the same operational status within the State Department as is now the case with respect to the Agency for International Development, the committee under the chairmanship of Ambassador Martin recommends:

The retention of the White House organizational pattern primarily concerned with foreign affairs; and the establishment of the position of Permanent Under Secretary as the third ranking position in the State Department. To ease the enormous burdens placed on the Secretary of State, the second position in the Department should be a true *alter ego* to the Secretary, with the title of "Foreign Secretary."

"The United States Diplomatic Mission" should replace the concept of the "Country Team," with the Ambassador, as the personal representative of the new President, exercising, on his behalf, control over all U.S. Government activities in the country to which the Ambassador is accredited.

Return to the basic foreign affairs structure created by the Congress in the Foreign Service Act of 1946, the first step being the restoration of the statutory independence of the Board of the Foreign Service. The board should have representation from all agencies using the Foreign Service and its chairman should be an outstanding private citizen.

The creation of an adequate manpower utilization and planning mechanism.

The expansion of Foreign Service efforts to assist the President and the Secretary of State in their task of maintaining continuing productive communication with the American people on basic foreign policy issues.

The new Administration should investigate thoroughly the applicability of new technology to the problems of foreign affairs as recommended by the Subcommittee on Technology and seek resources to install such systems. Other proposals deal with the promotion system, salaries, the "development" function, the assignment of Foreign Service Officers to other Departments and international organizations, greater comparability in medical benefits, remuneration and benefits on retirement and transfer allowances.

POLISH CELEBRATE CONSTITUTION DAY

HON. GLENN CUNNINGHAM

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 8, 1969

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, since the outbreak of World War II, Poland's valiant struggle against Nazi-Communist totalitarianism has become an inspiration for mankind.

On May 3, Poles throughout the world marked the 178th anniversary of Polish Constitution Day. Adoption of this document came in 1791 during one of those brief periods in recent history when the Polish people were free of foreign domination.

My many Polish friends joined about 10 million other Americans of Polish ancestry in this observance which also coincided with these important dates in Polish history: 30th anniversary of German-Soviet attack on Poland; 25th anniversary of the Battle of Monte Cassino; 25th anniversary of the Warsaw uprising; 25th anniversary of the founding of the Polish-American Congress.

Mr. Speaker, I commend to your attention the following article by the Polish-American Congress on a valiant people who will one day again taste freedom:

NATIONAL HOLIDAY

On May 3 Poles everywhere and citizens of Polish origin in many countries celebrate a Polish national holiday—the Polish Third of May Constitution Day.

In the United States, wherever Americans of Polish descent live, in cities and towns from coast to coast, this holiday is observed with appropriate exercises throughout the month of May to pay tribute to the Polish nation and to remind fellow Americans that Poland was one of the first pioneers of liberalism in Europe.

It was on May 3 in 1791, barely two years after the adoption of its Constitution by the United States in 1789, that Poland without a bloody revolution or even without a disorder succeeded in reforming her public life

and in eradicating her internal decline. But this great rebirth and assertion of democracy came to the Poles too late and did not forestall the third partition of Poland in 1795 by Russia, Prussia and Austria.

The greatness of the May Third Polish Constitution consisted in the fact that it eliminated with one stroke the most fundamental weaknesses of the Polish parliamentary and social system. The Poles raised this great moment in their history to the forefront of their tradition rather than any one of their anniversaries of glorious victories or heroic revolutions.

We Americans who have been reared in the principle given us as a birthright by the founders of our great Republic, the principle of the sovereignty of the people in the state, which is the primary postulate in the 1791 Polish Constitution, can see how this truism cut off the Poles and the Polish political tradition completely from both the Germans and the Russians, who have been reared in the principle of state, and not national, sovereignty.

The light of liberalism coming from Poland was then, as it has been throughout the years that followed and even unto today, a threat to tyranny and absolutism in Russia and Germany. In 1795 Russian and Prussian soldiers were sent to Poland to partition and rape her. In 1939 Russian and Prussian soldiers met again on Polish soil, as the absolute totalitarianism systems of nazism and communism again felt the danger of true liberalism coming from Poland just as in 1791.

In the Polish Third of May Constitution this liberalism was formulated in these words:

"All power in civil society should be derived from the will of the people, its end and object being the preservation and integrity of the state, the civil liberty and the good order of society, on an equal scale and on a lasting foundation."

The philosophy of government discernable throughout the Third of May Polish constitution leads one to believe that the American people and the Polish people had each drawn inspiration for their respective constitutions from the same source.

Meditation on the anniversary of May the Third deepens the faith and heightens the courage of every Pole and of every American of Polish origin. It reminds all Americans of Poland's destiny in the history of mankind, and prophesies the ultimate triumph of justice, even though Poland once more has been deprived of her independence, sovereignty and her territory by one of our former allies, Soviet Russia, with the consent of other United Nations.

RUMANIAN INDEPENDENCE DAY

HON. MICHAEL A. FEIGHAN

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 8, 1969

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Speaker, the 10th of May marks, for free Rumanians all over the world, the date when Rumania finally shook off the shackles of Turkish domination and became a free kingdom in 1877. Its observance provides an occasion for recalling the country's historical steps toward independence, steps which have been nullified by the virtual colonization of the country today by Soviet Russia.

Observance of the 10th of May as Rumanian Independence Day gives us an opportunity to draw world attention to the present enslavement of the Rumanians, and to note that its people continue to struggle for the restoration of true freedom. The Soviets who now dominate Rumania hope to dim the significance of this day by substituting another day as the important national holiday and thereby erase this symbol of freedom.

The Rumanians, however, join other captive peoples in refusing to accept communism and in clinging to their hope for freedom. I am proud to join in that celebration and await with them the day when freedom shall be restored in Rumania and flourish throughout the world.

EUGENE T. KINNALY

HON. SILVIO O. CONTE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 6, 1969

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Speaker, I would like to join with my colleagues in expressing my deep regret at the passing of a valued friend and dedicated public servant, Eugene T. Kinnaly.

For 51 years in the service of the Congress, 41 of them as the valued administrative assistant of our distinguished Speaker, Gene Kinnaly provided dedicated and competent service in a genuinely warm and sincere manner.

Since I first came to the Hill in 1958 I have had the great pleasure to come to know Gene Kinnaly and to understand fully the reasons for the wide esteem in which he was held by all who knew him. I could not begin to recount here the countless times he provided helpful assistance about the problems of my Massachusetts constituents and even more valued personal advice which I especially needed when I first arrived on the Hill.

Most of all, of course, I will miss the warmth and genuineness of his friendship.

I wish to extend my condolences to the Speaker and to Mr. Kinnaly's family for the great loss.

WASHINGTON AREA AMBULANCE CRISIS

HON. LAWRENCE J. HOGAN

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 8, 1969

Mr. HOGAN. Mr. Speaker, I want to take this opportunity to bring to the attention of my colleagues a series of editorials which have been broadcast over radio station WWDC bringing to the public's attention a shocking crisis existing in the District of Columbia concerning emergency ambulance service.

I also wish to commend WWDC for its enlightened public service in bringing to the public's attention through a series of searching reports, the problems related to ambulance service in Washington, D.C.

I urge each of my colleagues to read these editorials which shed light on a matter which warrants the concern of Congress, as it discharges its legislative responsibility for the District of Columbia:

WASHINGTON AREA AMBULANCE CRISIS

EDITORIAL NO. 1

Broadcast of this editorial by WWDC General Manager, William S. Sanders, was on April 8, 1969. We welcome comments.

The Washington area, city and suburb alike, is in the midst of a snowballing ambulance crisis. Ambulances are making taxi runs, carrying sick people to hospitals, while emergency cases lie bleeding on the streets because there are not enough ambulances.

Authorities here agree that between fifty and seventy-five percent of the current ambulance runs are *not* true emergencies. At the same time, during March there were no ambulances available twenty-five separate times when true emergencies did occur.

At the same time, hospital emergency rooms are glutted. Emergency cases wait in the hall because the crush of non-emergency cases keeps overworked personnel tied up.

The training given many ambulance drivers is not satisfactory, and many are not interested in their work. In the District, all firemen work one year on the ambulances. Many view that year as a necessary evil, a year in which there is no promotion.

WWDC Newsman Ross Simpson has studied the ambulance situation, delving into its problems, and studying its alternate solutions. His series began yesterday and will be heard for two weeks on WWDC. We will be commenting at the same time, hoping to find some relief from the Washington area ambulance crisis.

Thank you for your interest.

EDITORIAL NO. 2

Broadcast of this editorial by WWDC General Manager, William S. Sanders, was on April 9, 1969. We welcome comments.

A quick look at upcoming budgets for the District of Columbia indicates that the ambulance crisis here is going to get worse before it gets better. The ten D.C. fire ambulances are already so over-extended that on twenty-five occasions last month, there was no ambulance available for an emergency run. Those ten ambulances are making two hundred runs a day. A set of brakes last five weeks. An ambulance is worn out in eighteen months, and many drivers are through in twelve.

There is a documented need for more ambulances today, yet the budget calls for only two additional ambulance trucks next year. The situation, then, is running downhill. Emergency cases wait on the street while fire department dispatchers search the city for an available ambulance, and the demand for ambulances is increasing at a rate far outstripping any planned increases in the service. Part of the problem is money. There's not enough to buy the needed ambulances . . . but a larger part of the problem is abuse of the service. More than 50% of those two hundred runs a day are *not* emergency runs.

Thank you for your interest.

EDITORIAL NO. 3

Broadcast of this editorial by WWDC General Manager, William S. Sanders, was on April 10, 1969. We welcome comments.

For you who've been spared the experience, take our word for it, a ride in a D.C. ambulance is a frightening and frustrating experience. The penetrating siren wails, the driver's foot jumps from the accelerator to the brake pedal and back. The horn sounds a steady

staccato, and the driver curses under his breath as motorist after stupid motorist refuse to yield the right of way. Newsman Ross Simpson rode an ambulance for one night, and he reports frequent instances of drivers cutting the ambulance off, and of people refusing to move over and let the emergency vehicle pass.

There are several things which can be done about the situation. For starters police could make a few arrests of drivers who refuse to grant the right of way.

The D.C. Government should enact an ordinance authorizing the creation of specially marked emergency lanes down the center of major arteries. Several cities have these, New York for one, and some cities paint them a different color. When a siren sounds, you best not be caught in that emergency lane.

And finally, serious thought should be given to installing a control over-ride device on traffic signal control boxes. These devices react to a radio wave emitting from a traveling emergency vehicle. As the vehicle approaches, *all* lights at an intersection go red. This guarantees that no one will be moving, that there will be a clear emergency lane, and that there will be no tragic collisions between emergency vehicles and stupid or callous drivers. Washington has been miraculously free of such wrecks, thanks only to the skill of ambulance drivers and occasional divine intervention.

Thank you for your interest.

EDITORIAL NO. 4

Broadcast of this editorial by WWDC General Manager, William S. Sanders, was on April 11, 1969. We welcome comments.

Washington's emergency crisis extends beyond the ambulance service and into the hospital emergency rooms. Emergency rooms are glutted, often with non-emergency cases, and several area hospitals flatly refuse to treat indigent cases. Cash, they say, or an ambulance carries you to another hospital.

The total problem stems from the decline in the number of general practitioners, and from the fact that few doctors today will make house calls. If you felt bad yesterday, you called the doctor to your house. Today, you call an ambulance, and wait in line at an overcrowded emergency room.

Dr. Charles Hutchinson, staff physician at Freedmans Hospital, offers what we feel is a workable solution to the problem: neighborhood clinics, a place near the home, where a person can see a doctor. Neighborhood clinics for non-emergency cases would cut down the spiraling number of ambulance runs, and hospital emergency rooms would be reserved for emergencies.

Finally, the District government must make the Medicaid program financially workable. Every hospital in this city must open to all people. Since the hospitals and doctors have been unable to meet the problem, the government must. George Washington Hospital and others can turn people away, saying they can't afford to treat them. But the area governments cannot afford not to treat them.

Thank you for your interest.

EDITORIAL NO. 5

Broadcast of this editorial by WWDC General Manager, William S. Sanders, was on April 12, 1969. We welcome comments.

Over the past six months, WWDC newsmen have become convinced there is a critical shortage of ambulances in Washington. Yet when newsman Ross Simpson set out to document the problem, he ran around in shoals of official ignorance. The District government simply has no information whatsoever about the ambulance service: the demands on it, the quality of service, or problems, past, present and future. There are no statistics to refute or affirm either the private complaints of poor service or the official affirmations that all is well.

We suggest that the District government establish and maintain complete records of ambulance service, including the number and type of runs, the number, type and disposition of complaints, and a comparison between service offered here and in other cities. We have found a wealth of excellent ideas for improved ambulance service, already being practiced in numerous cities. In fact, neighboring Baltimore has one of the top ranked ambulance services in the nation. We would do well to follow her lead.

Thank you for your interest.

EDITORIAL NO. 6

Broadcast of this editorial by WWDC General Manager, William S. Sanders, was on April 13, 1969. We welcome comments.

Our investigation of the ambulance crisis in Washington has brought forth some sharp criticism, charges of inadequate training, of low morale and low experience, charges of insufficient manpower and equipment, and finally, charges that no one in the District Building is aware of the problem.

It strikes us that the ambulance situation today stems from the fact that ambulances are the stepchild of the fire department. There is no top official concerned only with ambulance service to push for action. Only 9 out of 78 ambulance men have more than three years experience. The reason: involuntary service. All fire department personnel are required to spend one year on the ambulance service. It may round out a fireman, but the practice does little to mold enthusiastic, well trained and experienced ambulance attendants. The service has no intrastructure. The result is *no promotions*, and no bosses. Ambulance men are trained at the fire department, not in hospitals. The result is attendants must get their experience in the field, perhaps with you.

We strongly urge that the District ambulance service be made a separate department, with line as well as staff, whose men work because they want to be ambulance drivers, and who are trained in medical science first and rescue work second. To do less than this is to gamble daily with the safety of you and me.

Thank you for your interest.

EDITORIAL NO. 7

Broadcast of this editorial by WWDC General Manager, William S. Sanders, was on April 14, 1969. We welcome comments.

The ambulance crisis is not limited to the District. A $15,000 rescue truck sits in the Kent District Firehouse, and it sits there through many fires, accidents with injuries, and ambulance runs. The reason is a lesson in fire department politics . . . the continuing struggle for power between paid and volunteer firemen. It is a struggle in which you, the citizen, are the real loser.

William Clarke, the Prince George's County Fire Director, has ordered that the Kent District truck not run on many emergencies. He has also ordered that paid firemen not ride on the Kent District ambulance. The result is that 13 times in nine months, Kent District residents waited extra time for an ambulance, while theirs' sat immobilized by executive order.

Newsman Ross Simpson has learned that two and possibly four other rescue squads in Prince George's County are contemplating pulling out of the county fire organization. Yet Fire Director Clarke told Simpson he thought there is an "amicable relationship" between his officers and the volunteers. There is not, Mr. Clarke, and for the sake of the people you serve, we hope you will recognize that there is not, and take some action to bring peace to the undeclared war between volunteers and paidmen . . . a war whose casualties are the people of Prince George's County who need ambulance and rescue service.

Thank you for your interest.

EDITORIAL NO. 8

Broadcast of this editorial by WWDC General Manager, William S. Sanders was on April 15, 1969. We welcome comments.

There is a bright spot in the area ambulance situation. That is the Bethesda-Chevy Chase rescue squad. Basically it is a volunteer organization which now is the mainstay of emergency service in a substantial portion of upper northwest Washington. Bethesda-Chevy Chase is *all* that the *District is not*. There is sufficient money. Bethesda-Chevy Chase held a fund drive last year and raised $120,000.00, and Bethesda has as many ambulances as the entire District of Columbia. The men are doing their work because they want to. Most are volunteers, unlike the District, where ambulance work is a prerequisite to becoming a firefighter. The workload in Bethesda is human. Bethesda-Chevy Chase runs 7,200 calls with 10 vehicles, the District runs 48,000 calls a year with the same number of ambulances.

We feel that the experience of the Bethesda-Chevy Chase rescue squad is strong evidence of the need for more vehicles and more personnel in the District ambulance corps and for an end to the practice of drafting ambulance attendants.

Thank you for your interest.

EDITORIAL NO. 9

Broadcast of this editorial by WWDC General Manager, William S. Sanders, was on April 16, 1969. We welcome comments.

The Washington Area Council of Governments has missed the ship . . . airship that is. We're referring to helicopter ambulance. The Council of Governments opted for a one year study of the feasibility of helicopter ambulance in the Washington area, while several other cities jumped at the chance to put copter-stretchers in the air. The result, a turndown of the local proposal by the Department of Transportation.

While we've missed out on a free year's service, we're convinced that helicopter ambulances have a role to play in the Washington area. They are not the panacea for all area ambulance problems, and indeed, they will be of less help in the District, where the problem is the worst, but they will save lives on area highways and they will cut the transportation time for the counties.

We hope that the Council of Governments will continue with their plans for implementation of helicopter ambulance service in the Washington area, with or without Federal monies.

Thank you for your interest.

EDITORIAL NO. 10

Broadcast of this editorial by WWDC General Manager, William S. Sanders, was on April 17, 1969. We welcome comments.

The District government has been derelict in its ignorance of the current ambulance crisis. On August 27, 1957, the District government created an Emergency Ambulance Service Advisory Committee. Its purpose was to study the ambulance service and make recommendations on current performance and future needs. The Committee was charged with making an annual report to the District government and to the Fire Department Chief. That Committee exists today, but Chief Hugh Groves of the Fire Department told newsman Ross Simpson he was unaware of its existence. Simpson delved into Fire Department records back to 1957 from the present, and found not one single annual report, study or recommendation.

The City Council has now created an ad hoc committee to study the situation. Councilman Stanley Anderson heads that committee, and is scratching the surface of the problem, but is obviously unaware of the depth or true nature of the crisis.

The District government must immediately move to rectify this situation. An ambulance crisis exists today, and will be worse tomorrow. The government cannot act without information, and the government today has neither information nor means of getting it. The Emergency Ambulance Service Committee must be reactivated, and told in no uncertain words that its job is truly a matter of life and death.

Thank you for your interest.

EDITORIAL NO. 11

Broadcast of this editorial by WWDC General Manager, William S. Sanders, was on April 18, 1969. We welcome comments.

WWDC is completing two weeks of study of the ambulance crisis in Washington. If we have done nothing else in these reports, we hope that the District government and area residents alike are aware that an emergency exists. We remind you that living in the suburbs does not exempt you from concern. For in the event of an auto accident or sidewalk stroke, you forfeit any choice in ambulance service or hospital emergency room.

It's time for the District government to move, and move quickly. The Ambulance Advisory Board must be immediately reactivated. The ambulance service must be given independent status, with promotions and staff. Ambulance service must be made voluntary. More equipment and better training must be provided ambulance drivers. And finally, there must be some solution to the ambulance overload. Neighborhood clinics would go a long way to relieving the dependence on ambulances and hospital emergency rooms to substitute for the vanishing general practitioner who makes house calls. And we suggest either a fee or fine for flagrant abuse of the free ambulance service . . . service designed for emergencies and not to replace taxis.

Thank you for your interest.

TRIBUTE TO THE HONORABLE HARRY SHEPPARD

HON. JEFFERY COHELAN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 30, 1969

Mr. COHELAN. Mr. Speaker, while it was not unexpected because of his long bout with chronic illness, the news of Harry Sheppard's death leaves all of us saddened and mildly stunned. Not only was Harry a revered colleague but to most of us he was a good personal friend. He was an especially important person in my own experience, as I had the privilege of serving with him as Secretary during his tenure as dean of the California delegation. Since I had the opportunity to work closely with him I think I got to know him well. I can testify that he was an extraordinary man and it was a unique experience to know him. Behind his gravel-voice and hard-boiled demeanor, he unsuccessfully concealed an extraordinary intelligence, an enormous fund of life experience and knowledge generated by a determination for self-reliance and the recognition that goes with monetary success and public achievement.

Others will recount his remarkable career and his achievements in both the private and the public sector. I merely want to say it was a great privilege to know Harry and to benefit from his frequently offered counsel. Evelyn and I will miss him and for many years will recall some of the great moments we had together.

On behalf of Mrs. Cohelan and myself, we extend to his devoted wife, Kay, our fond regards and heartfelt condolences.

SPEECH BY CONGRESSMAN WILLIAM D. HATHAWAY AT THE COLLEGE OF WILLIAM AND MARY, WILLIAMSBURG, VA., MAY 3, 1969

HON. JOHN BRADEMAS

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 8, 1969

Mr. BRADEMAS. Mr. Speaker, one of the ablest and hardest working members of the House Committee on Education and Labor is the distinguished gentleman from Maine, Congressman WILLIAM D. HATHAWAY.

At a time when all of us must be concerned about the problems of student unrest on our college and university campuses, I believe that Members of the House and Senate will read with great interest the text of a most thoughtful address on these problems delivered by Congressman HATHAWAY at the College of William and Mary, Williamsburg, Va., on May 3, 1969.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert the text of Mr. HATHAWAY's address at this point in the RECORD:

SPEECH BY CONGRESSMAN WILLIAM D. HATHAWAY AT THE COLLEGE OF WILLIAM AND MARY, WILLIAMSBURG, VA., MAY 3, 1969

President Paschall, Members of the Faculty, parents and students. It is a privilege and a distinct honor to be here at the Nation's Alma Mater, the college of presidents and numerous distinguished leaders in all walks of life. And we feel right at home, my wife, Mary, and I, William.

The history of this great institution forms an important part of the history of this nation.

One of the most distinguished alumni, Thomas Jefferson, was the first in our new nation to recognize the need for a good education to carry on a democratic society. He would be proud today to see so many of our young people attending college acquiring the education he deemed so necessary for promoting the public happiness. And Jefferson believed in dissent; dissent so long as it is clothed with reason, accompanied by calm deliberation. But college campuses are now experiencing a kind of dissent which lacks those qualities of reason and calm deliberation Jefferson suggested.

Today the campus has replaced Vietnam as the front page battlefield. The New York Times publishes a daily summary of campus combat. People have maps on their walls with pins and ribbons to follow the flow of fighting. Books, articles, and speeches abound; Congressional hearings are being conducted. You have been inundated with advice on this problem, and today I am going to burden you further with my views because they represent the views of a public official who can do something about the situation, because it is the domestic issue of the day, because certain aspects of the problem have not been fully discussed, and because the problem has ramifications extending beyond the campus.

Students are upset, restive, arrogant—for many reasons: Vietnam, racism, poverty disturb them, and these we'll discuss later. Shortcomings of the University disturb them. These we'll discuss now.

SHORTCOMINGS OF THE UNIVERSITY

First they want—and for good reason—full responsibility for their personal conduct on and off campus. It is high time the university got out of the custodial business, and let students run their lives the way ordinary Americans do—subject, of course, to the same laws—the same penalties, that govern us all.

There is a paradox in being a student in today's society. Presently, the attitude of many adults to students is that they're damned if they do and damned if they don't. A young man, if he wants to succeed in life and be respected by his elders, must go to college. On the other hand, while the young man is in school, as is expected by society, he is considered a kid who should not have adult opinions and views. We must stop this maddening attitude of beating them until they bleed and then beating them for bleeding. A young man or woman of college age is an adult and should be treated as an adult.

College attendance is not an adolescent pursuit, but a form of adult participation in our society.

Second, students want the chance to express their views on faculty teaching performance—and to have these views count. This need not be a popularity contest. Without some such opportunity, research will wax and teaching will wane to the continued detriment of those who come to college expecting full well to be taught.

Teaching is the primary purpose of a university. It is said that students are transients—and, therefore, should have no influence on essentially institutional matters which might affect the entire career of faculty members. This notion is false. In the first place, almost 50 percent of all college freshmen intend to take post graduate work and, in the second place, in the student's life college has much more than a merely transient place. College is the main event on his educational program. The university should be exploring every avenue to bring student and teacher back into the center of the arena.

The third student complaint is about the university curriculum. Here, as in other university matters, students should not have a controlling voice or even an equal voice, but they should have an effective voice. They or their parents are paying, at least in part, for the goods, and they should have some say about the quality of the goods. But more importantly, the university makes the mold for curricula all the way down to kindergarten.

This is an awesome responsibility—a responsibility which should be shared by the student, by the parents, by the alumni, as well as the faculty and administration. The decision for determining the content of programs which have such a tremendous impact on life in general should be shared by those who participate in life in general.

The lack of relevancy of curricula has led many to believe that school is school and life is life and never the twain shall meet. It is interesting to note that, to date at least, campus disturbances have been confined to liberal arts colleges with few incidents at the so-called trade schools. The late J. P. Marquand's opening quip at my commence-

ment was more than the customary audience relaxing joke—He said the only benefit he derived from his college chemistry course was the ability to pour while holding the flask and the stopper in the same hand.

VIETNAM, MILITARISM, POVERTY

And there are outside influences contributing to the general miasma of discontent. Foremost, of course, is Vietnam. Vietnam has been, and continues to be, a frustrating experience affecting particularly our young people. The war has gone on much longer than any expected and the platitudes of our political leaders offer little solace.

Militarism in this country in aspect, prospect, and attitude is a frankensteinian monster casting an ominous and discomforting shadow over all of us. But unlike Frankenstein's monster, this one was neither planned nor desired. It is the result of our overresponse to World War II and the cold war. In compensating for lack of preparation in the past, we are over prepared in the present and we have created a military-industrial giant for the future.

Social transformation—new groups asserting themselves: Economic transformation from an industrial to a technological age bring confusion, frustration, irritation—the ordeal of change. The changes are rapid and it is easy for the less adaptable old to be frustrated and the more adaptable young to feel contemptuous of the old. And this frustration and contempt is accentuated by our lack of a unifying, transcendental culture. We have an *Ad Hoc*, "pop" culture. Everything we build seems artificial. Everything is changing. Nothing seems permanent. This can be upsetting.

The ambiguity of progress is slowly dawning. The 1969 man carries strontium 90 in his bones, iodine 131 in his thyroid, DDT in his fat, and asbestos in his lungs. A litttle more progress and this man will be dead.

We have been described by a Presidential Commission as racists. This is not true, but is partially true and the part is too large. Racism abounds, but its obliteration would not be a panacea for all the Black man's problems. We can't burn the bigots for a bright new day. We still have large pockets of white poverty.

Vietnam, militarism, poverty, all of our problems both foreign and domestic are not subject to easy explanations—as most of us are prone to make. They aren't the evil designs of madmen. We can't blame an English banking conspiracy, a Communist conspiracy, a military-industrial conspiracy or any other conspiracy. Sure, certain individuals are responsible for certain acts, but the problems result from the haphazard flow of events and the uncontrollable momentum of situations.

Custodial rules, teachers who don't teach, irrelevant curricula, Vietnam, militarism, racism, poverty, imaginary conspiracies, ambiguous progress, a missing culture, certainly contribute to campus unrest. They contribute to the inevitable ambiguities of life and to the mounting desire to resolve all questions once and for all. They snowball man's longing for a cataclysmic showdown. To meet and to vanquish evil—The shootout at the OK corral—the same desire for confrontation between employee and employer, partner and partner, father and son, husband and wife, the desire we all have for a cathartic every once in a while.

Cathartic, showdown, yes; contempt for the freedom of others, no. Many of our campus demonstrators consider themselves a privileged class intolerant of the rights of others and contemptuous of human limitations. These puritans would destroy man for not being perfect. But all of history is a record of man's limited successes against a background of recurring failures. Man's failures are all too understandable. His successes need explanation. Student militants seem oblivious to the evil in themselves, the evil that lurks in all of us. In threatening people with guns, physically attacking opponents, we have a manifestation of moral certitude—the certitude of the Inquisition. They're going to save mankind even if they have to kill mankind to do it. But this violence can neither solve nor dramatize social problems. This violence becomes its own drama and its own problem.

We have the picture, the causes, now what can we do?

WHAT CAN WE DO?

First of all let's dismiss the notion that we can stop this violence by suspending Federal benefits to students and schools. Such punishment is both unjust and unwise. Unjust because, unlike the quality of mercy, it does not fall upon the rich and poor alike and unwise because it usurps the local police power. The rich violators lose nothing, the poor everything. Our greatest protection against tyranny, our decentralized police and judicial system, should not be tampered with.

Campus violence is still violence. Students want and shall have freedom, but with freedom comes responsibility—the same responsibility the rest of us have—to answer to the local police. But many administrators behave like buffalo being shot standing by inertly with dazed eyes as one by one they are slaughtered. Some administrators assert that the university must be open to the free exchange of ideas. If carrying a weapon or seizing a building is an exchange of ideas, then rape is just a social event and a holdup is merely a financial transaction.

Calling in the police only helps us mop up the floor. We still have to patch up the leak. Today's problems of teaching, curriculum, custodial rule, Vietnam, racism can be solved, but more problems will arise tomorrow and more unrest and more violence will follow unless we get to the root of the problem—the absence of a functioning community, the absence of a forum for the voice of students, faculty, administration, and even parents and alumni. We need an arena large enough to accommodate all interested participants. The frustration of non-participation hurts more than the burden of an anachronistic administrative rule. Extremists gather student support not because of errors in college life, but because of lack of community. The extremist fills this void like a dictator in an underdeveloped country.

This same lack of community on the campus is a reflection of the lack of community in the country. Our sense of identity, our place, our status in the community has not changed with the conditions of our lives. Yesterday we established identity by achieving success in our community, today many of us travel to succeed.

We have wandered from local status to institutional status. But we have not acquired a sense of social responsibility adaptable to this new mobility. The college professor is not part of his campus, only part of his discipline. The doctor not part of his city, but part of his profession. The technician not part of his town but a part of his trade. We have cities like Washington, D.C. where no one is responsible because everyone is from somewhere else. We must develop a new social code for this new mobility. A social code depending upon conditions rather than fixtures.

Our problems are not caused by the machinations of a few evil men; our problems are caused by the loss of control of our society by its citizens.

THE NEED FOR COMMUNITY

How can we create this new community? We must restructure our institutions, our schools, our factories, our churches, our governments, to allow for pluralism, diversity of opinion—self-contained forums for expression of ideas, if you will.

The sheer size and complexity of everything due to simple, uncomplicated, unevil facts like increased population has left most of us with a sense of powerlessness. Powerlessness which can only be overcome by responsibility—which means effort, which means commitment, which means sacrifice. With his automobile the affluent American escapes not only the city but his citizenship.

The poverty program was an experiment in this kind of responsibility. The poor were brought into the community, into the decision making process and the rebellion of vested government interests is evidence of this program's success. A decentralizing of power understandably irks those at the center of power.

We must choose whether the astrodome or democracy will control our destiny.

We need a renewed and expanded community spirit, a new social contract, a new relationship between man and society.

HON. HENRY S. REUSS PROPOSES SOLUTIONS TO INFLATION

HON. CLEMENT J. ZABLOCKI

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 8, 1969

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Speaker, as national concern has mounted over the failure of the Federal Government to curtail the momentum of inflation, my distinguished colleague from Milwaukee, the Honorable HENRY S. REUSS, has gained increasing attention nationally for his critical views of the monetary problems.

Complying with the Milwaukee Journal's request for his analysis of current economic problems and possible solutions, he prepared a concise and cohesive article which was published in the Sunday, May 4, 1969, edition of the Journal. The report, based as it is on his extensive experience on the House Banking and Currency Committee, the Government Operations Committee, and the Joint Economic Committee, deserves the attention of my colleagues.

More importantly, I urge careful consideration of the solutions which Congressman REUSS proposes for putting a stop to the spiral of inflation. His criticism of the current half-hearted attempts to stop inflation should be weighed carefully and the alternative solutions he proposes should be implemented without delay. The article follows:

[From the Milwaukee Journal, May 4, 1969]

WHY WE'RE LOSING "INFLATION WAR"

(By Representative HENRY S. REUSS)

WASHINGTON, D.C.—We are now undergoing the worst inflation since 1951—a more than 5% increase in the consumer price index in the last year and a more than 3% increase in the wholesale price index.

And we are failing to take adequate steps to bring it under control.

The main ingredients in the administration's "war against inflation" are these:

Continuation of the surtax after next June 30 for another year, at 10% until January, 1970, and at 5% until the following June; repeal of the 7% investment tax credit.

Spending cuts, distinguished by their modesty on the defense side of the budget.

Moderately tight money. The federal reserve so far this year has been creating money at approximately the rate of 2% a year—just about what the joint economic committee has recommended. Though it recently raised bank reserve requirements, the potential restrictiveness of this move will be at least partially vitiated by a somewhat more expansive open market purchase of securities by "the fed" (indeed, unless the fed does negate some of the effect of its increased reserve requirements by added open market purchases, it could well throw us into a recession).

SURTAX INEFFECTIVE

This "war against inflation" is being fought in a healfhearted manner.

We have had the surtax since last summer, and it has not markedly chilled consumer expenditures. Consumers have dipped into their savings rather than cut their spending.

The meat ax approach to budget cutting has been tried in certain areas of domestic spending, but has been found wanting as an effective way of curbing inflation. Inflationary government spending increases are concentrated heavily in a very few areas—defense, space, public works. These are the areas where substantial cuts should have been made.

Indeed, present methods are not only unlikely markedly to reduce inflation, but judging by the administration's admissions before the joint economic committee earlier this year, they may also produce up to 500,000 new unemployed by the end of this year who would have had jobs but for the slowdown of growth which is the aim of the program.

With our manufacturing establishment currently operating at only 84% of its plant capacity, it is shortsighted economics to contemplate throwing away half a million jobs. What we should be doing is to expand our manpower training programs so that job opportunities and trained manpower can be matched.

If we look at the consumer price index and the wholesale price index, we see at least five major inflationary pressure spots:

Defense spending. This is the greatest single inflationary factor—greatest not only in its enormous amount, but also in that it produces no useful good which can be used to sop up the purchasing power created by the act of producing defense goods. Our space program and costly projects like the supersonic transport have also made their contribution.

Business equipment spending. While the wholesale price index is up 9% in the last 10 years, the indices which most closely reflect business capital equipment spending are up by a much greater amount. Metals are up by 13%, machinery and equipment by 17%. These two are at the top of the wholesale index list primarily because of the government induced inflationary boom in capital equipment spending by business, as a result of the continued 7% investment tax credit. Business capital expenditures could reach a total of some $73 billion this year, up a whopping 14% over last year's record breaking total. The credit should be promptly repealed, as the administration has now wisely requested.

Home mortgage interest rates. The consumer price index has gone up overall by 23% since 1959. Expenses of homeownership, however, have gone up by 34%. And this is largely because of soaring interest rates, now at their highest level in 100 years. Interest rates for homeownership, in turn, are as high as they are largely because of the extraordinary siphoning off of the nation's credit resources to excess business investment, particularly in the defense industries. Repeal of the 7% investment tax credit should help somewhat to relieve the demand for credit and the resulting high interest rates.

Medical care. This is now 49% above what it cost 10 years ago. Here we are now reaping the whirlwind of shortages in the health professions and of growing pressure on hospital facilities. What will break the medical care log jam is belatedly to provide expanded schools for medical and other health professionals. At the same time, tax law changes might indirectly help to ease pressure on hospital facilities. A broadened and increased deduction for health insurance where it includes health care would encourage insurers to offer, and consumers to subscribe to, policies which present alternatives to hospitalization.

Lumber. Prices of lumber and lumber products have skyrocketed, particularly in the last year. At the same time, profits in the lumber industry have increased by almost 100%. Basically, this is the result of poor national planning in recent years: Our timber resources and cuts are simply not adequate for both present domestic and foreign consumption. Short term remedies include increasing allowable cuts without jeopardizing sound forestry practices, and temporarily reducing the level of our lumber exports. Housing and Urban Development Secretary Romney recently appealed to the lumber industry to exercise restraint in its price increases. The appeal is not likely to have much effect in the absence of wage-price guideposts.

WHAT CAN BE DONE?

What can be done to make the "war against inflation" real, with some chance of success? We should:

1. Adopt a positive goal of ending inflation. The council of economic advisers is apparently prepared to accept another 3.5% price increase this year. This attitude is too complacent, for a price increase of these dimensions not only damages the retired and others on relatively fixed incomes, but robs millions of workers of the purchasing power of their wages, and everyone of the value of his savings.

2. Achieve an adequate surplus by cutting military expenditures. Actions on expenditures and taxes this year must be guided by the overriding necessity to achieve a significant budget surplus. The administration has now completed a budget cutting exercise looking to a surplus of $5.8 billion in fiscal year 1970. But it is a surplus obtained by cutting too much from productivity increasing domestic programs, and far too little from military and military related programs.

The domestic sector has been cut back $2.9 billion, including $1.2 billion from health, education, and welfare alone, and cuts in job training, housing, urban transport, and environmental protection programs.

This 2.5% reduction in civilian outlays compares with a cut of only 1.3% for the Pentagon—$1.1 billion out of the enormous $80 billion defense budget. And most of that cut is in money for bombs and artillery shells for Vietnam, leaving the Pentagon free to come back next January for another supplemental appropriation. Still included in the budget are expensive new weapons systems—such as the $8 billion advanced manned strategic aircraft, the $6–$7 billion Safeguard ABM, and the controversial F–111 fighter-bomber.

TRINITY RIVER BOON

Programs in space and public works, also areas of inflationary government expenditures, have also been generously dealt with. The national aeronautics and space administration has been granted an increase of $86 million in fiscal 1970 to help finance seven more moon landings than originally planned. Reductions in public works spending have been achieved not by cancelling costly projects, but by deferring contract awards for projects not yet started or in early stages.

And in the budget can be found funds for the $1 billion army corps of engineers' project to make an ocean port of Fort Worth, Tex., by deepening the Trinity river. Experts assert that it would be less costly to move Fort Worth bodily 400 miles down to the sea.

3. Reinvigorate the wage-price guideposts. Almost every country of western Europe uses a wage-price guidepost procedure to focus public attention on wage and price increases which are likely to lead to inflation when they exceed improvements in productivity. The United States used the wage-price guidepost technique effectively during the period 1960–1965, when inflation was avoided. The administration, by rejecting the wage-price guideline system, has unilaterally disarmed itself in the battle to moderate price rises in such industries as steel and lumber.

4. Plug tax loopholes. Loopholes which should be promptly plugged because they are directly inflationary include the 7% investment tax credit, which contributes both to inflation in the capital equipment industry and to the inflationary overdemand on scarce credit supplies; the hobby farms loophole, which bids up the price of farmland; and the accelerated depreciation provision, which causes speculative price rises in urban real estate.

LOOPHOLES REMAIN

Loopholes whose inflationary impact is less direct—the 27.5% oil depletion allowance, capital gains provisions, tax exempt state and local securities, for example—should likewise be closed. They deprive the government of needed revenue, and they lead low and moderate income payers to ask—justifiably—why they should pay higher taxes while others fail to pay their fair share.

The administration's tax reform package rightly contains a call for repeal of the 7% investment tax credit. But in other respects the package is deceptive and relatively empty.

Affluent individual loophole enjoyers will be charged a small "user's fee" for enjoying some loopholes; they will have license to flock to other loopholes not subject to the fee; and corporations won't have to pay a fee at all.

New loopholes, to be known as "tax incentives" for businesses investing in poverty areas, are promised, and if accepted, will remove further areas from congressional annual budgetary control. Most important, major loopholes, such as the oil depletion allowance, are left untouched.

5. Lower interest rates. This is not a recommendation that the federal reserve system bring interest rates down by creating new money at an excessive rate. Instead, interest rate increases should be moderated by removing from the demand side of the credit equation the swollen demand for business equipment and military goods. Lower interest rates will help three elements of the economy that are in trouble—the home building industry, state and local government, and small business.

Thus one comes to the reluctant conclusion that the administration's choice of anti-inflationary weapons is just not going to do the job. Indeed, a war that begins by postulating a 3.5% rate of inflation this year concedes defeat before it starts.

Both parties are at fault for our inflation. It was the Democrats who allowed wage-price guideposts to atrophy, who enacted the investment tax credit, who let tax loopholes go unplugged for years, who enormously increased military spending.

What is needed now is a bipartisan and all-out attack on inflation. If we can stop it, there will be credit enough for all.

CAMPUS RACE RIOTS

HON. CHARLES H. WILSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 8, 1969

Mr. CHARLES H. WILSON. Mr. Speaker, the lead headline in the New York Times this morning read: "City College of New York Shut Down, Then Racial Clash Injures Seven Whites." Last week stories appeared relating similar occurrences at C.C.N.Y.'s sister school, Queens College, where 1,000 whites rousted 200 blacks from campus. To make matters more unfortunate, New York City, for better or for worse, often is correctly viewed by the rest of the country as a barometer of things to come. For this reason I feel duty bound to speak out today on this issue of national concern.

What potentially could have been a grand alliance between blacks and whites, an alliance that could have reunited our Nation through the bonds of working toward a common goal, an alliance that could have recaptured the spirit that our Nation had when Andy Goodman, James Chaney, and Mickey Schwerner gave their lives as brothers in a cause, this potential of black and white youth peacefully, constructively, intelligently working for change appears to be lost. Instead we are faced with the horrible specter of backlash by a traditional black ally, the white student, and with apartheid, by a traditional denouncer of segregation, the Afro-American university member.

Emotions are beginning to boil over throughout the land and rational thought is being replaced by visceral reactions. The time is now conducive to demagoguery as well as to overreaction. It is also for these reasons that I speak out today.

We must not let all that we have worked for in the past be swept away in a tide of emotional bitterness and vent our frustrations by ramming through get-tough legislation that would harm academic freedom and limit personal liberty for years to come. While our university administrators must act with alacrity and conviction and the rights of the majority must be protected, let us beware of playing into the hands of both the SDS radical and the black separatist militant. Those people desire a total polarization to occur, a polarization between the youth of our Nation and its Government, between blacks and whites. And it is exactly this polarization that we must avoid if our Nation is to remain free, strong, and united.

While we must keep our universities open, while we must continue to act to correct the inequities that unfortunately abound throughout our Nation, while we must protect life and property from attack, we must also not forget to abide by the principles that have sustained our Nation since its inception. We must not let the ends justify the means, for in the crises with which we are now faced, the means shall largely determine the validity of the ends. Let us pray that reason and sanity shall prevail and that the wounds that our Nation has suffered will be sutured with a surgeon's skill rather than be torn wider apart with a butcher's strength. Let us avoid the temptation to overreact.

MENTAL HEALTH GROUPS OWN MESSIANIC COMPLEX

HON. JOHN R. RARICK

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 8, 1969

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, the Commission on Mental Health of Children—a group composed of 13 national organizations of psychologists, educators, sociologists, psychiatrists, labor, and the like are proposing future legislation to establish a nationwide network of child development councils to serve as "direct advocate for the children and youth."

The Commission apparently feels that with legal protection and enough taxpayers money, they can cure all of the ills and problems of society and in addition make provisions for the youth to "participate in activities now available only to adults."

I include a news clipping from the Evening Star for May 5, 1969, a clipping from This Week for April 20, and a clipping from the Evening Star of May 7, as follows.

[From the Washington (D.C.) Evening Star, May 5, 1969]

BROAD NATIONAL SETUP URGED TO AID CHILDREN

(By Judith Randal)

BAL HARBOUR, FLA.—The Joint Commission on Mental Health of Children has recommended that the present fragmented collection of services and institutions for children be placed under a coordinating umbrella through a nationwide network of Child Development Council.

It would be partially funded by the federal government, but operate on the state, local and neighborhood level.

The council would function through state child development agencies which in turn would have ties to the federal government. Considerable latitude for local variation and innovation would be built into the plan.

The recommendation and its specific proposals have been three years in the making by the commission, a group of 13 national organizations of psychologists, educators, sociologists, psychiatrists, labor and the like interested in the welfare of children.

The proposals will be submitted to Congress as the basis for future legislation, probably within the next six weeks.

At a news conference today at the annual meeting of the American psychiatric Association here, representatives of the joint commission said implementation of the plan would result in a council to serve as "direct advocate for children and youth."

They indicated they were hopeful on getting action on the proposal because President Nixon has said children from one to five years old should get priority attention from the nation.

"We are," said Dr. J. Cotter Hirschberg, who directs the Child Psychiatry Program of the Menninger Clinic in Topeka, "really talking about a health program. . . . The Commission could not separate health from mental health especially in the early stages of child development. This was highlighted by the hunger hearings, where testimony pointed out that without proper nutrition the nervous system is damaged."

There are, said Hirschberg, about four million children in this country less than 14 years old who need psychiatric care and a half million of these are severely disabled. The total costs of mental illness in this group are about $20 billion annually. This doesn't take into account the costs of loss of productivity in later life, which are at least twice as great. "We've always known more medically than we've been able to do. We must now begin to reverse this trend."

Dr. Reginald Lourie, chief of psychiatry at the Children's Hospital in Washington, said the services now available for children are uncoordinated with the result that they compete rather than cooperate. What is needed, he indicated, is a system that provides continuity and followup care.

Many of the problems of the city, such as juvenile delinquency, racial violence and high school dropouts, have the roots in the first three years of life when the child forms an image of himself, he said. If they are not corrected then, the damage must be undone later, he said.

"It will become necessary for child rearing and child services to become one of the largest industries in this country if we are to do it right."

The Child Development Council he and his colleagues advocate would encompass a variety of services ranging from day care centers and physical and mental health care to legal and welfare support and a range of training and educational opportunities for both children and their families. Particularly important would be provision for youth to participate in activities now available only to adults.

[From This Week magazine, Apr. 20, 1969]

UNREST STUDIED

The National Institute of Mental Health has awarded a $114,000 grant for the study of unrest on college campuses. The money will cover the first year of efforts by The American Council on Education to obtain data from 300 institutions on such questions as: What is the actual frequency and extent of student demonstrations? What accounts for individual differences in the forms the protests take? What role does the size or kind of college have on student behavior?

In addition, more detailed case study and interview material from 30 of the sample colleges will be collected and analyzed. Dr. Alexander W. Astin, the Council's Director of Research, will head the study which will be made with the assistance of 12 distinguished scientists and educators.

[From the Washington (D.C.) Evening Star, May 7, 1969]

MENTAL CARE PLAN WORKS, UAW REPORTS

BAL HARBOUR, FLA.—When 1.1 million Michigan members of the United Auto Workers and their families became eligible to have out-patient psychiatric care covered by their health insurance, fewer than 7,000 took advantage of it, and only 7 percent of these received the maximum $400 yearly benefit, a union spokesman reports.

Speaking at the American Psychiatric Association meeting here yesterday, Melvin A. Glasser of the UAW's Social Security Department said this experience suggests that coverage of mental health services on an outpatient basis is "economically viable" both for blue collar workers and the middle class.

Under the novel plan, Glasser said, the usual deductible or co-payment by the patient is eliminated for the first five visits. From the 6th through the 10th treatment sessions, the patient pays 15 percent of the bill and for the 11th through the 15th sessions, 30 percent. After that, he must pay 45 percent of the bill.

Statisticians for the American Psychiatric Association estimate that of the 100 million Americans covered by some sort of health insurance plan, only about 1.5 million have any financial protection against the costs of outpatient mental health care. Yet about 2 million visit psychiatrists each year for an average of five visits at $30 an hour—the "usual and customary" fee.

The UAW experience has shown, Glasser said, that the problems of blue collar workers and their families are no different from those of the middle class. Children who do poorly in school, marital discord, alcoholism and depression—particularly among women—are the most usual complaints. And less than 20 percent of the patients need to be hospitalized for out-and-out psychoses, he said.

All in all, he said, the fear that insurance benefits for outpatient mental health care will lead to abuse of the coverage appears to be unjustified.

Indeed, because the benefits are most heavily used by people under 30, the utilization may prevent the development of serious mental illness which would be more costly in the long run.

SOCIAL SECURITY BENEFITS MUST BE INCREASED NOW

HON. WILLIAM F. RYAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 8, 1969

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Speaker, as is the case in so many other of our national needs, the performance of both the executive branch and Congress with respect to urgently needed increases in social security benefits is falling far short of the promises which were made during the campaign last fall. President Nixon has already recommended that social security increases proposed by President Johnson be cut back from 10 percent to 7 percent in order to achieve a budgetary saving. He has retained the proposed increase in social security taxes, however.

Now the chairman of the House Ways and Means Committee (Mr. MILLS), has indicated that he does not plan to take up social security legislation until next year. The effect of such a postponment will be that the millions of elderly citizens struggling to meet their needs in the act of the very inflation which President Nixon has cited as the No. 1 priority of his administration will have to make do for another year on the meager and grossly inadequate benefits which the law now provides.

If budget cuts must be made in order to curb inflation, surely the burden ought not to fall on programs which are the only source of income for most older Americans. To deny them the increases they urgently need even while the purchasing power of their present income is being eroded by inflation is to add still more burdens to the plight of those dependent on fixed incomes.

Mr. Speaker, it is essential that social security legislation be dealt with by the Ways and Means Committee this year. Similarly, the recommendation of the Nixon administration to reduce the proposed increases to 7 percent must be rejected. The inadequacies of social security payments and the need to tie the benefits to the cost of living must be considered immediately to ease the strain and inequity which inflation in our economy is already inflicting on the Nation's elderly citizens.

I include at this point in the RECORD an editorial from today's New York Times which underscores the necessity of Congress acting on social security legislation during the current session of the 91st Congress:

RETREAT ON SOCIAL SECURITY

In a time of inflation, the worst victims are elderly persons living on pensions. The economy may be booming to new highs, but their income does not change. Recognizing the painful bit higher prices take out of their limited purchasing power, both parties last year promised to tie Social Security payments to the cost of living. Like all such escalator provisions, this proposal has the disadvantage of tending to aggravate the inflation it is designed to offset. But it is unfair for a Government that is failing to hold the value of the dollar steady to deny relief to those hardest hit by rising prices.

Since the election, both parties have been steadily retreating from this pledge. Officials of the new Administration dismissed an escalator clause as too expensive. President Nixon cut back the increase of Social Security benefits recommended by President Johnson from 10 per cent to 7 per cent to save a billion dollars in the budget, but he retained the proposed increase in Social Security taxes.

Representative Wilbur Mills, the chairman of the Democratic-controlled House Ways and Means Committee, has now gone the President one better. He reportedly plans to put off any action on Social Security for a year. Delay would move an increase close to the 1970 election when recipients are presumably supposed to storm the polls in gratitude. But what about the elderly poor scrimping along for the next eleven to fifteen months? Their plight demands a much quicker response.

The ostensible reason for delay is that welfare legislation, specifically affecting the Aid to Families With Dependent Children program, is traditionally considered along with changes in Social Security. But there is no necessary or inherent connnection between the two. Indeed, it is only a legislative accident that welfare programs are under the jurisdiction of the Ways and Means Committee. Whenever the Nixon Administration has a basic reform of the welfare program to offer—an overhaul we hope will come soon—that reform ought to be considered on its own merits. Meanwhile, the failure to provide Social Security pensioners with an immediate and substantial increase is callous and unjustifiable.

POSTAL EMPLOYEES PROTEST

HON. GLENN M. ANDERSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 8, 1969

Mr. ANDERSON of California. Mr. Speaker, several days ago the National Postal Union held a rally in Washington with 2,500 members to protest the small 4.1-percent wage increase proposed by the Nixon administration for postal employees.

Although I was unable to attend the rally, I want to express my support to the postal workers that 4.1 percent is not enough. This small increase does not even cover the increase in 1 year's cost of living.

It is about time that we give postal employees true wage comparability as Congress has promised in 1962, 1967, and again this year. Starting salaries of postal employees are in some cases today substantially less than those earned by bus drivers, policemen, and firemen in many of our major metropolitan areas.

My bill, H.R. 9703, would give postal employees a one-step increase in their level which would take care of any increase in the cost of living and still give postal workers a substantial increase in their salary.

We must pay postal employees wages comparable with private industry; token salary increases such as 4.1 percent are totally unsatisfactory. Postal employees are just as affected by inflation, taxes, and cost-of-living increases as anyone else. They must be paid accordingly to reflect these adjustments in our economy. They must be paid a decent wage which will permit them to live with the same comforts enjoyed by their friends and neighbors in comparable non-Government jobs.

Mr. Speaker, I agree with the National Postal Union and postal employees across the country in saying "Nuts to 4.1 percent." They deserve better than that.

RUMANIAN INDEPENDENCE DAY

HON. CLEMENT J. ZABLOCKI

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 8, 1969

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Speaker, it is our honor today to commemorate the Rumanian Independence Day, May 10. Actually, we celebrate three great events in the history of the Rumanian nation on this anniversary.

First, after a long struggle on the part of the Rumanian people to acquire the right to choose their own sovereign, the Rumanian monarchy was founded on May 10, 1866. On May 10, 1877, a segment of the Rumanian people which had been under the domination of the Turkish Ottoman Empire declared their independence. Four years later, on May 10, 1881, the Rumanian nation became a full-fledged state of Europe, the Kingdom of Rumania.

These events reflect the vigorous independence of the Rumanian people. Courageously and with indomitable spirit they have endured repeated conquest and rule by foreign powers.

Today, though still under Soviet domination and with a Communist regime, Rumania is determinedly embarking on a semi-independent course, opening its doors to the West.

In responding to these initiatives, the United States has indicated our continued friendship with the Rumanian people by increased trade and diplomatic contacts.

Regretfully, the Rumanian people have yet to benefit from this liberalization of Rumanian foreign policy. However, it is expected that increased contact with the West will eventually lead to greater personal freedom within Rumania.

Thus, as we turn our thoughts toward the Rumanian homeland of the past and present, we earnestly hope for even greater liberalization of Rumania's foreign policy, and greater improvement in the living conditions and standards for the Rumanian people. As a freedom-loving people, they will not be kept in bondage.

It is our further hope that Rumania's leaders will realize that the future progress and development of their nation depends in large part on their providing significant liberties and an opportunity for free cooperation and expression to the Rumanian people.

JOB CORPS

HON. WILLIAM A. STEIGER

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 8, 1969

Mr. STEIGER of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, Secretary Shultz appeared before the Committee on Education and Labor this morning to set the record straight on Job Corps.

The Secretary's statement is clear and concise, and I commend it to my colleagues for their information:

STATEMENT BY THE HONORABLE GEORGE P. SHULTZ, SECRETARY OF LABOR, BEFORE COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION AND LABOR, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, MAY 8, 1969

Mr. Chairman, I am here at your request to discuss further with you developments with respect to the Job Corps.

Earlier I described our analysis of the Job Corps, its strengths, and its weaknesses. I described how we felt the Job Corps should be tied in more closely with the Nation's total manpower training effort and recast to better serve our youth.

In implementing the Department of Labor's plan for restructuring the Job Corps, our immediate concern is developing constructive alternatives for those corpsmembers in centers which are being closed. I would like to review briefly with you the procedures to achieve this objective and to discuss some of the preliminary results. The procedures have been formulated by OEO and the Department of Labor and have been carried out on a collaborative basis wherever possible.

1. Job Corps counselors ascertain from the enrollees at closing centers their desires about continuing in the Job Corps. Arrangements are then made to transfer the corpsmen to centers that will remain and to continue their particular training program.

2. Any corpsmember who does not wish to move to another Center is interviewed by Employment Service counselors assigned to the centers. The counselors explain to the corpsmember the manpower training programs work opportunities available. In many cases, the corpsmember's home is in a State considerably removed from the Job Corps Center and it is more sensible to make referrals to manpower programs on a local basis. The enrollee is referred to the local employment office in his home town and that office makes arrangements for appropriate training. The fact that the corpsman must go to the local Employment Service office to pick up his last pay check increases greatly the likelihood that an initial contact will be made with the Job Corps man who has chosen to return to his home community.

3. An enrollee may want some time before deciding what he wants to do. The counselors arrange by telephone to assign the enrollee to a special assessment program located in the trainees hometown. This special assessment program will last from two to four weeks during which time the enrollee will receive a very intensive counseling and placement analysis by the local office.

The special assessment program will include a stipend for the ex-corpsmember so he will be adequately supported while awaiting proper placement in a training opportunity or an appropriate job. The stipends will be equivalent to the MDTA allowance payments made in each State and may be paid to ex-Job Corpsmembers for up to a 4-week period, although it is expected that this period will not be needed in most cases. Payments will vary from $25 to $51 per week depending upon the State.

4. Following the period of assessment, the former Job Corpsman will be given the opportunity to enter a training program adapted to his needs and interests. Special placement efforts will be made to effectively place the trainee in either an institutional MDTA training program, an OJT program, a JOBS (JOBS–NAB) or other appropriate training opportunities.

We are following a deliberate process in the interviewing and referral of the Corpsmen to ensure that they will be able to make a decision based on the best possible information. For this reason we set aside funds to enable the Employment Service to do a better job of assessment and to provide an immediate financial incentive for the enrollees to remain in contact with the Employment Service in the event that he choses to leave the Corps.

Department of Labor representatives along with Job Corps officials, are following the phase-out of the designated centers closely in order to handle reassignments of corpsmembers as effectively as we can. Since the Department of Labor announced its plan, the following developments have occurred.

As of April 11 when the center closure announcement was made, according to Job Corps data, there were 16,300 enrollees in the centers to be closed. As of the end of April, there were 11,600 in these centers, a net reduction of 4,700.

In the past three weeks, 2,200 enrollees have been transferred to other centers; 300 have graduated; 1,400 have elected to accept other manpower training and been referred to the Employment Service; and 800 have dropped out. Efforts will, of course, be made to locate these young people and make provision for their enrollment in training.

Of the 11,600 remaining in the centers, 2,800 are scheduled to be moved to other centers. 4,000 have elected placement in other manpower programs and, of this number, 1,300 have been scheduled for assessment and programming referral. The remaining 2,700 are in the process of being counseled by the Employment Service at the centers. Another 4,800 have indicated they wish to remain in Job Corps but have not yet been scheduled for transfer.

Considering normal attrition, existing vacancies, and expansion of capacity by 10 percent, the centers to be left open will accommodate almost 8,000 individuals, slightly more than the 7,600 now in centers to be closed that want to remain in Job Corps but have not yet been scheduled for transfer. Indeed, we will probably recommend the renewal of the Job Corps recruiting in July to maintain the Corps at its revised capacity.

Other manpower programs will have ample vacancies to take care of those corps members electing to transfer to them rather than remain in the Job Corps. A State-by-State tabulation for the period May through July showed the following projected openings:

NAB–JOBS	20,400
MDTA institutional	14,200
OJT	24,200
CEP	2,800
Non-CEP New Careers	500
Total	62,100

While these shifts have been carried out, active steps have been taken to maintain or extend particular components of the Job Corps that have been effective and which are consistent with the new program design. Discussions have been held with representatives of the AFL–CIO to formulate plans to gain trade union involvement at a large number of urban and conservation centers. We intend to maintain the current Women in Community Service program as a supportive activity, and negotiations are underway to continue the Policy Academy and Rentor programs currently at Camp Kilmer. By retaining these programs, and integrating them with other manpower efforts administered by the Department it is expected that both will be strengthened.

The second area of concern involves the new residential manpower training centers. Before I discuss our plans, however, I would like to clear up some apparent misunderstandings about the role to be played by the new centers.

These centers were not proposed in the context of immediate availability to take care of the young people now at Job Corps centers which will be closed. The opening of the new centers and the closing down of some old centers are two entirely different operations. The young people at centers to be closed will be given alternative opportunities within the framework of the plan previously described. The new centers to be opened are part of an effort to use Job Corps resources in a more meaningful fashion, but will not necessarily involve individuals now in the Job Corps.

The new centers are designed to use the residential idea to meet the needs that existing Job Corps centers do not accommodate and to improve operating concepts where necessary. The new centers will provide a residential training facility for urban youth who need this kind of service but who are not willing to leave their home area. One of the most critical weaknesses of the Job Corps has been its high dropout rate. The new centers are designed to correct this problem by having the residential facility near their homes, families, and friends to mitigate the normal feeling of loneliness and homesickness young boys or girls may feel when they are in unfamiliar surroundings. The new centers will be closely tied in with the employers and institutions in the local labor market where the youths will seek work after completion of their Job Corps training. The new centers themselves will be expected to work more directly in the placement process than could be possible when they are far removed from the source of employment opportunities for their enrollees.

The 30 new centers we plan would have a capacity of about 4,600 enrollees. Half of them would be small, residential support facilities. These small centers, however, will contain about 8 percent of the enrollees in the new centers. The other 15 centers would be larger, containing up to 350 enrollees. As I indicated in my testimony two weeks ago, we plan to establish a number of different kinds of centers to meet the varying needs of young people in as flexible and imaginative a manner as possible.

Some centers will be co-educational.

Some will be for young unmarried mothers and could include, or be linked to, child care services.

Some will be in the city itself; others will be near enough to permit easy week-end commuting home.

The program design of the new centers is such that some cost savings can be expected. But a desire for cost reduction was not the prime consideration in the establishment of the new centers; we sought primarily improvement in the quality and relevance of the program.

Cost savings can be expected in the new centers as compared with the old in recruitment, placement, and enrollee travel expenses and in the use of available community supportive facilities.

Our time schedule for the establishment of the new centers includes the following steps:

1. There are a number of proposals that are already in the process of submission to either OEO or labor for residential skill centers similar to what we contemplate. The cities involved are Phoenix, Rochester, Nashville, Chicago, and Atlanta. A field visit has already been made to Phoenix. Rochester will be visited this week and the other visits are scheduled shortly thereafter. Some of these centers and some potential sponsors are revising their proposals in light of the Department's concepts of the new centers. It is anticipated that centers in some of these cities will be funded this fiscal year and be in operation in mid or late summer.

The present Job Corps centers that may be suitable for use as part of the new program include some facilities at Kilmer, Clinton, St. Louis, Huntington-Ashland, and Koko Head. Our people are already assessing these centers and it is likely that those found suitable for a new center will be among the first funded within the framework of the Residential Manpower Center program.

2. We are in the process of obtaining the recommendations of our Regional Manpower Administrators concerning the type of center most suitable for the cities under consideration as sites for the new centers. In addition, we are developing comprehensive guidelines for the new centers for purposes of specific proposals. We expect to have proposals developed for most of the centers by July. We expect that as many as half of the proposed centers can be funded this summer with the remainder funded by fall.

Each center's timetable will necessarily have a start-up and gradual build-up time to permit necessary preparation of the facility, staff selection and training, development of specific local ties for supportive services where appropriate and a reasonable progression time from initial enrollment to capacity enrollment. By late winter or early Spring, most, if not all, of the new centers should be fully operational.

The final point—it is important to mention today—concerns the disposition of the centers to be closed. Obviously, the personal property and equipment can be used in the remaining centers and the new centers to be opened. As I mentioned, there is a possibility that the facilities at some centers to be closed may be converted to use under the revised concept.

We are exploring carefully the possibilities for the productive use of the other centers by State or local governmental bodies.

An inter-agency committee has been established of all of the agencies involved, the Bureau of the Budget, Agriculture, Interior, Labor, OEO, and GSA. The committee is meeting today. It will very shortly develop a list of center facilities that will be available for disposition to public bodies and a schedule or priorities for alternative use. This material will be widely circulated in the areas where the closed centers are located and proposals invited. In the meantime, proposals have been received and they will all be considered on their individual merits.

The process of reshaping the Job Corps has not been without difficulty. Any change is unsettling. As I indicated to you last week, we are retaining those aspects of the Job Corps that have merit, and changing those that we believe have been found wanting. We are doing this as expeditiously as possible to avoid a long and lingering uncertainty about the fate of particular centers as uncertainties are particularly unsettling to Corps enrollees. We believe the residential component is an important element of the Nation's manpower training program and, with your help and cooperation, we will make the residential service a more meaningful and rewarding experience for those it serves.

THREE FROM STATE DIE IN VIETNAM

HON. CLARENCE D. LONG

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 8, 1969

Mr. LONG of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, Pfc. Wayne A. Stevens, Capt. John R. Tine, and S. Sgt. James R. Dorsey, three fine young men from Maryland, were killed recently in Vietnam. I wish to commend their courage and to honor their memory by including the following article in the RECORD:

THREE FROM STATE DIE IN VIETNAM

A Marine private first class and two Army men from Maryland have been killed in combat in Vietnam, the Defense Department announced yesterday.

The dead are:

Marine Pfc. Wayne A. Stevens, 20, of College Park, Md., who was killed May 1 in a fire fight.

Capt. John R. Tine, 26, of Silver Spring, who was killed May 1 in action near the Cambodian border.

Staff Sgt. James R. Dorsey, Jr., of Brandywine, Prince Georges county, who had earlier been reported as missing in action.

Captain Tine was stationed near the Cambodian border at Cao Lanh where he was with an advisory team attached to a South Vietnamese Army unit.

"He was our only son but we are just as proud of him as we could be," his mother, Mrs. Joe V. Tine said yesterday. "He was dedicated to his duty, and he refused two leaves in Korea and Vietnam because he felt he was needed."

He entered the Army as a recruit in 1965 and rose to the rank of captain last year.

After earning his second lieutenant's bar at the artillery school at Fort Sill, Okla., he served for a year in Korea.

He returned to the United States in August, 1967, and was assigned as a training officer at Fort Gordon in Augusta, Ga.

Captain Tine was trained as an expert in Vietnamese affairs before he was sent to the war zone last December.

A native of Washington, Mr. Tine spent his early youth in Silver Spring. He was a graduate of Randolph-Macon Academy, Front Royal, Va., and attended Chowan College, in Murfreesboro, N.C. and Salisbury State College.

Besides his mother and father, Captain Tine is survived by his wife, the former Judith Aber.

Private Stevens was an artillery soldier with the 3d Marine Division stationed at An Hoa near Da Nang. He died of a gunshot wound of the chest.

A native of Salem, Ohio, Private Stevens grew up to have one consuming passion in life: Music.

PLAYED 5 INSTRUMENTS

According to his mother, Mrs. Harold F. Stevens, of College Park, Private Stevens began playing the trombone at the age 8, and quickly broadened his range of instruments to include the piano, violin, viola and trumpet.

His true love was the trombone, an instrument he played at high school and at the University of Arkansas where he played for the Marching Razorbacks.

Private Stevens attended schools in California and Arkansas before being graduated from High Point Senior High School in Beltsville, Md., in 1966.

IN COLLEGE BAND

He attended the University of Arkansas as well as Sonoma State College in California before enlisting in the Marines in December, 1967. He had been in Vietnam eight months.

Besides his mother and father Private Stevens is survived by a brother, Roger Paul Stevens, at home; his paternal grandparents, Mr. and Mrs. Floyd Stevens, of New Richmond, Ohio; and his maternal grandparents, Mrs. Elzora Jones, of Columbus, Ohio, and Idris Jones of Van Wert, Ohio.

Sergeant Dorsey, 22, was reported missing April 26, but was later found to have been killed in combat.

SERVED IN KOREA

Born in Clements, in St. Marys county, Sergeant Dorsey attended the local public schools before joining the Army at the age of 18.

He served in Korea and the United States before being sent to Vietnam last January.

Sergeant Dorsey is survived by his wife, the former Elizabeth Proctor, of Brandywine; his father, James R. Dorsey, Sr., of Clements; four sisters and three brothers.

THE JOB CORPS

HON. JOEL T. BROYHILL

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 8, 1969

Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, from the hue and cry that went up with the announcement that some of the Job Corps centers will be closed, one might assume that these centers deserve nothing but praise and a blank check to continue to spend taxpayers money. No matter how poorly managed or ineffective they have been proven to be, the proponents of Great Society waste programs seem to be advocating the continuance of the programs on the basis that they just conceivably might be doing somebody a little good. But are they?

I think not, Mr. Speaker. I should like to call the attention of my colleagues and all who read this RECORD to the frightening experience of one Job Corpsman, as related by his uncle. This is not an isolated case, Mr. Speaker. It represents more the rule than the exception. Certainly we in Congress would be derelict in our duties if we permitted Job Corps centers such as this to continue to operate as breeding ground for crime and corruption.

The young man's experience at the Breckinridge Job Corps Center reads as follows:

If the conditions that are allowed to exist at the Breckinridge Job Corps Center—Morganfield, Kentucky is any example of what is going on at other Job Corps Centers—then I say its time to close down each and every one of these Job Corps Centers now.

The conditions that now exist at the Breckinridge Job Corps Center are deplorable—my nephew was a Job Corpsman at this center for about a month—only long enough for him to make arrangements to get out.

I charge here and now that at the Breckinridge Job Corps Center the few white youth who are in the Job Corps there live in fear of being beaten up by the great majority of negro youth. Not only are the few white youth in the Corps there have to fear of being beaten up but also there is the fear of being homosexually attacked by negro Job Corpsmen.

My nephew states that on March 26th—Wednesday Night—that a group of Negro Job Corpsmen beat up the few white Job Corpsmen in his dormitory or barracks.

My nephew enlisted in the Job Corps February 3, 1969—that is he made application—he was officially accepted March 3, 1969. My nephew enlisted in the Job Corps because he thought it was a good thing—he thought it would teach a young fellow something he could be proud of—but all my nephew found out after he arrived at the Job Corps Center from what he heard and from what he seen was the conclusion that the Job Corps was not what it was cut out to be.

While my nephew was going to the Breckinridge Job Corps Center a negro Job Corps recruit picked up his suitcase sitting on the platform of the Greyhound Bus Terminal—Washington, D.C. The negro Job Corpsman was shouting "hey man" "I got myself a suitcase"—"hey man" "I got myself a suitcase". My nephew did not realize that this was his suitcase that the negro Job Corpsman recruit had picked up off the Greyhound Bus Terminal platform . . . when my nephew arrived at the Breckinridge Job Corps Center he found his suitcase in the back of the Greyhound Bus—it had been broken into. . . .

The first week that my nephew was at the Breckenridge Job Corps Center he states that there were fights in his temporary dormitory just about every night. First the fights were mostly between the Negro Job Corps recruits—then the Negro Job Corps recruits started jumping on the white Job Corps recruits.

While my nephew was attending a training class at the Job Corps Center "Breckinridge"—his gloves were taken away from him by a Negro Job Corpsman and he never got them back. The white youth dared not report such incidents as this because of fear of being beaten up.

All Job Corps recruits when they come into the center are required to turn in all weapons and no questions asked . . . now I ask you gentlemen what type of boys are they (Job Corps) recruiting? You would think these boys are just starting time in a reformatory (an institution to which young law offenders are sent for training and discipline)!

My nephew states that during the time he was at the Breckinridge Job Corps Center a white youth in his dormitory—age twenty—home Pennsylvania—had a younger brother also in the Job Corps next to his dormitory—the younger brother was sixteen—he too was from Pennsylvania. My nephew states that this sixteen year old white lad was attacked homosexually by a group of Negro Job Corpsmen and was later taken to the Breckinridge Hospital where fifteen stitches were required in his behind (rectum). Now gentlemen: I ask you—do we have clean cut boys at the Job Corps Center or do we have a bunch of wild animals like the Job Corpsmen that attacked this helpless boy?

I ask you gentlemen of the U.S. House of Representatives and you gentlemen of the U.S. Senate to forget political motivations and forget whether or not a Job Corps Center in your state constitutes a "Pork Barrel" and think of the health and welfare of our youth that are in the Job Corps Centers. Is it a good idea to throw 30% of Job Corps recruits that do not have criminal records in with 70% of Job Corps recruits that do have criminal records . . . I think not!!! I would have never allowed my nephew to enlist in the Job Corps if I had of known at the time that 70% of Job Corps applicants have criminal records of some type or other.

If the Job Corps original purpose was to train and discipline young law offenders—this I think was a mistake—in the first place this is the job of our reform schools!!

My niece and her husband and myself—all three drove up to Breckinridge Job Corps Center the evening of Friday March 28th—we drove all night Friday and most of the day Saturday 29th, 69.

We arrived at Breckinridge Job Corps Center Saturday evening around 4:30 p.m.—my nephew called my niece the night of the 27th which was Thursday and requested that we come to Breckinridge Job Corps Center to get him out that things were getting worse—that he was living in fear of being beat up by the Negro Job Corpsmen. He requested that we come to the Breckinridge Job Corps Center to get him in person due to the fact that if they (Negro Job Corpsmen) heard that he was going to leave that he had heard that they would give you a "blanket party" (they put a blanket over your head and beat the living daylights out of you) that is my nephew talking and how he would express the situation because he is a clean cut boy but what it really boils down to "they beat the hell out of you"—"they kick you" "they beat you" . . . I signed the papers to release my nephew from the Breckinridge Job Corps Center Saturday March 29, 1969 . . . On April 5th I had an opportunity to talk with two brothers from Lynchburg, Va.—both brothers were in the Job Corps—one was at Breckinridge for five months and he too told me of an instance where another young Job Corpsman was tied to a bed and homosexually attacked by a group of wild animals (Job Corpsmen that would do a thing of this sort). The other brother was at a Job Corps Center in Michigan he stated that things were so bad that he left and hitch hiked home.

The brother that was at Breckinridge also stated that while he was there they found a white Job Corpsman in his bunk with a knife in his back. Also he stated you had to watch your money on pay day—roving groups would take it away from you. He said also "don't drop your soap in the shower" if you do you leave yourself wide open for an attack!

CLEVELAND PLAIN DEALER SERIES ON SPECIAL TAX RULINGS

HON. CHARLES A. VANIK

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 8, 1969

Mr. VANIK. Mr. Speaker, Mr. Sanford Watzman of the Cleveland Plain Dealer has written an excellent three-part series on special tax rulings by the Treasury Department which I thought might be of interest to the House during this time in which the Ways and Means Committee and the country are so absorbed with tax reform. The articles are as follows:

REGULATION GIVES HANNA ORE FIRM TAX BREAK IN MILLIONS

(By Sanford Watzman)

(NOTE.—To uncover the story behind an innocuous-looking regulation, The Plain Dealer went beyond the public record. Sanford Watzman of The Plain Dealer's Washington Bureau had only the regulation to start with, plus two comments filed by objectors who did not realize what was going on.

(More of the story was dug out, bit by bit, from confidential news sources. Watzman found that many government employes, taxpayers themselves, were allies of the public in the "tax revolt" that is sweeping the country.)

WASHINGTON.—Under a "special" government regulation, in one of the largest cases ever to turn on a single issue, a subsidiary of the Hanna Mining Co. of Cleveland has been allowed to avoid payment of $10 million to $20 million in federal taxes.

Hanna's offspring, the Iron Ore Co. of Canada (IOC), got the opening it wanted in the closing days of the Johnson administration. A regulation tailored for IOC was put on the books, resulting in a tax return of zero money owed.

As a decree applying across the board, helping any company with a case that fits, the regulation does not name any corporation. It was drafted in such a way, however, as to make it unlikely that any other company could benefit.

The break came for Hanna after the case had been pending seven years. In its fight with the Internal Revenue Service, Hanna lost every round. But higher authorities speeded action at the end to lift Hanna's hand in victory.

It was not the edict itself that raised eyebrows in the IRS building and produced critical remarks there. Rather, it was the way it was written and the procedure followed.

As to the merits of the case, the few who know the facts acknowledged that IOC, the Hanna subsidiary, had good legal arguments which could have swayed a court. But the regulation spared IOC the necessity of going to court, or of paying up.

A Hanna spokesman asserted in an interview with The Plain Dealer that the Treasury Department action had saved IOC $10 million. An authoritative rival figure computed for this reporter was $20 million.

Other estimates by tax specialists not as close to the case range higher.

The top official identified as being involved—although he denied an active role—was former treasury secretary Henry H. Fowler. IRS is a part of the Treasury Department.

In addition to taking its case to Fowler, Hanna enlisted the aid of the Canadian government, which interceded for the company.

The other principals were Stanley S. Surrey, then assistant secretary of the treasury for tax policy, and Sheldon S. Cohen, IRS commissioner until the Nixon administration.

It was Surrey who ordered his staff to write the pro-Hanna regulation. He took this action after the chief counsel of IRS refused three times to grant relief to the company, and after Cohen declined twice to issue a favorable ruling.

Surrey himself rejected Hanna's argument the first time the case was presented to him. In the end, both he and Cohen signed the regulation that laid the issue to rest. It was approved by them on Jan. 9, 1969—11 days before they left office.

The issue was IOC's eligibility to pay its taxes in a special way—by filing what is known as a consolidated return. It did file such a return in 1959 and 1960 with the IRS district director in Cleveland.

The return treated IOC and its own wholly owned subsidiary, the Quebec, North Shore and Labrador Railway Co., as a single taxpaying entity.

The railroad runs from Seven Islands, a Canadian port on the St. Lawrence seaway, to the ore fields at Knob Lake, some 350 miles to the north.

Starting in 1960, and without interruption since then, the railroad has been paying dividends to its parent corporation.

In 1960 these payments totaled $34.4 million. In addition, IOC that year realized a gain of $12.1 million from the sale of rolling stock to the railroad.

If a consolidated return were in order, these items could be eliminated from IOC's taxable income—meaning that IOC could retain the earnings tax-free.

The problem that arose was whether the railroad could be treated for tax purposes as a domestic (U.S.) corporation, although it had been chartered in Canada.

If it were held to be a strictly foreign entity, it could not be included in a consolidated tax return with IOC, which was incorporated in Delaware in 1949.

In that event, the gains realized by IOC would be considered income and held taxable by the United States.

Section 1504 (D) of the U.S. Internal Revenue code assigns domestic status to foreign subsidiaries of an American company—providing that the subsidiary was organized because the laws of the host country do not permit an American corporation to operate within its borders.

This section of the code dates to the revenue act of 1928. While it applies to Canada as well as Mexico, it was put in the code because of problems that arose over American business operations in Mexico.

When the consolidated return was filed, IRS officials in Cleveland questioned it. They argued that Canadian law does not bar American companies from Canada. It would follow, then, that the foreign railroad could not qualify as a domestic (U.S.) corporation.

IOC countered that, while there was no explicit prohibition in Canadian law, there was an implicit government policy—backed by historical precedent—which had the same effect.

Cleveland officials asked IRS headquarters here for a ruling. In September 1961, IRS sent out an agent from its office of international operations to examine the returns.

The fight—with its many long counts—had begun.

Meantime, IOC continued to file consolidated returns for subsequent years pending a final decision. Railroad payments to IOC kept rolling in, reaching a total of $136.3 million by the end of 1968.

Despite these earnings, IOC did not pay a penny in taxes to the United States in those years. Company officials assert that tax liability was wiped out by foreign tax credits and other special allowances.

The dispute has been over the 1960 return. Apparently, a challenge for the other years was not in the cards, even had IOC been forced to back down from a consolidated return.

By now, the company has built up a surplus credit of $30 million on taxes paid to Canada. This money is deductible, dollar for dollar, on returns filed with IRS. The credit has run through the 1960s, leaving the surplus available for the future.

When Cohen denied a favorable ruling to IOC, all possibilities of relief from IRS itself had been exhausted. Only the IRS commissioner—and no higher authority—has the power to issue a tax ruling.

But one more avenue remained open to Hanna as an alternative to going to court. It led beyond IRS to the Treasury Department, which shares responsibility with IRS for tax regulations.

Ordinarily, regulations are drafted or changed only after Congress amends an old law or enacts a new one. The regulations interpret the law, giving guidance on how it is to be applied.

There is a difference between an IRS commissioner's ruling and a regulation. A ruling resolves a particular case. A regulation—like a law—lays down a broad policy.

A complicated procedure has evolved for promulgating new regulations. Usually, it starts with a "proposed rule making"—an initial draft.

This is published in the Federal Register as a public document. Interested parties are given an opportunity to comment on the proposal, after which a public hearing may be held. Then the regulation is republished in final form.

For a regulation to become effective, it must be signed by two persons—the assistant secretary for tax policy and the IRS commissioner. A refusal by either one to sign kills the proposal.

What had set the stage for the Hanna controversy was the fact that the then existing regulation, based on section 1504 (D), did little more than restate the law. This opened both law and regulation to varying interpretations.

So far as Cohen and his staff were concerned, the law was clear. But the company felt IRS was being unfair and rigid in its rendering of the statute.

Surrey's order that a new and expanded regulation be written was carried out by publication of his proposal in the Register on Nov. 2, 1968, just before the presidential election.

As a statement of general policy, the prospective new regulation turned out to be surprisingly specific.

It said: "the term 'laws of such country' (Canada and Mexico includes . . . in addition to explicit statutory or constitutional provisions, any existing legislative practice or policy."

Then the specific language followed, with the regulation offering an example of a situation that might arise. This lengthy sentence, virtually a recitation of IOC's case, except that IOC's name was omitted, reads:

"For example, if the laws of Canada (SIC—not Mexico) permit the ownership or operation of specified property, such as a railroad (SIC), only by a person granted a special legislative authorization, and it is established that there is an implicit (SIC) legislative policy that such authorization would be granted only to a corporation organized under the laws of such country, then a corporation organized under the laws of Canada to own or operate such property will be considered maintained solely for the purpose of complying with the laws of such country . . ."

In addition to the precise wording of the example, two other aspects of the regulation proved interesting. Both had the effect of narrowing the circle of companies that might be helped by the edict, perhaps eliminating all other corporations.

One of these features was that the regulation is retroactive, applying only to the tax years before 1966. The second was that certain qualifying tests were retained without change.

Retroactivity stemmed from the fact that IRS has two sets of regulations in the consolidated return area, one applying to the pre-1966 period and the other to the years following. The reason is that regulations in this field slowly are being revised, as part of a general undertaking.

To make the Hanna regulation apply to the present and future, as well as the past, it would have been necessary to repeat the new proposal in the post-1965 regulations.

The fact that this was not done prevents any company from using the regulation today, even if it should find that for any year after 1965 its situation was similar to that of IOC.

The Plain Dealer was told that an amendment to the current regulations was also intended. However, this action was postponed in the rush to complete paperwork on the pre-1966 regulation. That was the explanation given.

The restrictive provision retained when the pre-1966 regulation was amended says:

"The option treats a foreign corporation as a domestic corporation so that it may be included in a consolidated return * * * must be exercised at the time of making the consolidated return, and cannot be exercised at any time thereafter."

Hanna met this test because, as related earlier, it had begun in 1959 to file consolidated returns on behalf of IOC and the railroad.

The next sentence in this section holds that, once a consolidated return is filed, the filing must be repeated "each consecutive year thereafter." Hanna also met this test.

Because there was no loosening of these provisions any company seeking relief under the new regulation would have to show it had done exactly what IOC did—that is produce a record of consistent filing of consolidated returns.

When the proposed regulation was made public, two parties availed themselves of the opportunity to comment. But their objections missed the point. Clearly, the authors were not aware of the real reason for the new regulation.

One comment was submitted by the American Bar Association on behalf of members of its committee on foreign tax problems. The second came from Chicago lawyers for the U.S. Gypsum Co.

The bar appeared puzzled. Its members observed that the decree "appears to apply only to taxable years commencing before Jan. 1, 1966."

U.S. Gypsum—and the bar members to a lesser extent—were particularly concerned about what impact the edict might have on American organizations doing business in Mexico.

Robert M. Gunn, attorney for U.S. Gypsum told The Plain Dealer about a conversation he had had with Stanley Weiss, who was drafting the regulation for Surrey.

"We felt that a Gypsum mine might properly be cited as an example, in the same way that a Canadian railroad was," Gunn recalled.

He added: "but our main problem was that we wanted to be sure that the same regulation would be made applicable for the years after 1965."

Gunn said to this reporter: "as you have probably gathered, there was a lot of urgency about this regulation and a great desire to get it closed out in January."

"How do you account for that? Do you think it had anything to do with the impending change of administrations here?" Gunn was asked.

"Your interpretation of that would be as good as mine. Why don't you check with Weiss? For my part, I was assured the matter would be taken care of later, and I saw no harm in waiting."

Weiss has since left the government. Reached at his law office here, he was asked what the rush was about.

"Well, this issue had been pending a long time, and there were tons of paper on it," Weiss replied. "Cohen and Surrey had already decided it, and they felt it ought to be disposed of before they left."

In spite of the comments by the bar association and U.S. Gypsum counsel, the proposed regulation was adopted without changes. No public hearing was held.

After Cohen and Surrey signed, notice of their action was published in the Federal Register on Jan. 15, 1969—five days before the Johnson administration was replaced by the new Republican team.

More than three months later, there still has been no publication of a proposal to repeat the edict in the current consolidated return regulations.

Treasury officials told The Plain Dealer this would be done. But other work, they said, has priority.

SURREY SAW TREND GROWING: EX-TREASURY AIDE HIT TAX BREAKS

(By Sanford Watzman)

WASHINGTON.—"The refuge of the wealthy has been in the brains of their tax lawyers and in the technicalities of the tax law."

Author of that sentence is Stanley S. Surrey, who wrote an essay for the May, 1957, Harvard Law Review entitled: "Congress and the Tax Lobbyist—How Special Tax Provisions Get Enacted."

Surrey's focus then was on Congress. But as the assistant Treasury secretary for tax policy, Surrey exercized quasi-legislative powers himself, as in the Iron Ore Co. of Canada case.

In his 1957 article, Surrey wrote:

"These provisions run counter to our notions of tax fairness. Moreover, the tendency of Congress to act this way seems to be increasing."

He cited the so-called "Louis B. Mayer Amendment," named for the movie mogul.

"It is generally assumed that the amendment at the time covered only two persons, Mayer, retired vice president of Loew's Inc., and one other executive in the company, and that it saved Mayer about $2 million in taxes."

Surrey continued:

"The question, 'Who speaks for tax equity and tax fairness?' " is answered today largely in terms of only the Treasury Department. If that department fails to respond, then tax fairness has no champion before the Congress.

"The Treasury, representing the executive branch, stands in the open before the Congress virtually alone as the champion of tax fairness. The main reason is obvious.

"When the issue is a special provision for one group as against the taxpaying public as a whole, what pressure group is there to speak for the public?

"Other legislation—labor laws, natural gas prices, farm legislation—brings forth strong and opposing pressure groups. But what pressure group fights against capital-gain treatment for employe stock options? Which group sees itself harmed by a 'Mayer Amendment'?

"In sum, there are no private pressure groups actively defending the integrity of the tax structure . . .

"Perhaps the most significant aspect of the consideration of special tax provisions by the Congress is that it usually takes place without any awareness of these events by the general public.

"Almost entirely, these matters lie outside of the public's gaze, outside of the voter's knowledge. The special provisions which are enacted lie protected in the mysterious complex statutory jargon of the tax law.

"This technical curtain is impenetrable to the newspapers and other information media. The public hears of debate over tax reduction or tax increase and it may learn something about the general rate structure.

"But it seldom learns that the high rates have no applicability to much of the income of certain wealthy groups. Nor does it understand how this special taxpayer or that special group is relieved of a good part of its tax burden.

"All of these matters are largely fought out behind this technical curtain. Hence the congressman favoring these special provisions has for the most part no accounting to make to the voters for his action.

"The task of educating and informing the public is formidable. To begin with, the educators are a very limited group. Most of them are in the executive branch, and hence perhaps the prime responsibility should fall on them. But in recent years that department has shown little disposition to inform the public about tax problems.

"Some of the prospective educators are in the universities. But academic knowledge and learned writing are not the keys to public education of this nature—more writing at the public-information level is clearly needed . . .

"It would seem proper for the Congress to require that all retroactive tax proposals limited in application to one person or to a small group be presented as private-relief bills to be considered by the tax committees (of Congress).

"The bills would name the individuals concerned and specify the amounts involved.

"Nor is there any reason why the 'Louis B. Mayer Amendment' should not have been handled as a 'Bill for the relief of Louis B. Mayer' and the amount of the relief stated in a precise dollar figure . . .

"It is only later that the extent of the tax generosity inherent in (special) provisions is comprehended.

"But by then they are in the law, the problem of the group benefited is one of defense rather than attack, and the strategic advantages are all with that group."

LAWYERS WORK ON CURTAIN THAT SCREENS TAX DECISIONS

(By Sanford Watzman)

WASHINGTON.—The "technical curtain" that obscures many big tax decisions sometimes baffles even the experts.

Government lawyers trained to write technical rules and corporate lawyers paid to interpret them spend a great deal of time speculating about why a rule was written, thereby hoping to learn more about it.

One such case involves a set of regulations published last July 3 in the Federal Register, spread across four pages and taking up 12 columns of type.

The rules tell affiliated companies how to account for earnings and profits exchanged within the group. They sanction intercorporate payments compensating one company for the "use" of its tax loss by another.

But some insiders theorize the real purpose of the regulations—or at least an impelling ancillary purpose—was to bail out certain companies from problems they were having with other units of government.

Fanning the gossip is the fact that the regulations apparently will not substantially increase or decrease the amount of taxes the government collects. Yet the Treasury Department spent three years working on them.

They were approved by Stanley S. Surrey, former assistant secretary of the Treasury for tax policy, and Sheldon S. Cohen, commissioner of the Internal Revenue Service (IRS) in the Johnson administration.

Commenting last April on a draft of the regulations, an anonymous member of the American Bar Association's section of taxation protested that they were "impossibly complex," so much so that there was no way to anticipate the possible effects.

"The problems in determining earnings and profits are difficult enough," he objected, "without adding complications which probably have relatively narrow application and probably little impact on the federal revenue."

The comment was filed with IRS.

The same theme figured in a sharp argument some months ago between Surrey and Cohen, part of which took place in the presence of their subordinates. As the exchange grew more heated, everyone else was ordered to leave the room—and then it resumed.

Cohen confirmed the incident when this reporter questioned him about it. Surrey said he did not recall it specifically, but he did not deny it.

Cohen told Surrey he was not going to sign the regulations because they did not have sufficient tax significance. Surrey replied he had already "committed" himself to issue the rules. Cohen retorted the commitment, then, was Surrey's, not his.

But in the end, Cohen did sign. He told this reporter: "I guess that's one that I caved in on."

Sen. Everett M. Dirksen, R-Ill., was interested in getting the regulations adopted, The Plain Dealer learned. In 1965 the GOP leader was defeated in an attempt to obtain legislation similar in many respects to the later regulations.

News reports at the time linked Dirksen with some gas pipeline companies who reasoned that, if certain bookkeeping methods were blessed by IRS, then a case for higher rates could be made before the Federal Power Commission.

But so far as utility rates today are concerned, a recent Supreme Court decision involving the United Gas Pipeline Co. appears to have wiped out any benefits the utilities might have received from the regulations, one source pointed out.

In addition to Dirksen, representatives of the Mobil Oil Corp. pushed hard for adoption of the rules. The Mobile people tried to get Cohen to issue a commissioners' ruling that would permit them to do what the regulations later allowed.

When Cohen balked, they took their case to Surrey. Instead of a ruling, they got the regulations.

One report was Mobil wanted the rules so it could squeeze out from under an antitrust decree that had been handed down by a federal court in 1941, in a lawsuit involving a predecessor of Mobil and many other corporations.

This decree imposed limits on dividends that could be exchanged among members of an affiliated group of companies. The prohibition could be undermined, one source suggested to The Plain Dealer, if a trading of funds could be labeled a payment for the "use" of a tax loss, rather than a dividend.

George F. James, senior vice president of Mobile, acknowledged in a telephone interview that his company worked hard to get the regulations promulgated. He added that other corporations were similarly active.

But he denied the rules could help his company in antitrust litigation.

James said: "We simply had to have it made clear, for our own internal purposes, what was the correct method of allocating, on our books, the charges among companies in our consolidated group.

"This doesn't save us any tax money at all. The only tax advantage it would have for us would come, possibly, if we deconsolidated the corporate group or if we sold off one of the companies. However, we have no plans to do this."

When the rules were first proposed, IRS announced it was not that agency's intention to try via the regulations to influence the policies or requirements of other government agencies dealing with corporations.

However, everyone concedes that what IRS intends is one thing but how lawyers might choose to stretch it or take advantage of it, if they can, is quite another.

Writing in the Journal of Taxation in July, 1968, one authority, Arnold Jay Cohen, observed:

"The implications of these rules may go far beyond their tax aspects. It may well be that . . . their main impact will not be in the tax area, but rather in the corporate or regulatory area."

Surrey was asked about this by The Plain Dealer. He replied:

"The purpose of these regulations was to accept methods of accounting that accountants say are proper. So long as the method is right and IRS is protected, the Treasury ought to recognize it.

"No, it wouldn't concern me if someone says that the regulations might have meaning in antitrust or rate-making cases. What we do often spreads to other area. That isn't relevant so long as we are right and IRS isn't hurt by it."

Asked about the "commitment" he had cited to Cohen, Surrey said: "At various times bills were introduced in Congress dealing with the area of these regulations. In my judgment, those bills were too generous.

"I told the Senate Finance Committee we would study the matter and try to work something out administratively. I don't think it's a good idea to clutter up the legislative

books and to have people running to Congress if it's something we can handle here.

"If I used the word 'commitment,' it was in that sense. I wasn't under any pressure from Sen. Dirksen or anyone else. I don't work that way."

"Some of the news stories in 1965 reported that you were backing Sen. Dirksen's legislation," the interviewer said.

"Well, some of those stories were correct and some were not, because there were a lot of versions of the legislation," Surrey replied. "It would depend on which version the stories were referring to."

INTERSTATE TAXATION ACT

HON. PETER W. RODINO, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 8, 1969

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, as chairman of the Special Subcommittee on State Taxation of Interstate Commerce, I am aware of the great interest in my bill, H.R. 7906, the proposed Interstate Taxation Act, which has been ordered reported favorably by our subcommittee on May 7, 1969.

In this regard, I want to call to the attention of my colleagues an excellent law review article written by the distinguished chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary, Representative EMANUEL CELLER. The article appeared in the March 1968 issue of the Fordham Law Review. In analyzing both the political and economic ramifications of State taxes imposed on interstate commerce, Chairman CELLER has made a major contribution to the literature on this important subject.

Chairman CELLER's article was published during the 90th Congress prior to consideration by the House of H.R. 2158—a bill which was identical to H.R. 7906. This measure eventually passed the House on May 22, 1968, by a vote of 284 to 89.

I would like to include this article as a part of my remarks in the RECORD today.

The article follows:

THE DEVELOPMENT OF A CONGRESSIONAL PROGRAM DEALING WITH STATE TAXATION OF INTERSTATE COMMERCE

(By EMANUEL CELLER*)

I. BACKGROUND

Prominent on the list of great legacies which modern America received from the original framers of the Constitution is the principle of a national common market. It is this principle—the principle of the Commerce Clause—that has bound our states together in the economic union which is so essential to their political union. At the same time, this principle has also played a major role in the phenomenal development of our American economy. Yet, essential as the common market principle has been for both our political and economic development, the very nature of our federal system has precluded us from attaining a completely open market and necessitated that some proper balance be struck between the need for the free movement of goods and persons across state lines and the need of the states for revenue.

From the enactment of the Constitution until 1959 the entire responsibility for reconciling conflicts between the tax policies of the states and the national interest in the free flow of commerce was shouldered by the courts. Congress itself enacted no statutes to give the courts guidance. As a result, a vast body of decisional law provided the only standards for determining whether any particular state or local levy was violative of the national principle of free trade among the states. However, most of the cases which arose were so diversified and of such peculiarly local significance that they did not generate strong political interest on a national level.

While Congress remained silent, significant trends developed which resulted in a balkanization of the economy. As each state reached farther and farther beyond its own borders to tax more and more companies the burdens on the courts became unmanageable, and it became clear that the judicial branch of the government was inadequate to balance state revenue requirements with the national need for an open market. Indeed, the Supreme Court itself came to recognize its own inadequacy in this area. Thus, in recent years several members of the Court with such diverse philosophies as Justice Jackson,[1] Rutledge,[2] Black,[3] Frankfurter,[4] Douglas,[5] and Clark[6] have all subscribed to this view and have either directly or implicitly called upon Congress to act.

Essentially, the inadequacy of the judicial process to accommodate both the competing demands of the states for revenues and the national need for a free flow of commerce is an inherent one. It arises from the fact that the Court can deal only with individual cases and is substantially handicapped by its inability to explore fully the national impact of a broad conglomeration of levies imposed on interstate companies by all fifty states and literally thousands of local governments. The late Justice Frankfurter has described these built-in limitations of the Court in the following terms:

"At best, this Court can only act negatively; it can determine whether a specific state tax is imposed in violation of the Commerce Clause. Such decisions must necessarily depend on the application of rough and ready legal concepts. We cannot make a detailed inquiry into the incidence of diverse economic burdens in order to determine the extent to which such burdens conflict with the necessities of national economic life. Neither can we devise appropriate standards for dividing up national revenue on the basis of more or less abstract principles of constitutional law, which cannot be responsive to the subleties of the interrelated economies of Nation and State.

"The problem calls for solution by devising a congressional policy. Congress alone can provide for a full and thorough canvassing of the multitudinous and intricate factors which compose the problem of the taxing freedom of the States and the needed limits on such state taxing power.[7]

Faced with its own inherent limitations, the Court generally maintained a permissive attitude toward state levies on interstate commerce[8]—often declining in the absence of federal legislation to invalidate state revenue measures.[9] Encouraged by the Court's permissive posture, the state tax administrators asserted broader and broader jurisdictional claims over interstate commerce, so that by 1959 it was clear that Congress would have to act if the rapidly growing trend toward a balkanized domestic economy were to be reversed. In that year, in two companion cases, *Northwestern States Portland Cement Co.* v. *Minnesota* and *Williams* v. *Stockham Valves & Fittings, Inc.*,[10] the Supreme Court decided that in the absence of federal legislation a company could be required to pay a state income tax, even though it was engaged *exclusively* in interstate commerce in the taxing state. Prior to this decision the view had been widely held by the business community that a company could not be taxed by a state unless it engaged at least to some extent in *intrastate* commerce within the taxing state.[11]

The reaction of the business community to the *Northwestern* decision was extremely sharp. Small and moderate-size businesses in particular became gravely concerned with the prospect of having to comply with diverse, complex and overlapping income tax laws which would be beyond their capacity to handle. Not only was the business community fearful of future liabilities, but it was also confronted with the specter of assessment for countless numbers of back years as well. Having failed to file tax returns in the past in the belief that no liability had existed, generally they could not rely on statutes of limitations to bar assessments. In the *Northwestern* case, for example, the taxpayer was held liable for back taxes covering a period of some sixteen years. Under all of these circumstances, the business community regarded it as imperative for Congress to act.[12]

The reaction by Congress to the *Northwestern* decision was swift. Within weeks after the decision, hearings were held by the Senate Select Committee on Small Business.[13] Meanwhile, both the House Judiciary Committee[14] and the Senate Finance Committee[15] reported out bills designed to provide "stopgap" relief while Congress could develop a more comprehensive program based on more detailed information. The outgrowth of the bills was Public Law 86-272,[16] which became effective in September of 1959.

Public Law 86-272 had a two-fold significance. First, the statute precluded a state or subdivision from imposing an income tax in situations in which the company's only activities in the state were limited to the solicitations of orders by salesmen or the making of sales through independent contractors. Second, both the House and the Senate viewed the statute as a temporary measure designed to prevent a further expansion of the jurisdictional reach of the states, pending the completion of a thorough study of state income taxes—which was considered necessary to achieve a permanent solution.[17]

Although Public Law 86-272 was limited in scope so as to apply only to income taxes, it soon became clear to the Congress that other forms of taxes were likewise having a profound impact on interstate commerce. Several months after the enactment of Public Law 86-272, the Supreme Court held in *Scripto, Inc. v. Carson*[18] that an out-of-state seller could be required to collect a use tax on shipments to in-state purchasers even though the seller maintained no facilities in the taxing state and its sales were made entirely through independent contractors. This decision raised apprehensions in the business communities similar to those which had been raised by the *Northwestern* decision concerning income taxes. Indeed, the ramifications of *Scripto* are so broad that even those who tend to support the views of the state tax collectors regard it as a "stunning extraterritorial extension of a State's reach."[19]

Following *Scripto*, bills were introduced in both the House and Senate which would have extended the jurisdictional protection of Public Law 86-272 into the sales and use tax area and would also have broadened the Congressional study so as to include sales and use taxes. Deeply concerned with the broad impact of *Scripto*, but reluctant to restrict state taxing powers without a thorough study, the 87th Congress enacted legislation which was limited to broadening the scope of the study called for by Public Law 86-272. However, out of an awareness of the interrelated effects of a variety of taxes, Congress expanded the study to include not only sales and use taxes but "all matters pertaining to the taxation of interstate commerce. . . ."[20]

Footnotes at end of article.

II. THE CONGRESSIONAL STUDY AND THE DEFECTS IT DISCLOSED IN THE PRESENT SYSTEM

Pursuant to Public Law 86-272, as amended, a comprehensive study was initiated early in 1961 by a Special Subcommittee of the House Judiciary Committee under the chairmanship of Representative Edwin E. Willis of Louisiana. Since Congress had expressed its intention to act only on the basis of clearly documented facts, the primary objective of the study, as stated by Representative Willis, was "to develop a body of factual information, hitherto unavailable, as to the number and characteristics of interstate companies, the pattern of their activities across State lines, the cost of complying with State and local tax laws, the degree to which they were able to comply, and the effect on businesses and State revenues of various possible remedial proposals." [21]

The study conducted by the Special Subcommittee on State Taxation of Interstate Commerce was one of the most exhaustive ever undertaken within the Congress, and occupies a total of four volumes published over a four and one half year period.[22] It has by now become the definitive work in its field and has provided a wealth of reliable data of value not only to the Congress but also to state legislators, lawyers, accountants and students of local and state fiscal problems.

Since the study was extremely comprehensive—covering major aspects of the tax structures of all fifty states and several hundred local governments—one cannot summarize it briefly without losing sight of the extraordinary complexity of the current levies on interstate commerce. Yet it is useful for purposes of this analysis to point out that the study revealed at least four major defects in the present system.

First, the study revealed that the system is characterized by widespread non-compliance and non-enforcement—with most companies simply not filing any form of tax return in any state in which they do not actually maintain a place of business.[23] For example, in the income tax area it was found that in 97.5 per cent of the cases in which liability existed in the absence of a place of business, no return was in fact filed.[24] In the sales tax area there was non-compliance in 93.5 per cent of the cases under similar circumstances.[25] At the same time, those companies which do in fact file tax returns were found not to be complying accurately with state and local rules. As a result, it is clear that the system creates gross inequities among similarly situated taxpayers and leaves the tax administrator free to exercise an extremely broad amount of discretion to determine just which taxpayers will be subject to rigorous enforcement. In addition, it is also clear that the business community does not have the capacity to comply without incurring grossly excessive compliance costs.

The second defect documented by the congressional study is the tendency of the present system to result in overtaxation in some cases and undertaxation in other cases.[26] In the income tax area, for example, it is possible for some companies to be taxable on more than 100 percent of their net earnings, while other similarly situated companies pay a tax on substantially less than 100 percent.[27]

A third defect of the current system results from the existence of some provisions in state laws which give to locally based companies benefits which are not made available to competitors who are based outside of the taxing state.[28] In the sales and use tax area, for example, some states discriminate against consumers who trade in automobiles that are purchased outside of the taxing state.[29] Still other states tax products which are produced outside of the state, while granting exemptions for identical products manufactured within the state.[30]

Footnotes at end of article.

The fourth major defect of the present system is the attitude which it has generated among taxpayers, especially small and moderate-size companies. Faced with rules that are inherently unworkable and cannot possibly be enforced by the state tax administrators on a systematic basis, taxpayers generally have developed a widespread resistance to the assumption of responsibility. Rather than file return under circumstances in which the cost of preparing the return often exceeds the tax, it is understandable that the small company especially will simply disregard state and local requirements. Thus the system itself not only breeds a widespread disrespect for state and local tax laws, it also tends to foster disrespect for laws in general.[31]

III. THE PROPOSED INTERSTATE TAXATION ACT

Based on the study conducted by the Subcommittee, as well as on three months of extensive hearings held subsequent to the completion of the study,[32] the House Judiciary Committee reported out a proposed Interstate Taxation Act in the form of H.R. 16491 on September 7, 1966. Since the 89th Congress adjourned shortly thereafter, consideration by the House was not possible, and the proposal was reintroduced in the 90th Congress in the form of H.R. 2158. On March 7, 1967, the House Judiciary Committee again reported the measure favorably, together with several amendments which reflected a number of suggestions for improvements made largely by State tax administrators.[33] In July of 1967, H.R. 2158 was reported by the Committee on Rules. Although it was not scheduled for debate by the House of Representatives in the first session of the 90th Congress, its sponsors are hopeful that it will be considered during the second session.

The core of H.R. 2158 is found in Title 1 of the bill, which establishes uniform jurisdictional standards for each of the four types of taxes which were included in the congressional study: corporate income taxes, capital stock taxes, sales and use taxes, and gross receipts taxes. Under these standards a company would not be subject to the jurisdiction of any state in which it does not maintain a "business location," which is defined to include: the owning or leasing of real estate, the maintenance of a localized employee, or the regular maintenance of a stock of tangible personal property for sale in the ordinary course of business.

To the basic jurisdictional standard there are two significant exceptions. One exception occurs in the sales and use tax area in the form of a provision which makes an out-of-state seller liable for the collection of a tax if he regularly makes household deliveries in the state. The other exception to the basic "business location" standard occurs in the income and capital stock tax areas, and involves the exclusion from the jurisdictional rule of those corporations which have an annual net income in excess of one million dollars.

Title 2 of H.R. 2158 provides a supplement to the jurisdictional standard in the form of a limit on the percentage of income or capital which can be taxed in those cases in which a company does have a business location in more than one state. Under Title 2, the maximum percentage of income or capital which is taxable is determined by a two-factor formula based on property and wages.

Title 3 of the bill addreses itself to some specific problems in the sales and use tax area. It provides for, *inter alia*, the location of sales for tax purposes, the granting of credits for prior taxes, exemptions for the household goods of persons who establish new residences, the exclusion of interstate freight charges from the measure of the tax, and the relief from collection requirements in the case of sales to persons who are already registered under the sales tax program of the jurisdiction imposing the tax.

Title 4 provides for continued congressional scrutiny of the problems left unresolved by the bill. It affords the states an additional four years to make progress in resolving such problems before congressional committees are called to make specific proposals.

Title 5 contains definitional provisions. In addition, it prohibits states and localities from giving favored tax treatment to local companies or local products under sales and use taxes or gross receipts taxes. It also prohibits the states from charging a taxpayer with the cost of conducting an audit—a practice which is fairly common on the part of states such as Florida, which sends auditors throughout the entire United States and assesses the taxpayer with the travel and living expenses of the roving auditor.[34]

IV. THE JURISDICTIONAL BALANCE STRUCK BY H.R. 2158

Since the jurisdictional provisions in Title 1 provide the basic framework around which the entire proposal is structured, the balance struck by those provisions is of paramount significance to an understanding of the manner in which the bill would reconcile the taxing powers of the states with the national need for a common market.

In this regard it is especially important to keep in mind that the present jurisdictional assertions of the states cannot be complied with by small and moderate-size companies and in fact are beyond the enforcement capabilities of the states themselves. To understand the reason for this, one need scarcely look beyond the data collected by the Subcommittee with respect both to the types of companies engaged in interstate commerce and the numbers of state and local governments which assert jurisdiction over interstate commerce.

At the time the Subcommittee conducted its study, it ascertained that there were, at the very minimum, some 120,000 manufacturing and mercantile companies engaged in interstate commerce in the United States. Today, the number is obviously considerably larger. About half of these companies have fewer than twenty employees, a substantial number have fewer than ten employees, and a significant minority have fewer than five. Yet these companies typically sell their products in many states, and even among those companies which are so small that their annual gross proceeds are less than two hundred thousand dollars, a considerable number sell their products in a truly nationwide market.[35]

By 1965, the number of jurisdictions taxing interstate commerce was already staggering. There were in effect at the state level 38 sets of corporate income tax laws, 38 sales and use tax laws, 37 capital stock laws and 8 gross receipts tax laws of general applicability. In addition, to compound further the chaos and confusion, business taxes are rapidly proliferating on a local level—with sales taxes already imposed by over 2,300 localities, gross receipts taxes by over 1,000 and corporate income taxes by more than 100 local governments.[36]

In formulating jurisdictional standards, one alternative which was considered and rejected by the Judiciary Committee was a plan to give jurisdiction for sales and use tax purposes to each state into which an interstate company shipped its products. However, such a broad jurisdictional reach necessitated a substantial degree of centralized administration. In short, if each state and each locality were to impose its own tax on a nationwide scale, it was clear that the system could only be made to work under a uniform nationwide collection program. As a result, the proponents of the plan recommended that a cooperative system be established under which the states and their subdivisions, as well as the Treasury Department of the Federal Government, would cooperate to provide a single audit for those companies

which market their goods in more than one state.[37]

Were the raising of state revenues the only consideration in the formulation of jurisdictional standards, then the effective enforcement of a broad jurisdictional reach that could be obtained through central administration would obviously be desirable. However, during the course of the lengthy hearings that were held prior to the formulation of H.R. 2158, state officials made it clear that one of their primary considerations was the preservation of the maximum possible amount of state and local autonomy.[38] As a result, the sponsors of H.R. 2158 concentrated their efforts on the formulation of jurisdictional rules which would not require central administration but which would have the least possible effect on state revenues and at the same time protect the small and moderate-size companies from being exposed to insurmountable compliance burdens.[39]

In fashioning jurisdictional standards, the results of the Subcommittee's earlier study provided workable criteria. The Subcommittee had found that, for all practical purposes, compliance and enforcement were both limited to circumstances in which the interstate company actually maintained some form of permanent establishment within the taxing state.[40] The Subcommittee's findings also made it clear that no state would stand to gain or lose a significant percentage of its total revenues if Congress were simply to lay down legal rules which were consistent with the present actual practice.[41] Thus, having rejected the possibility of centralized administration and having found that the states do not have the capacity to tax systematically out-of-state companies which do not have some form of permanent establishment within their borders, the sponsors of H.R. 2158 then sought a practical and workable jurisdictional rule embodying a permanent establishment concept.

Having evaluated a fairly broad series of "permanent establishment" rules, the Special Subcommittee proposed the "business location" definition which is embodied in H.R. 2158. Originally, the term "business location" was defined so as to include either the ownership or leasing of real property, or the maintenance of a local employee who does more than merely solicit orders. Subsequent to the introduction of H.R. 2158, this definition was subject to considerable criticism by state tax administrators who argued that the resulting jurisdictional rule would be too narrow as a result of its failure to give the states jurisdiction over companies which regularly maintain stocks of goods in the state, but which have no other jurisdictional contacts. In response to this criticism, H.R. 2158 was later amended by the Judiciary Committee so as to include the regular maintenance of a stock of goods as a basis for jurisdiction.[42]

Several additional features of the jurisdictional standard in Title 1 were also incorporated as a means of further reconciling the views of the state tax administrators with the need for a free flow of commerce. In this regard, perhaps one of the most controversial features of H.R. 2158 is the exclusion from jurisdictional protection in the income and capital stock tax area of corporations which earn more than one million dollars annually. The basis for such an exclusion was suggested by one of the foremost state tax administrators in the United States, Mr. Fred Cox of the Georgia Department of Revenue. Based on a careful evaluation of both federal and state income tax returns, Mr. Cox concluded that, as a practical matter, there would be no significant loss of revenue so long as the states were left free to impose their current jurisdictional rules and their own types of apportionment formulas on the larger corporations. At the same time, the adoption by Congress of jurisdictional rules and a consistent two-factor formula for the smaller companies would substantially eliminate the compliance problems of the smaller companies and contribute to increased efficiency of state tax administration.[43]

Since Mr. Cox's proposal was consistent with the data and findings of the Subcommittee, it offered the possibility of a highly workable compromise that would be acceptable to the state administrators as well as to the small business community. In addition, Mr. Cox's proposal was also consistent with a widely held view on the part of the state tax administrators that the states themselves ought to be given four more years to resolve the major problems through state legislative action, rather than to be required to conform immediately to federally imposed standards.[44] Thus, by limiting the scope of the income tax and capital stock tax provisions to the smaller corporations, H.R. 2158 was able to afford the states such an opportunity in those areas where significant amounts of revenue were involved.

Still another feature of the jurisdictional standard in Title 1 which is consistent with the views of the state tax administrators is the provision in the sales and use tax area which gives the states jurisdiction over out-of-state sellers who regularly make household deliveries in the state, regardless of whether the seller has a business location in the state. During the course of the various hearings held on interstate taxation problems, state tax administrators generally emphasized the need to protect local retailers from the tax-free competition of out-of-state sellers. In its investigation the Subcommittee had found that this was a matter of considerable significance to retailers who are located close to the borders of a state.[45] Although the United States Supreme Court has generally maintained a permissive attitude toward state taxes, one of the few cases in which the Court struck down a state tax on interstate commerce involved an out-of-state company which regularly delivered goods from Delaware to household consumers in Maryland.[46] As a result of this case, border retailers are currently exposed to a significant amount of tax-free competition.

In its evaluation of this problem the Subcommittee observed that if a seller in this type of a case were required to collect the tax, he would generally not be subject ot a multiplicity of laws since the radius of his delivery routes, is, of necessity, limited. As a result, the Subcommittee recommended that the Supreme Court's decision be reversed and the jurisdictional reach of the states be expanded in this area.[47]

In its entirety, Title 1 of H.R. 2158 may thus be viewed as embodying a series of compromises. First, it permits the states to continue to assert taxing jurisdiction on a level that is consistent with the level of actual compliance and enforcement under the present system, while protecting the many small companies engaged in interstate commerce from having to cope with a plethora of taxes imposed by states and localities which are now asserting jurisdiction even though the companies do not maintain an actual place of business within their borders. Second, it obviates the need for centralized administration and for a direct involvement of the federal government in state and local tax matters and thereby strengthens the autonomy of state and local governments, while assuring that the national market will remain accessible to the small business community. Third, in the income and capital stock tax area, it provides immediate relief for those companies which have the most serious compliance problems, while affording the states an opportunity to work out their own solutions to the interstate tax problems of those companies which are a major source of state and local revenues. Fourth, in the sales and use tax area, since the jurisdictional rule coincides with effective limits of the current systems, it permits the states to retain jurisdiction over all but a very few of their presently registered seller-collectors, while extending the jurisdictional reach of the states in the border retailer situation where tax-free competition is currently the most troublesome.

V. SOME POLITICAL RAMIFICATIONS OF THE JURISDICTIONAL BALANCE

It is testimony to the objectivity of H.R. 2158 that it has not raised political issues of a partisan nature on either a national or a regional level. In short, neither a Republican nor a Democratic policy position has emerged. At the same time, neither support nor opposition for the bill is more concentrated in one area of the country than another—or concentrated in accordance with either the size or degree of industrialization of particular states. Instead, H.R. 2158 has received broad general support from the business community as well as from segments of labor, with the major opposition coming from state officials.

The groups which strongly support the establishment by Congress of jurisdictional standards include such diverse organizations as the National Association of Wholesalers, National Association of Manufacturers, the United States Chamber of Commerce, the International Ladies Garment Workers Union, and a large number of associations representing specialized industries, such as the American Association of Nurserymen, the Magazine Publishers Association, the National Food Brokers Association, the Advertising Federation of America, etc. On the other hand, the organizations which oppose the measure include the National Association of Tax Administrators, the Council of State Governments and the National Association of Attorneys General.

The very nature of the types of groups which support and oppose H.R. 2158 makes it clear that the major political issue raised by the measure is whether the imposition by Congress of jurisdictional limitations on state taxing powers is inimical to the political interest of state and local governments. Expressed in other terms, the issue before the Congress is whether the political power which would be denied to the states and their subdivisions by H.R. 2158 is such that it ought properly to be exercised by state and local governments. As a result, careful consideration ought to be given by the Congress to two fundamental aspects of the type of power in dispute.

First, the question arises as to the actual capacity of state and local governments to exercise this power in an equitable manner. Obviously, jurisdictional claims which cannot be equitably and systematically enforced by the states and their subdivisions and which cannot be complied with by the great majority of taxpayers, ought not to be asserted. In this regard, the evidence accumulated by the Congress indicates that the states simply do not have—and without federal assistance are unlikely to acquire—sufficient administrative capacity to eliminate the widespread non-enforcement and non-compliance that currently exists with respect to out-of-state companies which do not maintain business locations within their borders.[48] Thus, in effect, the power denied to a state or local tax collector by H.R. 2158 is not the power to impose an effective tax program which is capable of raising significant amounts of revenue but is, instead, simply the broad administrative power to select out of a wide range of non-resident businesses only a limited number as targets for enforcement. To deny the tax collector such power—the power to administer an unwieldly and unworkable system—can scarcely be considered to have a deleterious effect on state and local governments.

Second, even if it were assumed that the states and their subdivisions could acquire

Footnotes at end of article.

the administrative capacity to enforce their present jurisdictional claims equitably and systematically and that the many small companies in interstate commerce could afford to acquire the record-keeping facilities necessary to comply, an even more fundamental political question arises: would it be to the long-range benefit of the states and of the federal government if each state imposed its own tax on a nationwide scale, effectively reaching all of the companies which market goods in the state but do not have a business location there? Admittedly, such a system would have strong political appeal if viewed solely in local terms. As one distinguished writer has observed:

"Interstate commerce is a rich tax base. It has, moreover, special political fascination. A state or local tax levied upon it falls largely upon people in other states. Here is a legislator's dream: a lush source of tax revenue, the burden of which falls largely on those who cannot vote him out of office. It is the old problem of taxation without representation." [49]

It is indeed this appeal of the present system which accounts to a large extent for the opposition to H.R. 2158 on the part of a number of state and local officials. Obviously, any federal proposal to limit the power of the local tax collector vis-a-vis out-of-state companies would tend to be rejected summarily by governors, state legislators and state tax administrators, who are continuously plagued with the arduous task of extracting revenues from their constituents. Yet the policy of seeking continually to expand each state's jurisdictional reach beyond its own limits of effective enforcement has broad ramifications, not only because of its effect on the national economy but also because it undermines the political vitality of the states themselves. The more each state is successful in shifting its tax burden onto persons who are without political representation in the state government, the more those persons will exert political pressures on the federal government to play a primary role in state and local affairs. Thus, strong as the political appeal of programs to tax out-of-state citizens may be, the results of such programs lead to greater and greater political responsibility for the federal government.

Finally, there is still another aspect of state programs designed to shift tax burdens onto out-of-state companies which is too often ignored by state officials. The development of such a program on the part of one state and its subdivisions obviously acts as a stimulus to other states and subdivisions to develop similar programs. For example, California currently asserts jurisdiction over companies all over the United States, which do not have business locations in California. As part of its program, it currently maintains field offices in other states, including a staff of some 80 full-time auditors in New York City and a similar staff in Chicago. A number of other states have likewise begun to operate out-of-state offices of their own. Under the circumstances, there is certainly implicit in California's policy an open invitation to all of the other states and their subdivisions to assert jurisdiction over California companies which do not have business locations outside of California.

At first blush, one might expect that some sort of "golden rule" of state taxation would emerge from this situation so that each state would voluntarily limit its own jurisdictional assertions as a means of assuring its own local companies continued access to the national market. Yet the very nature of our federal system relieves state officials of political responsibility in this area. On the one hand, if a local businessman feels aggrieved by having to comply with the tax laws of a state in which he has no business location, he rarely calls his grievance to the attention of public officials in his "home state." Instead, he regards his predicament as raising a federal issue and is inclined, therefore, to make his grievance known to his representative in Congress. On the other hand, if the local businessman does call his grievance to the attention of the officials of his "home state," these officials will, in fact, be powerless to act.[50] Thus, if there is to be a "golden rule" for the taxation of interstate commerce, it is unlikely that such a rule will be promulgated by any political body other than the Congress.

VI. SOME OBSERVATIONS ON THE MULTISTATE TAX COMPACT WHICH HAS BEEN SUGGESTED AS AN ALTERNATIVE TO H.R. 2158

As part of their official program of opposition to H.R. 2158, both the National Association of Tax Administrators and the Council of State Governments have taken the position that Congress ought to discontinue further consideration of federal legislation in this area and ought instead to authorize the negotiation of an interstate tax compact. Thirteen states [51] have already enacted such a compact and several bills [52] have been introduced into Congress which would give congressional approval.

The compact provides *inter alia* for: the creation of a multistate tax commission composed of tax officials from each party state, the arbitration of multistate disputes, a three-factor formula for apportioning income which could be elected at the option of the taxpayer, and a system of credits in the sales and use tax area. Although a detailed discussion of similarities and differences between the compact and H.R. 2158 is beyond the scope of this analysis, there are two major features of the compact which are highly significant in the light of the foregoing discussion.

First, the compact does not address itself to the jurisdictional problem. Since it establishes no jurisdictional standards it leaves even the smallest interstate companies vulnerable to the claims not only of many states but of thousands of localities as well. Thus, it would not reaffirm the principle of a common market—as would H.R. 2158—but would instead encourage the states to persist in their efforts to shift tax burdens onto out-of-state businesses.

Second, by granting broad administrative powers to a multistate tax commission, the compact would tend to lessen the direct control of each individual state legislature over its own state's tax policies. At the same time, since the powers which would be granted to the Commission, as well as to individual tax administrators, are largely discretionary, it is unlikely that the compact would bring about an improvement in the attitudes of taxpayers towards the present system. In short, it is largely because the present system is lacking in precise standards and is so heavily dependent on the exercise of administrative discretion that taxpayers have developed a widespread resistance. If businessmen are to be called on to pay taxes in jurisdictions in which they have little or no political representation, a decrease rather than an increase in discretionary administrative powers would appear to be necessary.

VII. SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

During the eight years that have passed since the Supreme Court's decision in the *Northwestern* case it has become abundantly apparent that the present system for taxing interstate commerce works badly both for business and for the states. The study conducted by the Special Subcommittee makes it clear that as the states reach farther and farther to impose smaller and smaller liabilities on more and more out-of-state companies, tax administrators are called on more and more to enforce the unenforceable and businessmen to comply with the impossible. Since the system has grown unworkable, it is essential that a national policy be formulated which will preserve the taxing autonomy of our states and at the same time reaffirm the basic principles of our American common market.

H.R. 2158, which is now pending before the 90th Congress, would limit the jurisdictional reach of the states to the present levels of effective enforcement and compliance, and in so doing would provide a system which is not dependent for its efficacy on centralized administration. Although the measure has widespread support from the private sector of our economy, opposition to the measure on the part of state tax officials is formidable, and the states generally are reluctant to accept any statutory limitations on their jurisdictional reach over out-of-state businesses. As a result, the major political issue raised by H.R. 2158 is whether the establishment of jurisdictional limitations would in fact be inimical to the interests of state and local governments.

Whether the common market principles embodied in H.R. 2158 will eventually prevail depends ultimately, of course, on the collective judgment of the Congress. The facts have been found, the issues framed, and the alternatives in terms of national policy made clear. Reduced to its essence, the question for the Congress now to determine is whether the principles of free trade among the states ought to be compromised so as to permit each state to continue to make broad jurisdictional claims on a nationwide scale.

If the program contained in H.R. 2158 is approved by the Congress, then the present trend toward a balkanized domestic economy will be reversed and the small business community assured continued access to the national market. If on the other hand, H.R. 2158 is rejected, the states will be encouraged to increase their efforts to extract revenues from non-resident businesses. As a result the need to provide relief for small companies plagued by a plethora of compliance problems will continue to grow and correspondingly increase the need for centrally administered programs capable of systematic enforcement. In either event, it is clear that the vexing problem of state taxation of interstate commerce has broad national ramifications and that ultimately a national program must of necessity emerge to remedy the present chaotic and unworkable system.

FOOTNOTES

*United States Representative from Tenth District of New York; member of the New York Bar.

[1] Northwest Airlines, Inc. v. Minnesota, 322 U.S. 292, 306–07 (1944) (concurring opinion).

[2] International Harvester Co. v. Department of Treasury, 332 U.S. 340, 360 (1944) (concurring opinion; General Trading Co. v. State Tax Comm'n, 322 U.S. 335, 360 (1944) (concurring opinion); McLeod v. J. E. Dilworth Co., 322 U.S. 327, 360 (1944) (dissenting opinion).

[3] McCarroll v. Dixie Greyhound Lines, Inc., 309 U.S. 176, 188–89 (1940) (dissenting opinion); Gwin, White & Prince, Inc. v. Henneford, 305 U.S. 434, 448–55 (1939) (dissenting opinion); J. D. Adams Mfg. Co. v. Storen, 304 U.S. 307, 327 (1938) (dissenting opinion).

[4] Northwestern States Portland Cement Co. v. Minnesota, 358 U.S. 450, 474–77 (1959) (dissenting opinion); Northwest Airlines, Inc. v. Minnesota, 332 U.S. 292, 300 (1944); McCarroll v. Dixie Greyhound Lines, Inc. 309 U.S. 176, at 188–89 (1940) (dissenting opinion).

[5] McCarroll v. Dixie Greyhound Lines, Inc., 309 U.S. 176, 188–89 (1940) (dissenting opinion).

[6] Northwestern States Portland Cement Co. v. Minnesota, 358 U.S. 450, 457–58 (1959).

[7] Id. at 476–77 (dissenting opinion) (footnote omitted).

[8] For discussion of the judicial approach see Federal Limitation on State Taxation of Interstate Business, 75 Harv. L. Rev. 953, 956–72 (1962).

[9] But see National Bellas Hess, Inc. v. Department of Revenue of Illinois, 386 U.S. 753 (1967).

[10] 358 U.S. 450 (1959).

[11] H.R. Rep. No. 1480, 88th Cong., 2d Sess. 7 (1964).

[12] Id.

[13] Hearings on State Taxation of Interstate Commerce Before the Senate Select Committee on Small Business, 86th Cong., 1st Sess. (1959).

[14] H.R.J. Res. No. 936, 86th Cong., 1st Sess. (1959), reporting H.J. Res. 450.

[15] S. Rep. No. 658, 86th Cong., 1st Sess. (1959), reporting S. 2524.

[16] 15 U.S.C. §§ 381–84 (1959).

[17] See H.R.J. Res. 450, 86th Cong., 1st Sess. (1959); 105 Cong. Rec. 16354 (1959) (remarks of Senator Byrd).

[18] 362 U.S. 207 (1960).

[19] H.R. Rep. No. 69, 90th Cong., 1st Sess. 14 (1967) (separate views of Rep. Edward Hutchinson).

[20] 75 Stat. 41 (1961).

[21] H.R. Rep. No. 69, 90th Cong., 1st Sess. 4 (1967).

[22] Special Subcomm. on State Taxation of Interstate Commerce of the House Comm. on the Judiciary, Report on State Taxation of Interstate Commerce, H.R. Rep. No. 1480, 88th Cong., 2d Sess., vols 1 and 2 (1964); H.R. Rep. No. 565, 89th Cong., 1st Sess., vol. 3 (1965); H.R. Rep. No. 952, 89th Cong., 1st Sess., vol. 4 (1965) (hereinafter referred to as Report).

[23] Report, vol. 4, at 1127.

[24] Report, vol. 1, at 303.

[25] Report, vol. 3, at 729.

[26] Report, vol. 4, at 1127.

[27] Report, vol. 1, at 408–11.

[28] Report, vol. 4, at 1127–28.

[29] Report, vol. 3, at 819–20.

[30] Id. at 820.

[31] Report, vol. 4, at 1128.

[32] Hearings Before the Special Subcomm. on State Taxation of Interstate Commerce of the House Comm. on the Judiciary, 89th Cong., 2d Sess., ser. 14 (1966).

[33] H.R. Rep. No. 69, 90th Cong., 1st Sess. 5 (1967).

[34] Report, vol. 3, at 698–99.

[35] Report, vol. 1, at 90–91.

[36] Report, vol. 4, at 1121.

[37] Report, vol. 4, at 1181–82.

[38] See Hearings Before the Special Subcomm. on State Taxation of Interstate Commerce of the House Comm. on the Judiciary, 89th Cong., 2d Sess., ser. 14, vol. 1, 76–111 (1966).

[39] See CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 112, pt. 18, p. 24744 (remarks of Rep. Edwin E. Willis).

[40] Report, vol. 4, at 1124–25.

[41] Report, vol. 4, at 1209–11.

[42] H.R. Rep. No. 69, 90th Cong., 1st Sess. 2 (1967).

[43] Hearings Before the Special Subcomm. on State Taxation of Interstate Commerce of the House Comm. on the Judiciary, 89th Cong., 2d Sess., ser. 14, vol. 2, 854–56 (1966).

[44] Id. vol. 1, at 82.

[45] Report, vol. 3, at 767–70.

[46] Miller Bros. Co. v. Maryland, 347 U.S. 340 (1954).

[47] Report, vol. 4, at 1180.

[48] See, e.g., Report, vol. 1, at 515–16.

[49] Mendelson, Epilogue to F. Frankfurter, The Commerce Clause 118 (Quadrangle Paperback ed. 1964).

[50] See, e.g., Statement of Willard W. Livingston, Chief Counsel, Alabama Dep't of Revenue, Hearings Before the Special Subcomm. on State Taxation of Interstate Commerce of the House Comm. on the Judiciary, 89th Cong., 2d Sess., ser. 14, 1301–03 (1966).

[51] Alabama, Arkansas, Florida, Idaho, Illinois, Kansas, Missouri, Nebraska, Nevada, New Mexico, Oregon, Texas, and Washington. In addition, the Wyoming Legislature has authorized the Governor to negotiate a compact subject to the subsequent approval of both the Legislature and the United States Congress.

[52] H.R. 9476, H.R. 13682, 90th Cong., 1st Sess. (1967).

WASHINGTON REPORT

HON. GLENN CUNNINGHAM

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 8, 1969

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, I periodically make a report to the people of the Second Congressional District of Nebraska, whom I have the honor to represent in the U.S. House of Representatives.

This is my second report for the 91st Congress:

WASHINGTON REPORT: CONGRESSMAN GLENN CUNNINGHAM, SECOND DISTRICT, NEBRASKA

COMMANDER BUCHER COMES BACK HOME

DEAR FRIENDS: I was very proud to be among those welcoming Pueblo Captain Lloyd M. Bucher on his return to Nebraska and Boys Town.

And it was a privilege to have the opportunity to introduce *H.R. 10359*, which calls for award of the Medal of Honor to Commander Bucher. This bill would authorize President Nixon to present, in the name of Congress, this nation's highest military honor to one of its most courageous sons whom we in Nebraska claim as our own.

There was a giant welcome for Commander Bucher, his wife, Rose, and sons, Mark, 16, and Mike, 14, at Eppley Airfield, with 900 boys from Boys Town there. And there were many damp eyes when he attempted to thank each of the Boys Town residents individually, saying in an emotional tone: "I'm glad to be home. This is my home."

BLAIR MAPLE TREE ON CAPITOL GROUNDS

I had the pleasure to represent *Blair, Nebraska*, at the planting of a *Blair Maple* on the Capitol grounds. As you can see from the picture, it is in a beautiful area on the House side.

The tree was planted to commemorate Blair's 100th Birthday which comes later this year. Those of you who live in the Blair area know that a similar tree was planted in Rhoades Park on Highway 30.

A *"time capsule"* will be buried at Blair during the August 1–9 Centennial Celebration and will note the planting of the two trees. It will be opened in the year 2069 and it is hoped a check can be made to see if the two trees still are living.

The Blair Maple was a selection from a Silver Maple observed growing on the courthouse grounds in Blair in the 1930's. The tree has an unusual upright habit of growth, developing a crown which is exceptionally resistant to wind damage.

GENERAL EISENHOWER

I lost a close and personal friend with the passing of General Eisenhower. But more important, the world lost a great leader and a soldier who dedicated his life to peace.

History also will record General Eisenhower as one of our great Presidents. I think it can be best stated in this manner: The nation had confidence in this man, and he gave it back.

SERVICE ON COMMITTEES, COMMISSIONS

In addition to my primary assignments on the *Committees* on *Interstate and Foreign Commerce* and *Post Office and Civil Service*, I have been honored with two other appointments.

I was selected as a member of the *Republican House Task Force on Transportation*, one of nine such groups studying areas of national concern.

I am also honored to become one of four members of the House of Representatives to serve on the *Lewis and Clark Trail Commission*.

The purpose of the Commission is to advise and stimulate activities of Federal, State and local agencies and individuals to keep available for public inspiration and enjoyment the route traveled by Lewis and Clark early in the 19th century from the mouth of the Missouri to the mouth of the Columbia.

PAPIO IN PRESIDENT'S BUDGET

I have been informed by *President Nixon* that he has included $75,000 in his revised fiscal 1970 budget for preliminary work on the *Papio Flood Control* project. This is extremely good news and marks another step toward completion of this vital undertaking. In the 90th Congress I led the fight which brought authorization last August of $26.8 million for the Papio project. The Corps of Engineers says it can make use of as much as $800,000 in 1970 for planning, design and some land acquisition. *I will make every effort* to see that additional funds are provided by Congress for this very important lifesaving project.

NINE NAMED TO ATTEND CONFERENCE

I have named nine men from the 2nd District to attend the National Rivers and Harbors Congress Convention May 13–16 here in Washington. *John W. Neuberger* of Omaha, General Manager of the Papio Watershed Board, will serve as Chairman of the delegation of water resource leaders. Others invited to attend the four-day meeting are *Ted V. Salestrom* of Tekamah; *Walt Oehlerking, Sr.* of Elmwood; *Robert Steffen*, Boys Town; *Mark Gautier*, Omaha; *Milton Fricke*, Papillion; *Bill Brooks*, Bellevue; and *Simon Korshoj* and *Hjalmer Quist*, both of Blair. The National Rivers and Harbors Congress was organized in 1901 and is a nationwide organization of Federal, State and local leaders devoted to the sound development of America's water resources. I have served as a Vice President of the Congress since 1967.

ANTI-OBSCENITY FORM

The Cunningham Law enacted in 1967 gives parents the means to halt the flow of unsolicited obscene literature to the family mail box.

Your *local* Post Office can provide you with a form (POD Publication 123) and instructions on how to have your name or the names of your children removed from smut peddlers' mailing lists. Or you can get one from me.

My law became effective April 15, 1968, and so far nearly 150,000 parents have taken advantage of it, filing complaints with the Post Office Department. It is really a "gut blow" to those dealing in obscenity.

My wife Janis was recently in my office with five Nebraskans who attended the 17th National Republican Women's Conference. Those present were Marilyn Gesiriech, Mrs. Dorothy Hermanek, Mrs. Robert Finnman and Mrs. H. A. Boersma of Omaha, and Mrs. John R. Scott of Lincoln.

LEGISLATIVE RECOMMENDATIONS

In addition to the bill calling for the Medal of Honor for Commander Bucher, I have introduced a number of other measures in the past two months. *H.R. 9724* would require the Federal Government to share Federal Income Tax with the States, something which I have long advocated. This bill calls for outright appropriations to Nebraska of one-fourth of one percent of the Federal individual income tax collected from our State for the 1971 budget year. This would be increased to one-half percent in fiscal 1972 and to one percent in 1973.

My new bills include: *H.R. 10341*—Establishes Cabinet-level Department of Peace. *H.R. 10379* and *10375*—Provide cost of living

increases to Social Security and Railroad Retirement recipients. *H.R. 10378*—Allows Federal Income Tax credits for certain expenses of higher education. *H.R. 10380*—Prohibits States from imposing a lien on a blind person's property as a condition for assistance under the Social Security Act. *H.R. 9723*—Calls for closer scrutiny of toys and other products manufactured and constructed for use by infants and children. *H.R. 9013*—Would abolish the Presidential Commission which recommended the Congressional salary increase. *H.R. 8434*—Provides free letter mail service to *all* servicemen in overseas assignments. *This bill has passed the House and has been sent to the Senate.*

Sincerely,

GLENN CUNNINGHAM.

TREAD SOFTLY ON THE JOB CORPS

HON. WILLIAM S. MOORHEAD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 8, 1969

Mr. MOORHEAD. Mr. Speaker, the war on poverty has been under attack since its inception; and shouldering the brunt of most of it has been the Job Corps.

Now we are advised that the Nixon administration plans to close more than half of the Job Corps centers and to shift the rest to the Labor Department.

Are we concerned with saving people or saving only money? I would suggest that if it is the former, that Congress take a long look at the accomplishments of the Job Corps to date. If it is only the latter, I would suggest that we could start with items like defense spending rather than domestic programs to cut the fat.

As a cosponsor of the resolution opposing the shutdown of the centers, I am pleased to include for the RECORD an excellent editorial from the Washington Post of May 7 which tells the story very well:

TREAD SOFTLY ON THE JOB CORPS

The basic mistake the Nixon Administration may be making about the Job Corps, as it seeks to close 59 of 109 centers and to shift the rest from OEO to the Labor Department, is in assuming that it is only a job-training program. Anyone who has ever been at a Job Corps center the day a batch of recruits piled off the bus will know it isn't. Unkempt, unsociable, unwell, unlearned, their condition adds up to a frozen unfitness for anything, not to mention job-training.

Officials dealing with the poor are fond of the term *the disadvantaged* in describing Job Corps youth. Disadvantaged? They read and add at fifth grade level. Fifty per cent have never seen a doctor or dentist. Sixty-four per cent have been either thrown out or pushed out of school. Sixty per cent lived in substandard housing. Sixty per cent are from broken homes. Add to all this the fears, neuroses and suffering that statistics can't get to, and the term *disadvantaged* becomes a puton. At best, the average Job Corps youth is seriously sub-disadvantaged, so far at the bottom of society's barrel that until Job Corps, no scraping was thought possible.

The Administration, sensitive to charges that some 13,000 trainees will be thrown to the wolves when the 59 centers are closed, has busily given assurances to everyone that these trainees unable to be placed in jobs or other centers will be absorbed into existing manpower programs. But this is unrealistic. One reason Job Corps was created in the first place is that it is a human renewal program, a last-stand try at reclaiming the broke and broken youths when other programs can't or won't. Programs in the Manpower Development and Training Act and Concentrated Employment Program are meant for the pleasantly "disadvantaged," not the unpleasant kind of Job Corps.

Sides have been forming in recent weeks on the fate of Job Corps. Last week the Senate Labor and Public Welfare Committee cleared a resolution calling on the President to hold up the shutdown. It is scheduled for the Senate floor Monday. Meanwhile, Nixon aides are now holding confidential files alleging a high incidence of gang rapes, homosexuality and drug use at the Job Corps centers. Presumably, the Administration may use this information, if things get tight, as a trump card to persuade Congress that it's better to let Job Corps die.

Aside from the cheapness, the tactic would be based on a distortion. The headlines describing the files may say, for example, that the Kilmer Job Corps Center in New Jersey had 22 cases of narcotics in the first six months of 1968. Yet Kilmer's 22 narcotics users represent a relatively small proportion of the 1700 total in the center, whose officials should be congratulated if that's actually the full dimension of their drug problem.

The genesis of all this is President Nixon's trimming of the $280 million budget currently set for Job Corps by the House and Senate to $180 million. This cut allows him to tell taxpayers of another $100 million saved. But next to defense and space money, the saving is ridiculously small. Job Corps never had the funds it needed in the first place. Economy driving now only adds fiscal insult to social injury.

As for the injured, a few showed up here last week. A busload of students, faculty and Job Corps trainees on a 25-hour ride from northern Michigan testified before the House Education and Labor Committee. They said simply that the Job Centers are worth preserving.

Reports from individual centers around the country reveal that trainees at the axed centers are shocked and depressed at the Administration's action. Others, too beaten by the odds to react, have slipped off quietly. They may have misinterpreted the signal from on high as an invitation to get lost. But that is how they read it, nevertheless. And the message the Job Corps centers are sending back to the Administration in return is in the words of Yeats: "Tread softly, because you tread on my dreams."

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA: DRUG CRISIS

HON. JOHN R. RARICK

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 8, 1969

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, the latest report from the Federal Bureau of Narcotics and Dangerous Drugs indicating that the Washington area schools rank second in the Nation for student drug violations is a frightening example to set from our Nation's Capital.

Especially is this so when the report indicates grade school students using drugs or their equivalent.

It is past time that the self-promoting adult community here in the District of Columbia set their values straight by attending to this drug crisis among the youth. If the adult community of our Nation's Capital cannot provide a wholesome environment, free from drugs for their youth, how can they be entrusted with self-government under any proposed home rule.

I include a clipping from the Evening Star:

AREA'S SCHOOLS RANKED NO. 2 IN DRUG VIOLATIONS

Washington area schools now rank second in the nation for drug violations by students, and the problem here reaches down to elementary school level, according to two D.C. public school officials.

J. Arthur Miles, the Districts schools' assistant director of health, athletics and safety, said he got his figures from the Federal Bureau of Narcotics and Dangerous Drugs. He said yesterday the metropolitan area is ranked only behind California in the use of drugs and narcotics by school students.

In addition, Frank P. Bolden, director of health, athletics and safety for the schools, noted recent incidents of grade-school students taking drugs. He cited a Northwest Washington elementary school where some youngsters were found getting "high" on vanilla extract, a common kitchen item they obtained at home.

TAX REFORM AND THE TREATMENT OF CAPITAL EXPENDITURES

HON. JAMES A. BURKE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 8, 1969

Mr. BURKE of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I would like to share with my colleagues the "Tax Reform and the Treatment of Capital Expenditures" paper prepared by Stanley S. Surrey, the very able Assistant Secretary of the Treasury for Tax Policy appointed originally by President Kennedy and continuing in office under President Johnson:

TAX REFORM AND THE TREATMENT OF CAPITAL EXPENDITURES

(By Stanley S. Surrey, former assistant Secretary of the Treasury for Tax Policy)

The Congress is presently engaged in a wide ranging consideration of reform of the Federal tax structure. The main location of the consideration at the present time is the House Ways & Means Committee, which is conducting Hearings on an announced agenda. These Hearings in large part parallel an extensive Treasury Study made under Secretary Fowler, culminating in 3 volumes of material published by the Tax Committees of Congress in February of this year. But the location of the tax reform consideration can change at any time as tax measures—principally extension of the 10% surcharge—make their way through the House and Senate. The present consideration is in response to insistent and growing demands inside the Congress and on the part of the public—and the two are of course linked—that revision in the tax structure is overdue. The pressure for reform is thus stronger than in many a year and the situation is volatile.

I would like to discuss with you an aspect of this tax reform consideration that I know from past discussions is of interest to your industry. This is the treatment of capital expenditures under the Federal income tax—primarily expenditures for machinery and equipment. You are both investors in ma-

chinery and equipment on your own account and manufacturers and distributors of machinery and equipment for others. Hence you have a double concern in how expenditures for machinery and equipment are treated—and will be treated—under our tax law.

The Treasury Studies—and statistical data—clearly demonstrate that the present tax treatment of a variety of capital expenditures is responsible for much of the escape from the individual income tax now enjoyed by the high-income group in our society and much of the lack of uniformity under the corporate tax. The list of excluded items under the individual income tax described in those Studies as responsible for the complete absence or low rates of individual income tax supports this view. This is the list:

The excluded half of realized capital gains.

Interest on state and local bonds.

Accelerated depreciation on buildings.

Deduction for unlimited charitable contributions.

Farm "tax losses."

Excess of percentage depletion over cost of investment.

Intangible drilling expenses of oil wells.

Four of these seven items—the last three and accelerated depreciation of buildings—involve the treatment of capital expenditures. As to the corporate tax, the major cause for an overall actual effective tax rate—37.5%—below the expected effective tax rate—43.4% (after taking into account the effect of the 22% normal tax and the investment credit—is the low effective rates for the natural resources industries and for financial institutions. The rate for the petroleum industry is 21.1%, for other mineral industries 24.3%, and for lumber 29.5% (these effective rates are before the foreign tax credit). The principal factors responsible for the low rates of the natural resources industries relate to the treatment of capital expenditures made by those industries.

The Studies also show that the activities benefited by these tax rules regarding capital expenditures bear a high burden of proof as to the perpetuation of that treatment, for the benefits to our economy appears to be far below the revenue lost under the tax rules.

As a consequence, the tax reform consideration necessarily will involve an examination of capital expenditures. Since a variety of capital expenditures are involved, it is hard to foresee what trails will be followed and how developments for one type of expenditure will affect other types. And for an industry interested in machinery and equipment, the questions are where will the trails end and what will be the interacting effects that can radiate from other sectors. Let us start therefore with some of these other sectors.

TAX TREATMENT OF CAPITAL EXPENDITURES

Natural resources

In the natural resources area, a large part of the capital expenditures can be expensed—that is, written off in one year as incurred. Thus, so called "intangible drilling costs"—all costs of drilling wells except the cost of depreciable property—are expensed. These costs come to about 60 or 70% of total drilling costs. In addition, all the costs of drilling non-productive wells are written off. Hence much of the investment in oil and gas wells is written off at the start. Where a well is productive, the owner can then take a depletion deduction, supposedly to recoup the investment made. But the percentage depletion deduction is not limited to the remaining investment in the well—nor even to the original investment—since it is in no way related to cost but is a percentage of income. Thus, in this industry not only is a large part of the investment cost recovered at once for tax purposes through current deduction rather than capitalized but then continuing deductions offsetting receipts are allowed without regard to the remaining unrecovered cost. The contrast to other business investment is obvious.

The revenue cost of this favorable depletion treatment compared with cost depletion is about $1.5 billion for all minerals at present, and $1.3 in the longer-run; for intangible drilling expenses and other deductible development costs compared to capitalization it is $750 million at present and about $300 million in the longer-run. The Government is thus presently spending around $2 billion in tax funds to assist the natural resources industry, about 80% of which is for oil and gas wells (and about 85% of the overall spent goes to corporations). This is about the same amount spent through direct budget expenditures, as the Treasury Tax Expenditure Budget indicates. Overall, in amount, it is by far the largest factor making for disuniformity among industries under the corporate tax. The Treasury Studies summarize a report made last year for the Treasury by a private research organization, Consad Research Corp., measuring the benefits to the United States, in terms of additional oil reserves, resulting from the large tax expenditure for the oil industry. Its conclusion was that the tax money spent, say around $1.5 billion, produces about $150 million annually of additional oil and gas reserve findings. The rest, assuming the tax savings go to benefit the oil companies, goes into refining or general diversification, or reduced cost of capital generally for the industry.

The Treasury Studies indicate that the Consad Report conclusions raise serious questions as to the cost effectiveness of the present tax provisions for oil and gas and other minerals. The Studies also discuss the relationship of the present tax treatment to other policies regarding our natural resources, such as oil imports, the management of oil and gas reserves owned by the Federal Government, State regulation of production, the availability of alternatives sources for liquid fuel, as oil shale and hydrogenation of coal.

Agriculture

We can turn from natural resources to agriculture. Here the principal tax benefits arise both from the treatment of capital expenditures and the acceleration of certain expenses:

A farmer can deduct at once certain capital costs rather than having to capitalize the investment and spread it over the useful life of the asset involved. Thus, he can deduct currently the cost of raising a citrus grove although it may not bear a commercial crop until 6 or 7 years after it is planted, or he may currently deduct the cost of raising livestock held for breeding. In these periods while the asset is unproductive, so that these are no receipts, the farmer will be writing off his costs thus creating "tax losses" to apply against non-farm income.[1]

A farmer can use cash accounting even though he produces merchandise for sale, so that the expenses involved are deductible when paid—such as the expenses of raising cattle to be sold. This also creates "tax losses" in advance of receipts from farming. Any other business involved in producing articles for sale must accrue its expenses and cannot deduct expenses associated with its inventory until it is sold and there is receipt of income.

[1] The Treasury Studies call attention to a similar problem for timber, where tax practice permits the current deduction of costs associated with the raising of timber—property taxes, prevention of disease and insects, fire insurance—unlike financial accounting which would usually add these items to the cost of standing timber.

The consequences of this treatment are to turn investment into "tax losses" applied against non-farm income otherwise taxable in high brackets. The data show that this is an important factor in reducing individual income tax at high income levels. While the situation seriously affects the individual income tax, it is also becoming a factor in corporate farming.

Does the United States gain from this tax generosity? Many Senators from farming states and the Department of Agriculture think not and are supporting bills which, similar to the proposal in the Treasury Study, would not let these farm "tax losses" be offset against non-farm income. These Senators, and that Department, believe that the attractiveness of farm tax benefits available to wealthy individuals has caused them to bid up the price of farmlands above the level that would prevail in a normal farm economy. Further, the ordinary farmer must compete in the marketplace with wealthy farmers who may consider a farm profit—in the economic sense—unnecessary for their purposes since a "tax profit" is of sufficient benefit.

Buildings

Moving now to another area of capital expenditures, the Treasury Studies point to the use of accelerated depreciation for buildings as a major factor in eliminating or reducing tax for high-income groups and for corporations generally. The Treasury material describes the present benefits:

Accelerated depreciation—at 200% for new buildings and 150% for old buildings—with no economic evidence to justify this acceleration.

Leveraged financing, the use of a high ratio of mortgage debt in relation to the equity invested, with the ability under the tax law for the equity owner to base the depreciation on the debt as well as the equity. The excessive depreciation advantages are thus obtained with only a minor equity investment.

Excessive depreciation plus mortgage interest looms so large in the early years that it not only offsets any cash flow from the building but also creates "tax losses" that can be applied against other income. The parallel to the farm "tax loss" is clear.

The gain on a sale of the building is taxable only at capital gain rates, with only a very limited recapture of the excessive depreciation.

The revenue cost of acclerated depreciation for buildings compared with straight line depreciation is about $750 million annually. Of this total, according to the Treasury Studies:

About $500 million is used for tax advantages for motels, office buildings, shopping centers, and commercial and industrial construction of all kinds.

About $100 million is used for continued tax advantages for older buildings undergoing the second, third or fourth round of depreciation writeoffs at rates above straight line.

Around another $100 million goes for housing construction in the semi-luxury or luxury high rise category.

Only about $50 million feeds into the process of rewarding investors who invest in low and moderate income housing (and some think only about $10 million into projects with direct Federal assistance).

Again, the question is, what is the United States obtaining for these large expenditures? The Treasury Studies indicate that the degree of increased construction that they may produce cannot yet be measured quantitatively but that qualitatively the investment is in a direction at variance with our social goals as expressed in direct Federal expenditures to assist private construction. Thus, the tax benefits tend to expand luxury housing, office building, and other forms of more glamorous investment and thereby squeeze out lower income housing—

the item on which Federal direct assistance is focused. We thus find a costly tax policy pulling directly against other Federal policies regarding construction and housing. The Treasury Studies conclude with the following:

"Recognizing the importance of the real estate section of the economy and of low and moderate income housing in particular, it is nevertheless evident from the foregoing that the present structure of tax provisions for real estate seems ill-suited and costly. Moreover, it provides individuals with an unwarranted and excessive escape from tax liabilities. Clearly, a new set of tax provisions together with suitable non-tax measures that meet proper tests of efficiency and effectiveness are required" (451).

For these reasons, in an appearance before the House Ways and Means Committee last February, I recommended that the matter be attacked directly through elimination of the deduction for depreciation on buildings in excess of straight-line depreciation and the recapture of any remaining excess depreciation on sale, or that it be handled through including excessive depreciation in the base of the minimum tax proposed for individuals.

This discussion indicates that the tax treatment for capital investment in three important sectors of our economy, natural resources, buildings, and farming, is very costly from a revenue standpoint—from $2.5 to over $3 billion (if capital gain on sale is included); at best is highly inefficient in achieving desirable economic or social goals; and more probably induces activities that are harmful to those goals. The tax treatment consists of a more rapid write-off of investment than is warranted from an economic standpoint and, in some cases, of a write-off that is in excess of the cost involved. In all the situations, the tax treatment is not reflected in financial accounting for the same activities.

TAX TREATMENT OF MACHINERY AND EQUIPMENT

Now, against this background, what are the implications for the tax treatment of machinery and equipment? That treatment involves the use of accelerated methods of depreciation, the use of guideline lives coupled with the reserve ratio test, and the 7% investment credit. Let us start with accelerated depreciation.

Accelerated depreciation

Accelerated depreciation on machinery and equipment is not one of the topics listed in the agenda for the Ways and Means Committee Hearings, unlike the other capital expenditures earlier discussed. Nor is it listed in the Treasury Tax Expenditure Budget. Instead, that Budget states:

"The tax depreciation allowed for machinery and equipment is thought to be closer to actual depreciation than that allowed on buildings. Also the code provisions relative to recapture of profits resulting from excess depreciation effect a full recapture as ordinary income of such profits on machinery and equipment, but recapture of only a declining and then disappearing proportion of such profits in the case of buildings. In view of this and the difficulty of estimating the divergence, if any, between depreciation allowed for tax purposes and actual depreciation, depreciation for machinery and equipment is not included here as a tax expenditure."[1]

In effect, this statement indicates the belief that, generally speaking, accelerated depreciation may properly represent the decline in economic utility of machinery. Moreover, the guideline lives are not intended to depart from expected depreciable lives. This aspect is underscored by the complementary adoption of the reserve ratio test to monitor the correspondence between the guideline lives used by a taxpayer and his actual practices. Hence, the entire setting of depreciation policy for machinery and equipment is quite different from that for buildings. Indeed, the adoption in 1954 of accelerated depreciation for buildings, was just about a happenstance, for the focus was all on machinery and equipment.

Those who wish to see the present depreciation policies for machinery and equipment continue can take comfort from the above factors, for they are factors that separate depreciation policy for machinery and equipment from the other capital expenditure areas in need of reform. But all is not serene. There are abuses associated with the depreciation of machinery and equipment that require attention. One is the use as a tax escape by high income individuals of arrangements for the "leasing" of personal property which combine the tax benefits of accelerated depreciation on certain types of high-cost equipment, such as airplanes, railroad cars and computers, and the investment credit with leveraged financing (a high ratio of debt to the cost of the property). In reality in these situations the company obtaining the use of the equipment is selling its depreciation deduction and its investment credit, thereby distorting the scope of those provisions.

It would seem possible to reach this abuse through administrative action, by a more careful delineation between genuine lease transactions and transactions which are essentially financing arrangements for acquisitions of equipment by the purported "lessee." The delineation can be in terms of the portion of the asset retained by the lessor at the end of the lease, taken at its present value and compared to the cost of the asset. If that present value is significant in relation to that cost and is used as the expected salvage value which cannot be currently depreciated, a lease is involved. The depreciation deduction and the credit would then be properly available to the lessors. But if that value is not significant, a sale and not a lease is present and the depreciation deduction and credit properly belong to the user of the property and not to the purported lessor. His role in this situation is that of financing the acquisition by the user, just as in the case of a loan used by the borrower to acquire property. The determination of what is a significant value could be based on a formula which would remove the tax motivations from these arrangements and thereby separate out the transactions that are not based on a pre-tax profit that is economically rational.

Another approach would consider whether accelerated depreciation is proper at all in a lease situation, since the taxpayer has himself chosen a stream of receipts to provide a recovery of capital whose timing under the typical lease is clearly at variance with the timing of capital recovery presupposed by the accelerated methods. Indeed, the whole matter of the appropriate treatment of the modern "lease" of equipment should be reexamined, both from tax and non-tax aspects. Thus, the question touched on above of whether a sale or a lease is involved is also present for financial accounting. Also, if a genuine lease is involved, financial accounting should consider whether the balance sheet treatment should differ, as it does today, from that of a purchase on credit.

A second concern regarding accelerated methods of depreciation grows out of the consequence that its use by a number of companies, primarily utilities, has resulted in the dividends of those companies being tax-free to their shareholders. This situation appears at bottom to rest on the use of an accelerated depreciation method for tax purposes, thus reducing tax earnings and profits which determine the presence of a dividend in the tax sense, but straight-line depreciation for book purposes, thus increasing the profits available for the distribution of a dividend in the corporate sense. There would appear to be no reason to permit accelerated depreciation to remove the annual stream of public utility dividends from the individual income tax.

This aspect of book depreciation differing from tax depreciation may well draw increasing attention in other situations. It is one facet of the question of how regulatory commissions should treat for rate-making purposes those utilities that do not claim accelerated depreciation for tax purposes, a matter on the agenda of the Ways and Means Committee. Some commissions may desire to ignore the tax books and compute taxes and hence rates as if accelerated depreciation were taken and the tax bill were lower, a position objected to by the companies. The companies would like to use accelerated depreciation for tax purposes though it is not permitted for utility accounting generally, and then establish a deferred tax account for ratemaking purposes. These conflicting positions move, as does the tax-free dividend abuse earlier mentioned, in the direction of raising the question of whether tax depreciation and book depreciation should be at variance. The shift of some industrial companies back to straight-line depreciation, to show larger pre-tax profits, may accentuate this question. As we observed earlier, one of the factors highlighting the tax escapes occurring through the tax treatment of capital expenditures in natural resources, farming, and buildings is the variance of that treatment from financial accounting.

Accelerated methods of depreciation thus have a potentiality for abuse that we must be alert to remove or confine if the substance of those methods is to be protected. The failure in 1954 adequately to safeguard accelerated depreciation from abuse was a major defect that has plagued the tax structure ever since. To avoid this situation, when guidelines were adopted in 1962 the reserve ratio test was also adopted to confine the use of those lives within safe channels.

Essential to any continued use of the present depreciation approaches for machinery and equipment is the recognition that unless safeguarded and appropriately confined, accelerated depreciation or any treatment of depreciation that is at variance with actual experience is bound to produce unfairness and lack of uniformity. In the past the complacent attitude of many toward tax largesse in the depreciation area has been rationalized by the view that in the long run the tax advantage of rapid depreciation at variance with realistic depreciation cannot be great if the taxpayer who early uses up his depreciation and reduces his taxes must later pay the piper though larger tax bills when his depreciation deductions decline as his depreciation base runs out. It was for many a comforting rationalization.

But the rationalization is simply wrong. A lengthy computer study of "Tax Depreciation and the Need for the Reserve Ratio Test", published by the Treasury in 1968, solidly demonstrates this. Its conclusions, briefly summarized are:

Realistic tax depreciation is important from an equity point of view, in that a tax depreciation policy which does not insist on linking tax lives to actual replacement lives will result in an intolerable cost in terms of tax unfairness between otherwise similarly situated taxpayers.

The extent of that unfairness can be illustrated as follows: the opportunity to use a tax life shorter say by 30% than the

[1] Annual Report, Secretary of the Treasury, Fiscal Year 1968, p. 332.

actual life will produce an effective tax rate on the income from the assets which may frequently be as much as 20% lower than the tax rates applicable to the taxpayer whose tax lives match his actual replacement cycle. In effect, a 48% corporate tax rate becomes a 38% rate. The benefit conferred on the non-conforming taxpayer is equivalent to a rate cut for the income from the assets twice as large as that enacted for corporations in 1964; it is equivalent to a doubling of the investment credit.

The non-conformity in depreciation lives does not catch up with itself unless the business contracts. Instead the non-conformity is a continuing source of difference in tax treatment and the differences do not wash out over time.

The reserve ratio test does serve as a fair and efficient administrative technique to enforce the correspondence between actual depreciation lives and tax depreciation lives which is necessary to the realistic determination of tax depreciation.

Realistic tax depreciation is thus essential to a fair tax system. Over-depreciation is as unfair as is under-depreciation. We should note that while the reserve ratio test will properly safeguard the guideline lives concept, it does not tell us—nor did the Treasury depreciation study—whether in a given situation accelerated depreciation on straight-line depreciation properly measures the allocation of depreciation over the tax life.

Investment credit

We may turn from accelerated depreciation on machinery and equipment to the 7% investment credit granted for investment in those assets. Since that credit is not an essential element of the measurement of business net income and since it grants a tax benefit beyond a return of cost, it is listed as a tax expenditure in the Treasury Tax Expenditure Budget—in the amount of $2.3 billion. It is not on the agenda of the Ways and Means Committee Hearings.

The investment credit does not have the abuse problems associated with other tax measures that treat capital expenditures differently from their treatment under financial accounting. The place of the credit in the tax structure and the actual benefit it provides are clear and open, in contrast to the other measures affecting capital expenditures. Moreover, the credit does not make any claim to its being a proper element in the determination of net income, which also contrasts with those other measures. Since the credit is a flat percentage of the asset and is limited to only a portion of the tax, it does not have the potential for unfairness and abuse that accelerated depreciation possesses, though the role of the credit in certain "lease" arrangements must be examined. Finally, it is applicable across the board for new machinery and equipment and is not confined to a particular industry or activity.

But these credentials, though important, do not end the inquiry. For the question remains whether the expenditure involved in the credit is of benefit to the United States—does it do any good and does it do so effectively in relation to the cost in revenue that is involved?

I know that business in general, and certainly the machine tool industry, would answer these questions in the affirmative and strongly so. But the econometricians who are pondering these matters are not so quick with an affirmative reply. They seek to answer the question of what the level of investment would have been if the credit had not been enacted. To do so takes them into the task of developing forecasting equations that "predict" the level of investment on the basis of economic indicators. Unfortunately for the rest of us, the econometricians are not in agreement on these matters. The first question the econometricians face is whether changing the relative costs of labor and capital in favor of capital does cause business firms to shift to more capital-intensive methods of production, through modernization and expansion of machinery and equipment and the buildings associated with them. It is evident that business investment has grown since the investment credit was adopted in 1962. But the whole level of 6NP also rose in that period. The problem is, how much of the growth in business investment can be attributed to the credit and how much to eight years of prosperity. A study of investment by Hickman published a few years ago by the Brookings Institution concluded that from past experience very little of the increased business investment could be explained by profitability factors—and hence by the credit which increases the profitability of an investment—and that almost all of the increased investment was explained by growth in markets. More recent work, however, particularly by Jorgenson, tends to support the proposition inherent in the advocacy of the credit that a reduction in the cost of capital will cause business firms to want to invest more than they otherwise would at the given level of demand.

I gather that the consensus is in the direction that in the years during which we had not reached full employment the credit did produce an investment response that exceeded the revenue spent through the credit (and would do so more effectively than rapid depreciation), so that in this regard the credit did good. But in an economy at full employment economists will tell us the matter becomes harder. If businessmen desire to invest more in response to the credit than the level of demand would dictate, we face the question of where will business obtain the savings that will enable the credit to achieve such an increase in investment. In a full employment economy, this would require bidding the funds away from other uses, i.e., raising the interest rate and hopefully increasing the supply of savings through a lowering of consumption. But if the savings do not increase sufficiently, businesses will be bidding against each other for funds and interest rates would rise to the point where they would offset the cost saving of the credit. This would allow little or no increase in business investment from the credit except to the extent that business would bid savings away from home buyers and state and local governments.

Some economists do not see the necessary savings arising in response to the interest rate changes and would thus regard the credit as inflationary and unsuited to a full employment economy. Others would see an adequate response that would produce the necessary capital and would thus find the credit a useful device to promote economic growth, even in a full employment economy. Still others might see the savings response but be concerned with the allocation consequences—away from state or local government or housing—even in the presence of economic growth.

Against this divided background, some economists would urge repeal, some no change, and some a suspension, the last hoping that the technicians learned enough in 1966–1967 to handle the admittedly difficult task of using the credit in this fashion. Still others would say that in an economy that has so many problems and tensions as we have today—and which will face great uncertainties when hostilities end—the wisest course until more knowledge is available is to maintain the credit rather than through a change in the credit inject still another uncertainty into the economy and our export position.

Thus, the present place of the investment credit is basically an economic matter. It does not directly raise issues and questions of the kind that characterize the capital expenditure items involved in the current tax reform consideration. But the matter is not entirely economic and does concern the tax structure. For the investment credit has led many to suggest the use of the tax credit device as the path to solution of a wide spectrum of social objectives—manpower training, low-income housing, location of businesses in ghetto and poverty areas, anti-pollution devices, education financing, and so on. The investment credit and its operation are not precedents for tax credits in those fields, for they present more particularized areas and problems far removed from the simple mechanics and generalized application of the investment credit. Certainly, if it were clear that the presence of that credit would mean the adoption of a whole train of credit incentives that could turn our tax structure into a shambles, then the question of the perpetuation of the investment credit would be an entirely different one. But so far that has not occurred.

CONCLUSION

In summary, the tax treatment of capital expenditures in particular industries and activities—natural resources, farming, and building—has developed preferences that are costly and present distinct tax unfairnesses. These consequences when measured against the lack of benefits or even disadvantages to our economy resulting from the preferences have given the items a prominent place in the agenda of tax reform. The tax rules for investment in machinery and equipment do not raise similar abuse or tax escape possibilities and thus do not appear directly involved in that agenda. But accelerated depreciation has a potentiality for tax abuse and in some instances correction is needed. The investment credit raises issues that are economic in nature rather than directly related to tax reform consideration. But economists are not agreed as to the answers to those issues. In all likelihood, then, the tax rules governing investment in machinery and equipment will not be free from continuing examination. But that is a healthy situation. A tax structure freed from the careful and continuous scrutiny of its important segments, especially those that depart from financial accounting, is not likely to give full service to our economic and social goals.

ON THE OKINAWA FRONT

HON. JOHN R. RARICK

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 8, 1969

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, I have received correspondence from the VFW Post in Okinawa professing a fear that our American people are not getting all the facts in the ultra-left-wing movement to intimidate the United States to surrender Okinawa to Japan.

In the hopes that our colleagues may find the viewpoint of Americans in Okinawa enlightening, I insert the letter from Post Commander Altman and several newsclippings from the Okinawa Morning Star in the RECORD:

VETERANS OF FOREIGN WARS OF THE UNITED STATES,
OKINAWA MEMORIAL POST NO. 9723,
Naha, Okinawa, May 1, 1969.

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

MY DEAR MR. RARICK: The VFW of U.S., Okinawa Memorial Post No. 9723, the largest VFW Post in the world joins with the Oki-

nawa Morning Star to furnish you with the local viewpoint of Americans on Okinawa.

For fourteen (14) years, Robert Prosser, Editor of the Okinawa Morning Star has written on the local problems with humor, compassion and understanding. His editorials form the bulk of this second special issue of the Morning Star. Featured also is Hessell Tiltman, Dean of the Tokyo Correspondents, who writes with equal knowledge and foresight on Japan-U.S. relations.

Much of the news which appears in the U.S. press concerning Okinawa has been filtered through a reporting process which records voices without evaluating or properly estimating the situation. The speakers in most cases frequently self-seekers and emotionalists who choose to ignore the basic reasons why the U.S. has found it necessary to remain on Okinawa.

We know that this local source of first hand information will be very helpful as background in preparing you for the up coming U.S.-Japanese talks regarding the future of Okinawa.

Sincerely,

RALPH S. ALTMAN,
Post Commander.

JAPANESE COMMUNIST PARTY CALLS SHOTS FOR OKINAWA DEMONSTRATION

As the result of an obscure bit of political augury Feb. 4 has been set aside by the Ryukyuan leftists as an auspicious day to hold a general strike for the avowed purpose of demanding the removal of B52 bombers from Okinawa. Or, in the light of subsequent events, perhaps there is less obscurity in the selection of Feb. 4 as the great day for anti-Americanism than had been earlier imagined. In selecting Feb. 4 as the day for a general strike on Okinawa the sponsors of this event did not consult the gods or inspect the entrails of slain animals. Nor did they study the flight of birds or listen to the mumblings of the sorcerer.

The only wizards to whom the local leftists listened in setting the date for their local affair on February 4 were the organizers from the Japan Communist party.

As almost an afterthought the other day the Japan Communist party announced its policy program for 1969 by declaring that Feb. 4 was to be the first day of a one-month Communist movement aimed at sabotaging the U.S.-Japanese mutual security pact. It is no coincidence that the local threatened general strike against the B52s was planned to take place on opening day of the newest self-declared Communist drive against the free world. And thus the general strike threat on Okinawa takes on its proper perspective in the big picture of Communist activities.

Viewed against its proper background it also becomes apparent that the Communists have had an impact out of proportion with their numbers in influencing local politics. This is largely due to the pact of strange bedfellows which was formed to engineer the election of Chobyo Yara as chief executive of the Ryukyus. Lip service for the Communist-sponsored general strike is part of the political debt that Yara owes his poll watchers and election day assistants who assisted in his election.

With the Communist announcement that their newest political drive against the free world is combined with Okinawa's general strike it becomes apparent that the local politicians have been strongly infiltrated or overwhelmed by the Communists. The brightest ray of hope for the free world is the fact that the Communists are almost as unhappy with their allies acquired under Yara as they are with the free world. In announcing their newest plan for a one-month anti-security treaty campaign opening on Feb. 4 the Japanese Communists offered a few other bits of information also.

The Japanese Communists also denounced both the Japan Socialist party and Sohyo, the Japanese labor federation which supports the Socialist party. The Japanese Socialists and Sohyo were also strong supporters of Yara during his election campaign and expect just as much political allegiance from Yara as the Communists demand. Both would like to lay claim to the Feb. 4 general strike if it is a success in the eyes of the anti-establishment forces in Japan. Each will blame the other if the affair is less than a rousing, head busting success.

As rival political organizations in Japan lay claim to responsibility for future strife on Okinawa the general strike and its damaging fall-out become less and less a domestic product and more and more a foreign import from Japan. Unhappily our local political leaders have allowed themselves to be outsmarted and maneuvered into a dangerous position by political manipulators in Japan who do not have the best interests of the Ryukyus in mind. In announcing that Feb. 4 was their day for troublemaking the Japan Communists admitted paternity of the Okinawan general strike threat. This may cause a certain amount of surprise on Okinawa particularly among the Socialists. After all, they thought all along that they were the father.

SOUTH KOREA, THAILAND, NATIONALIST CHINA ALSO UNEASY ABOUT OKINAWA'S RETURN

Some new voices have been added to the reversion dialogue which has for long involved only Ryukyuan reversionists, occasional Japanese and from time to time American experts who have been recognized mostly for their superficial grasp of the problems involved.

At this time when the prime instigators of the reversion movement admit that they are motivated mostly by Ryukyuan self interest, voices are being heard from the outside which also reflect self interest. The governments of South Korea, Nationalist China and Thailand have questioned the wisdom of the reversion of Okinawa to Japan and the accompanying dislocation of the defense capability of the Ryukyu islands. These voices from the outside deserve to be heard when it is remembered that Thailand, the Republic of Korea and Nationalist China are all signatories of the Japan peace treaty which originally empowered the United States to perform any and all functions in the administration of the Ryukyu islands. These voices from the outside also question the legality of the reversion of Okinawa to Japan as a private arrangement between the Japanese and the Americans since the governments of some 50 nations participated in approving the peace treaty that gives the United States its current status on Okinawa.

Thailand's Foreign Minister Thanat recently went on record during a Tokyo visit by saying that if Japan wants to replace the United States in the Ryukyus that it must be prepared to pick up the military burdens which are now borne by the Americans as well as the U.S. administrative chores on Okinawa. If Japan wants the United States out of the Ryukyus then Japan should be prepared to finance and maintain its own defense umbrella, the Thai minister declared.

The Republic of Korea, ROK Foreign Minister Lee Tong-Won told the Japanese that the Republic of Korea cannot remain indifferent to any move which would deprive that government of the protection that American military presence on Okinawa provides.

The Nationalist Chinese government is, of course, vitally concerned with American presence in the Ryukyus and has been blunt in saying so. Calling plans to return Okinawa to Japan "complicated and delicate" a spokesman for the Chinese government pointed out that the United States became responsible for the administration of Okinawa as the result of the Yalta declaration, the Potsdam declaration and the San Francisco peace treaty. The return of Okinawa to Japan, the Nationalist Chinese government said, would impair the security system of the entire Far East and create a security threat to the free nations of the Far East. The island of Taiwan is within sight of the southern Ryukyuan islands, a fact which links Okinawa and Taiwan together on the closest possible basis since a weak or unfriendly Okinawa would be a direct military threat to the Nationalist Chinese.

The Koreans, the Thai and the Nationalist Chinese are not the only ones who seriously question the wisdom of the immediate and unconditional return of Okinawa to Japan. Japan's own Prime Minister Sato has said that there is no concensus in the Ryukyus or in Japan on the return of Okinawa. There are Okinawans who seriously question the wisdom of forfeiting the security of the Ryukyus on the altar of emotionalism. Japan's own security and prosperity are linked to Okinawa since the American military in the Ryukyus contributes not only to the military safety but also the economic prosperity of Japan. For Japan to abruptly attempt to replace the U.S. in the Ryukyus would be a costly and even dangerous gamble.

The reversionists have held the center of the stage for over long. Theirs have been the only voices heard in connection with Okinawa. Strong opinions from Japan's neighbors in the Pacific and Asia are welcomed at this time in connection with Okinawa because the rest of the Asians will have to live with whatever the future brings. And it seems that much of free Asia would be uneasy at the prospects of living without certain American military guarantees.

UNMASKING JAPAN—JAPAN CAN'T PROVIDE LEADERSHIP

When the Japanese set out to unmask themselves the results are more demure than they are startling. Nonetheless it may be useful to review the Japanese view of themselves at their most critical as reflected by Ichiro Kawasaki, the author of Japan Unmasked (Tuttle, $3.75). Kawasaki is a 1932 graduate of the Tokyo (Imperial) University Law school, is proficient in eight languages and has enjoyed a brillian career with the Japanese diplomatic service. He is currently serving as Japanese ambassador to Argentina.

Kawasaki's analysis of the Japanese national is surprisingly close to that held by most foreigners and is not exclusive with the Japanese. Kawasaki describes the average Japanese as an abominable linguist and as a person who is more at home with his own kind than among persons of another race or nationality. As the result he makes a deplorable traveler and a person who prefers to travel in packs rather than as a loner. He tends to be unadventuresome and to judge the world from the standards of Tokyo rather than on its own merits.

Thus far the average Japanese is not a great deal different from the average American, Frenchman or the Australian or Briton who prefers to travel with his club or village group and wearing his distinctive old school or club tie and beanie.

Japan's major philosophy, according to Kawasaki, is the spirit of "Enjoy today, for tomorrow who knows," a philosophy developed by Japanese laborers who felt that money earned should be spent the same day to prevent the loss of the earnings through some mysterious means.

Kawasaki takes to task the Japanese newspapers for their "negative attitude" and the people themselves for their innate aversion to assert themselves. As the result all Japanese newspapers parrot virtually the same line with the main emphasis on an egotistical demand for individual rights rather than

a healthy concept of group welfare. The result has been for Japanese politics to promote self interest rather than common welfare.

Politics emerges in a peculiar light when seen through the eyes of Kawasaki who takes the historic post-war view of Japan's political development. Before the war the government of Japan was based upon a three-part foundation. This consisted of the military, the politican and the bureaucrat. In losing the war the military discredited itself and in discrediting itself the politicians who supported the military were also discredited. Those politicians who were not automatically discredited were placed out of bounds by allied occupation policy which set out systematically to eliminate the zaibatsu or large moneyed interests which had supported the government and the militarists.

By the end of the allied occupation of Japan only the bureaucracy remained, a fact which is equally true today. Dedicated and capable, Japan's bureaucracy today is the backbone of that government and the balancing factor between the politicians and a reborn zaibatsu. The politician in Japan today demonstrates his skill by obtaining favors from the bureaucracy on behalf of the new zaibatsu and for a fee to the politician. Political struggle in Japan is more likely to occur between factions within the same party than between the parties themselves because the Japanese Socialists have largely isolated themselves from the people as the result of their extremist and unrealistic approaches to common problems.

The Japanese themselves are made up of pressure groups all of whom press for special advantage from the government. One of the most important pressure groups in Japan is the farm group which attempts to keep rice prices as high as possible while consumer groups demand low commodity prices. War veterans, families of war dead, special claimants for pensions and relief are a yen a dozen in Japan and Japanese industry from shipping to coal mining to beef raising demands special subsidies from the government.

Okinawa's "demands" for sugar and rice subsidies are only drop in the bucket when compared with the multitude of demands which are made against the Japanese treasury each day. The ability of Okinawan politicians to realize these demands against the Japanese government will be the ultimate measure of the ability of the local politicians. Thus far the Yara Government has been more successful than it has had any right to hope. Its continued success is likely to depend more upon Okinawan politicians acting like Japanese and joining the club rather than attempting to teach the Japanese new methods of doing what they have been doing for so long.

In summing up Kawasaki reviews Japan's ability to provide political leadership in Asia in the near future and finds it extremely doubtful. Before the war Japan provided certain leadership in Peking, New Delhi, Taipei and elsewhere in Asia. During the war Japan destroyed British, French and to a degree Chinese influence in these areas. The United States comes closest to Japan in replacing this lost leadership but the goals are still elusive for the occidental. And the Japanese aren't particularly interested in taking over the white man's burden at this time. The Japanese are still too busy selling miniature cars, jumbo tankers and transistor radios to be concerned with politics among their neighbors. At least that's what seems to be behind Japan's mask.

OKINAWAN TEACHERS NOT SURE OF WANTS

To be or not to be, that is the question. That is the question that seems to plague the Okinawa Teachers' Association at this time. The teachers have campaigned long and ardently to transform Okinawa into another Japan. At least that is the impression that they have given. Now there is room to wonder whether the Okinawan teachers want Okinawa to be more like Japan or if they want Japan to be more like Okinawa.

Japan's education minister, Hiroaki Nadao, is currently visiting Okinawa. In their never ending quest to be more Japanese than the Japanese it would seem logical for the Okinawan teachers to welcome the visit of this top educator. Instead, the Okinawan teachers find his visit somewhat objectionable since they fear that Nadao's presence will give aid and comfort to the political moderates on the island. And Okinawa's teachers are anything but moderate in their political and economic demands. The perennial president of the Okinawa Teachers' Association aspires to become the next chief executive of the Ryukyus and has acquired the backing of the Communist Okinawa Peoples party, the Okinawa Socialist and the local Socialist Masses party to assist him.

At least the teachers' candidate thinks that he has the backing of these three somewhat parallel but hotly competitive groups. He may be mistaken, however, since the Okinawa Peoples party recently went on record, according to Japan's Communist party house organ, as being Communist first and pro-teachers second.

Japan's Socialists earlier declared their intentions of backing the local teachers in the upcoming election also. Unfortunately for the Socialists and the teachers the Socialists have been unable to decide who is going to head the Japan Socialist party and the presently leaderless Socialist camp is unable to lead itself, let alone direct the local teachers toward their political ambitions.

And that leaves the local Socialist Masses party to back the local teachers. The Socialist Masses people, however, must remain on the alert lest their loyal allies from the Communist and Socialist camps subvert their aims.

With such unlikely allies it is easy to understand why the teachers are uneasy on behalf of the welfare of their candidate. To be or not to be can sometimes be a considerable problem. The teachers' problem is how to be a super Japanese and still make their own ground rules and not to have moderate Japanese interference in local affairs. Such problems can result in a split personality.

FIVE MARYLANDERS DIE IN VIETNAM

HON. CLARENCE D. LONG

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 8, 1969

Mr. LONG of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, Army Sp5c. Paul D. Savanuck, Navy PO3 Lloyd E. Jones, Army T. Sgt. Harry P. Burton, Army S. Sgt. Robert P. Roehmer, and Marine 1st Lt. Robert D. Huie, five fine young men from Maryland, were killed recently in Vietnam. I wish to commend their courage and honor their memory by including the following article in the RECORD:

FIVE MARYLANDERS DIE IN VIETNAM: ONE WAS NEW STAFF WRITER FOR SERVICE PUBLICATION

Five servicemen from Maryland, including a Baltimorean who had been a staff correspondent for the *Pacific Stars and Stripes* for only two weeks, were killed in Vietnam, the Defense Department announced yesterday.

They were:

Army Spec. 5 Paul D. Savanuck, the correspondent, son of Mr. and Mrs. Daniel F. Savanuck of 4323 Manor Hill road, Pikesville.

Navy PO 3 Lloyd E. Jones, son of Mr. and Mrs. Lloyd Jones, of 2149 Hawkins Point road.

Army Tech. Sgt. Harry P. Burton, husband of Mrs. Shirley A. Burton, of 908 East 30th street, Baltimore.

Army Staff Sgt. Robert P. Roehmer, husband of Mrs. Darlene Roehmer, Hillside road, Kingsville Md.

Marine 1st Lt. Robert D. Huie, Jr., husband of Mrs. Paulette P. Huie, of 127 Smith avenue, Annapolis.

SOUGHT VIETNAM SERVICE

Specialist Savanuck, according to his father, had just been appointed a staff correspondent for the Army newspaper two weeks ago. He was killed when North Vietnamese troops penetrated the position where he was stationed.

A graduate of Poly, Specialist Savanuck majored in journalism at the University of Maryland from which he graduated in 1967. After graduation he enlisted in the Army.

He attended journalism school in the Army and was stationed for six months in Germany. According to his father, he had written to Representative Samuel N. Friedel (d., 7th) asking for transfer to Vietnam.

He received his transfer and left for Vietnam June 30, 1968. He was an information officer for an artillery unit until his switch to the newspaper.

Besides his parents, he is survived by two brothers, Anthony and Stewart Savanuck, both of Baltimore.

Sergeant Burton, 27, was a platoon sergeant in the 11th Armored Cavalry unit. He was a career Army man with 10 years of service and was due home this September, according to his mother, Mrs. Margaret F. Burton.

He had been in Vietnam since August 8, 1968.

With Sergeant Burton's mother in Baltimore is his wife, Mrs. Shirley Hooper Burton, whose home is New Zealand, and his two sons, Christopher Paul, 5, and Jeffrey Wayne, 18 months. Sergeant Burton met his wife while he was stationed in Germany.

He was a graduate of City College, class of 1959. Besides his mother and wife, he is survived by his father, Harry P. Burton, Jr., also of Baltimore, and a sister, Elizabeth.

Engineman Jones, 22, had served on a PBR boat in Vietnam since July 8, 1968. He had been in the Navy since March, 1966, and was previously stationed on the USS Howard W. Gilmore at Charleston, S.C.

He was graduated from Glen Burnie high school in 1965.

Survivors, besides his parents, are a brother, also in the Navy and stationed at Charleston, and a sister, Darnell, a student at Northeast high school.

Two weeks before he was killed he had been awarded the silver star for bravery and gallantry, according to a younger brother, David.

Sergent Roehmer was a graduate of Perry Hall senior high school. Besides his wife, he is survived by his parents, Mr. and Mrs. John D. Roehmer, and three brothers, of Kingsville.

Lieutenant Huie was a 1966 graduate of the Naval Academy at Annapolis, was commissioned into the Marine Corps basic school at Quantico, and was selected to be a marine naval aviator, training at Pensacola, Florida.

Besides his wife he is survived by two sons, Robert D. Huie, 3d, 3, and Charles Hamilton Huie, 18 months. His parents, Robert D. Huie, Sr., and his grandmother, Mrs. Charles Rutherford, formerly of Arkadelphia, Ark., now reside in Beltsville.