

Berry, William D.
Bessey, James P.
Boese, William J.
Boyer, Michael F.
Briggs, Richard H.
Brixey, Stephen A.
Buell, David G.
Bush, Richard P.
Buttrill, William S.
Campbell, Richard W.
Carlin, Stanley E.
Carr, Emerson F.
Chopak, Joseph B.
Clarke, Robert D.
Cohen, Larry D.
Conrad, Michael D.
Comiskey, Stephen W.
Cooley, Joel L.
Corrigan, Robert M.
Costello, Martin J.
Covey, John K.
Cowan, Robert W.
Creed, Jerry L.
Cross, Michael "J"
Denight, Terrence M.
Doig, William A., Jr.
Doolittle, John P.
Dunham, George R.
Dunn, Perry R.
Edwards, Stephen A.
Eikenberry, Robert C.
Estes, Kenneth W.
Estey, Donald H., Jr.
Farrow, Jerry M.
Fawcett, Robert J.
Fender, Robert G.

Fisher, Charles S.
Garland, William R.
Garner, Robert D.
Gass, James E., Jr.
Geary, Robert W.
Gray, John H.
Hagel, Lawrence B.
Hannemann, James R.
Hood, Ronald C., III
Horton, David S.
Hough, Michael A.
Jiminez, Jose L.
Johanson, Erick T.
Jones, William R.
Kendig, Edward S.
Ketchie, Scott D.
Kollay, Daniel P.
Kopp, William J.
Kuck, George V. H., Jr.
Langston, Edward R., Jr.
Lasher, John R., Jr.
Lees, Robert B.
Leonard, Edward M.
Linder, Stephen T.
Long, Daniel J.
Lottie, Richard O.
McBrier, Timothy A.
McDonough, Robert C. Jr.
McGee, Michael P.
Miller, Douglas L.
Mize, David M.
Morgan, William, Jr.
Normand, Andrew L.
O'Neill, Hugh J.

Pace, Nat M., Jr.
Pasquale, Thomas D.
Pitman, Thomas J.
Pomroy, Geoffrey W.
Porter, Charles R.
Post, John H., III
Provini, Charles R.
Rayburn, Ros (n)
Red, Richard P.
Ribalta, Charles (n)
Riggs, Jeffrey L.
Rogers, William C.
Rose, Michael P.
Russell, David P., III
Sandberg, James R.
Sciba, William L., Jr.

The following-named (U.S. Air Force Academy graduates) for permanent appointment to the grade of second lieutenant in the Marine Corps, subject to the qualifications therefor as provided by law:

Jones, Perc L.
Reid, Viet S.

The following-named (U.S. Military Academy graduates) for permanent appointment to the grade of second lieutenant in the Marine Corps, subject to the qualifications therefor as provided by law:

Bosshard, Steven A.
Heath, John W.
Leppig, William H.

The following-named (Naval Reserve Officer Training Corps) for permanent appointment to the grade of second lieutenant in

Snakenberg, John D.
Stromberg, Russel M.
Tanaka, Donald H.
Timperlake, Edward T.
Todd, James L.
Tolmie, John S., Jr.
Ture, Kenneth M.
Turner, James T., Jr.
Tyler, Thomas W.
Uhlemeyer, Arthur F.
Van Pelt, James S.
Ward, Stephen A., III
Wellington, Joseph A.
Wild, Edward B.

the Marine Corps, subject to the qualifications therefor as provided by law:
Gilbert, Ronald M.
Markle, Herbert H.

The following-named (Navy Enlisted Scientific Education Program) for permanent appointment to the grade of second lieutenant in the Marine Corps, subject to the qualifications therefor as provided by law:

Force, Allen L.

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

Anderson, Joseph N.
Bode, Victor H.
Chovanec, Barbara J.
Dobson, Jesse A.
Epps, Robert R.
Jones, Ronald L.
Laws, Thomas L.
Richardson, Coy W.
Rush, John F.
Shewmake, David F.
Smith, Wharton S., Jr.
Stafford, Herbert B.
Thomas, Gary G.
Thompson, Wayne L.
Ward, Cecil E.
Wilson, John T.

CONFIRMATION

Executive nomination confirmed by the Senate May 13, 1969:

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA
COURT OF APPEALS

Frank Q. Nebeker, of Virginia, to be an associate judge of the District of Columbia Court of Appeals for the terms of 10 years.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES—Tuesday, May 13, 1969

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

Let us draw near with a true heart in full assurance of faith.—Hebrews 10: 22.

God of our fathers and our Father God, who art sending Thy spirit into the hearts of men seeking to bring justice and peace to our world, may we with open minds and receptive hearts receive Thy spirit and with Thee strive to make justice and peace a reality in our day.

Give us grace to take to heart the dangers involved in our unhappy divisions and our unhallowed differences. Remove from us all that hurts our unity of spirit and all that hinders our forward march together. Kindle in us the fire of Thy redeeming love, strengthen us by Thy power and draw us closer to one another.

To Thee and to our country we consecrate the work of this day.

In the Master's name we pray. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

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

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the House by Mr. Leonard, one of his secretaries, who also informed the House that on May 2, 1969, the President approved and signed a bill of the House of the following title:

H.R. 3832. An act to amend title 10, United States Code, to provide the grade of general for the Assistant Commandant of the Marine Corps when the total active duty strength of the Marine Corps exceeds 200,000.

APPOINTMENT TO THE JOINT COMMISSION ON THE COINAGE

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to the provisions of section 301, Public Law 89-81, the Chair appoints as a member of the Joint Commission on the Coinage the gentleman from Idaho, Mr. McCLURE, to fill the existing vacancy thereon.

PERMISSION FOR COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION AND LABOR TO SIT TODAY

Mr. BRADEMAS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Select Subcommittee on Education of the House Committee on Education and Labor may be permitted to meet this afternoon in markup session, while the House is in session. The subcommittee will be marking up amendments to the Older Americans Act of 1965. This request has been cleared with the ranking minority members of the subcommittee and the full committee.

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

There was no objection.

CAMPUS UNREST AND SCHOOL GUIDELINES

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

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, there is room for apprehension over the varying viewpoints expressed by administration officials on a policy of dealing with campus unrest. Most people, long dismayed by lack of action in dealing with these prob-

lems, were relieved when Vice President AGNEW and Attorney General Mitchell spoke out strongly against what is happening to American colleges. There is no question but that their statements reflected the overwhelming desire of the American people for a return to sanity, a lessening of unrest, and a firm attitude by college presidents.

Now Secretary Finch, of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, has tipped the scales the other way by indicating his belief that the Federal Government can have only a very limited role in stemming the current disorders. He places a great share of the blame on the failure of American universities and suggests a commission to study the problems of change on campuses. This is a disconcerting development and one which it is hoped will not progress. There is nothing the United States needs less than another commission. We have had more than our share of commissions, which wasted the taxpayers' money and contributed nothing. The Government cannot fail to accept responsibility for preserving law and order if duly constituted local authorities fail to do so. Present day problems will not wait.

Secretary Finch also stated there is no room for change in Federal desegregation guidelines unless changes are dictated by the courts. This is directly contrary to campaign commitments by the President. The guidelines have long been the source of greatest agitation in anti-segregation problems. Time and again they have gone beyond the letter of the law and reflected the whim of race mixers rather than sound policies intended for the betterment of education. Needed schools have been closed without reason

because they did not show a racial mix that satisfied HEW officials.

The need to resolve the problems of campus unrest and school guidelines are among the major concerns of the American people. Failure to cope realistically with them will do serious damage to the image of the Nixon administration.

ARMY'S DUMPING OF GAS BOMBS THREATENS MARINE LIFE

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

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, the Army's plan to dump deadly nerve gas into the Atlantic Ocean 250 miles off the east coast of the United States presents a grave problem which I do not believe should be decided by the Department of Army alone. I understand that the Army has not even considered bringing in for consultation the Departments of Interior, Transportation, or State, yet these three Departments could have valuable advice to give and possibly a solution for disposal of such dangerous gases that is far superior to the plan the Army wants to use.

Even if the gas is transported safely to the dumping area, what of the threat to marine life in future years should corrosion open one of these tanks?

I have been told by Mrs. C. Gaye Floyd, a member of the ocean physics group, Applied Physics Laboratory, University of Washington, that significant pollution potential exists, and that dumping these gas bombs into the ocean does not destroy the gases but could cause inestimable destruction and contamination of marine life which is becoming more and more a necessary source of nutrition for the entire world's population.

Mr. Speaker, as a member of the Oceanography Subcommittee of the House Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee, I urge a complete review of the Army's gas disposal programs and reports from the Interior, Transportation, and State Departments on their views of such disposal methods.

SELECT COMMITTEE ON HOUSE BEAUTY SHOP

Mrs. GRIFFITHS. Mr. Speaker, I offer a resolution and ask unanimous consent for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution as follows:

H. RES. 404

Resolved, That the Clerk of the House of Representatives is authorized and directed to accept and deposit to the credit of the contingent fund of the House such sum not in excess of \$7,500 as the Select Committee on the House Beauty Shop, created by House Resolution 258, Ninety-first Congress, may tender to the Clerk in final repayment to the contingent fund of the House of amounts paid from that fund, pursuant to section 2 of House Resolution 1000, Ninetieth Congress, to cover certain expenses in connection with the operation of the House Beauty Shop.

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

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I wish to compliment the distinguished gentlewoman from Michigan and her committee associates for running that operation successfully and profitably. They deserve a great deal of credit.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, will the distinguished minority leader yield?

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. I yield to the distinguished majority leader.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I wish to associate myself with the remarks of the distinguished minority leader. Not only have they operated it effectively and profitably, but they have performed a worthwhile public service in taking over this operation.

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

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

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I want to associate myself with those who have complimented the gentlewoman from Michigan (Mrs. GRIFFITHS) and her associates on the committee, Mrs. GREEN and Mrs. MAY, and say that this repayment should be a lesson to other areas of Government including the Congress.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

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

There was no objection.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

THE DRAFT—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 91-116)

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States; which was read and referred to the Committee on Armed Services and ordered to be printed:

To the Congress of the United States:

For almost two million young men who reach the age of military service each year—and for their families—the draft is one of the most important facts of life. It is my conviction that the disruptive impact of the military draft on individual lives should be minimized as much as possible, consistent with the national security. For this reason I am today asking the Congress for authority to implement important draft reforms.

Ideally, of course, minimum interference means no draft at all. I continue to believe that under more stable world conditions and with an armed force that is more attractive to volunteers, that ideal can be realized in practice. To this end, I appointed, on March 27, 1969, an Advisory Commission on an All-Volunteer Armed Force. I asked that group to develop a comprehensive plan which will attract more volunteers to military service, utilize military manpower in a more efficient way, and eliminate conscription as soon as that is feasible. I look forward to receiving the report of the Commission this coming November.

Under present conditions, however, some kind of draft will be needed for the

immediate future. As long as that is the case, we must do everything we can to limit the disruption caused by the system and to make it as fair as possible. For one's vision of the eventual does not excuse his inattention to the immediate. A man may plan to sell his house in another year, but during that year he will do what is necessary to make it livable.

Accordingly, I will ask the Congress to amend the Military Selective Service Act of 1967, returning to the President the power which he had prior to June 30, 1967, to modify call-up procedures. I will describe below in some detail the new procedures which I will establish if Congress grants this authority. Essentially, I would make the following alterations:

1. Change from an oldest-first to a youngest-first order of call, so that a young man would become less vulnerable rather than more vulnerable to the draft as he grows older.

2. Reduce the period of prime draft vulnerability—and the uncertainty that accompanies it—from seven years to one year, so that a young man would normally enter that status during the time he was nineteen years old and leave it during the time he was twenty.

3. Select those who are actually drafted through a random system. A procedure of this sort would distribute the risk of call equally—by lot—among all who are vulnerable during a given year, rather than arbitrarily selecting those whose birthdays happen to fall at certain times of the year or the month.

4. Continue the undergraduate student deferment, with the understanding that the year of maximum vulnerability would come whenever the deferment expired.

5. Allow graduate students to complete, not just one term, but the full academic year during which they are first ordered for induction.

6. In addition, as a step toward a more consistent policy of deferments and exemptions, I will ask the National Security Council and the Director of Selective Service to review all guidelines, standards, and procedures in this area and to report to me their findings and recommendations.

I believe these reforms are essential. I hope they can be implemented quickly.

Any system which selects only some from a pool of many will inevitably have some elements of inequity. As its name implies, choice is the very purpose of the Selective Service System. Such choices cannot be avoided so long as the supply of men exceeds military requirements. In these circumstances, however, the Government bears a moral obligation to spread the risk of induction equally among those who are eligible.

Moreover, a young man now begins his time of maximum vulnerability to the draft at age nineteen and leaves that status only when he is drafted or when he reaches his twenty-sixth birthday. Those who are *not* called up are nevertheless vulnerable to call for a seven-year period. For those who *are* called, the average age of induction can vary greatly. A few years ago, when calls were low, the average age of involuntary induction was nearly twenty-four. More recently it

has dropped to just about twenty. What all of this means for the average young man is a prolonged time of great uncertainty.

The present draft arrangements make it extremely difficult for most young people to plan intelligently as they make some of the most important decisions of their lives, decisions concerning education, career, marriage, and family. Present policies extend a period during which young people come to look on government processes as particularly arbitrary.

For all of these reasons, the American people are unhappy about our present draft mechanisms. Various elements of the basic reforms which I here suggest have been endorsed by recent studies of the Selective Service System, including that of the Marshall Commission of 1967, the Clark panel of that same year, and the reports of both the Senate and the House Armed Services Committees. Reform of this sort is also sound from a military standpoint, since younger men are easier to train and have fewer family responsibilities.

My specific proposals, in greater detail, are as follows:

1. *A "youngest-first" order of call.* Under my proposal, the government would designate each year a "prime age group," a different pool of draft eligibles for each consecutive twelve-month period. (Since that period would not necessarily begin on January 1, it would be referred to as a "selective service year.") The prime age group for any given selective service year would contain those registrants who were nineteen years old when it began. Those who received deferments or exemptions would rejoin the prime age group at the time their deferment or exemption expired. During the first year that the new plan was in operation, the prime age group would include all eligible men from nineteen to twenty-six, not deferred or exempt, so that no one would escape vulnerability simply because of the transition.

2. *Limited vulnerability.* Each individual would experience maximum vulnerability to the draft only for the one selective service year in which he is in the prime age group. At the end of the twelve-month period—which would normally come sometime during his twentieth year—he would move on to progressively less vulnerable categories and an entirely new set of registrants would become the new prime age group. Under this system, a young man would receive an earlier and more decisive answer to his question, "Where do I stand with the draft?" and he could plan his life accordingly.

3. *A random selection system.* Since more men are classified as available for service each year than are required to fill current or anticipated draft calls, Selective Service Boards must have some way of knowing whom to call first, whom to call second, and whom not to call at all. There must be some fair method of determining the sequence of induction for those available for service in the prime age group.

In my judgment, a fair system is one which randomizes by lot the order of selection. Each person in the prime age

group should have the same chance of appearing at the top of the draft list, at the bottom, or somewhere in the middle. I would therefore establish the following procedure:

At the beginning of the third month after Congress grants this authority, the first of a sequence of selective service years would begin. Prior to the start of each selective service year, the dates of the 365 days to follow would be placed in a sequence determined by a random method. Those who spend the following year in the pool would take their place in the draft sequence in the same order that their birthdays come up on this scrambled calendar. Those born on June 21st, for example, might be at the head of the list, followed by those born on January 12th, who in turn might be followed by those born on October 23rd. Each year, a new random order would be established for the next year's draft pool. In turn those who share the same birthday would be further distributed, this time by the first letter of their last names. But rather than systematically discriminating against those who come at the front of the alphabet, the alphabet would also be scrambled in a random manner.

Once a person's place in the sequence was determined, that assignment would never change. If he were granted a deferment or exemption at age nineteen or twenty, he would re-enter the prime age group at the time his deferment or exemption expires, taking the same place in the sequence that he was originally assigned.

While the random sequence of induction would be nationally established, it would be locally applied by each draft board to meet its local quota. In addition to distributing widely and evenly the risk of induction, the system would also aid many young men in assessing the likelihood of induction even before the classification procedure is completed. This would reduce uncertainty for the individual registrant and, particularly in times of low draft calls, simplify the task of the draft boards.

4. *Undergraduate student deferments.* I continue to believe in the wisdom of college deferments. Permitting the diligent student to complete his college education without interruption by the draft is a wise national investment. Under my proposal, a college student who chooses to take a student deferment would still receive his draft sequence number at the time he first enters the prime age group. But he would not be subject to induction until his deferment ended and he re-entered a period of maximum vulnerability.

5. *Graduate Student Induction.* I believe that the induction of men engaged in graduate study should be postponed until the end of the full academic year during which they are first called to military service. I will ask the National Security Council to consider appropriate advice to the Director of the Selective Service to establish this policy. At present, graduate students are allowed to delay induction only to the end of a semester. This often means that they lose valuable time which has been invested in preparation for general examinations or other degree requirements. It can also

jeopardize some of the financial arrangements which they made when they planned on a full year of schooling. Induction at the end of a full academic year will provide a less damaging interruption and will still be consistent with Congressional policy.

At the same time, however, the present policy against general graduate deferments should be continued, with exceptions only for students in medical and allied fields who are subject to a later special draft. We must prevent the pyramiding of student deferments—undergraduate and graduate—into a total exemption from military service. For this reason the postponement of induction should be possible only once for each graduate student.

6. *A review of guidelines.* The above measures will reduce the uncertainty of young men as to when and if they may be called for service. It is also important that we encourage a consistent administration of draft procedures by the more than 4,000 local boards around the country. I am therefore requesting the National Security Council and the Director of Selective Service to conduct a thorough review of our guidelines, standards and procedures for deferments and exemptions, and to report their findings to me by December 1, 1969. While the autonomy of local boards provides valuable flexibility and sensitivity, reasonable guidelines can help to limit geographic inequities and enhance the equity of the entire System. The 25,000 concerned citizens who serve their country so well on these local boards deserve the best possible framework for their decisions.

Ultimately we should end the draft. Except for brief periods during the Civil War and World War I, conscription was foreign to the American experience until the 1940's. Only in 1948 did a peacetime draft become a relatively permanent fact of life for this country. Now a full generation of Americans has grown up under a system of compulsory military service.

I am hopeful that we can soon restore the principle of no draft in peacetime. But until we do, let us be sure that the operation of the Selective Service System is as equitable and as reasonable as we can make it. By drafting the youngest first, by limiting the period of vulnerability, by randomizing the selection process, and by reviewing deferment policies, we can do much to achieve these important interim goals. We should do no less for the youth of our country.

RICHARD NIXON.

THE WHITE HOUSE, May 13, 1969.

DRAFT REVISION

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

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, in wartime—and we are at war—there is no issue more important to a young man and his parents than the draft.

The draft is necessary as long as the Vietnam war continues. It is vital, therefore, that the draft be made as fair as possible. It is also vital that the uncertainty which clouds the lives of young American men under the present Selective Service System be eliminated.

To make the draft fair and to wipe out uncertainty, Congress must reform the present draft law.

President Nixon today has outlined for Congress the reforms needed to achieve equity and certainty.

The only way to make the draft fair is to spread the risk of induction equally among all who are eligible. The President's proposals would do this.

The only way to eliminate uncertainty is to let it be known at an early age whether or not a man has been chosen to serve sometime during his draft-eligible years. The President's reform plan also would do this.

The most important feature of the President's suggested reforms is the plan for choosing by lot those who are actually drafted. Actually, this is the only change which the President does not now have the power to make on his own. It is essential that this power be restored to him, for without this change the others he suggests would not be feasible.

Why not? Imagine for a moment that the President has set up a system in which the prime age group contains younger men and in which each man stays in that vulnerable status for only a 1-year period, when he is 19 or 20. How do you then decide who will be called first and who will be called last? Who will be at the top of the draft list and who will be at the bottom? The present law would force the Government to list men for this purpose in the order of their birth dates.

Now, suppose that there were 500,000 men available in 1970 but that we only needed 250,000. The only way we could pick out those who would be inducted would be to start with those born on January 1, go next to those born on January 2, then take those who were born on January 3 and so on. Everyone born in January and February would always be taken. And no one born in November or December would ever be taken. Those who were born in March and April would run a much, much greater risk each year than those born in September and October.

Now someone will say, "No, we can do it on a month-by-month basis." But once again the same problem arises. All those born on the first, the second, or the third day of each month would always be called up. Nobody whose birthday is on the 28th or the 29th or the 30th would run a very great risk ever. Moreover, since draft calls are almost always higher in some months than in others, those who happened to have their birthdays in high-call months would be systematically discriminated against.

In the present oldest-first system, these problems are somewhat obscured because everyone who is passed over by the draft during one month or one year moves higher and higher on the list as time passes. But that system has the overwhelming disadvantage of prolonging the time of vulnerability and uncertainty. A youngest-first, limited vulnerability system corrects this evil and, in addition, it provides more easily trained personnel.

But the only way such a system can work sensibly is if the risk of induction is equally distributed among all who are

eligible. This cannot be done unless we change from the order of birth-date system to a random system, as the President proposes.

The draft as it presently operates is terribly disruptive of a young man's life. It generates tensions and divisions within our society. I believe reform of the present Selective Service System as proposed by President Nixon is an absolute necessity.

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, young people are prone to say these days that established institutions sometimes treat them in an unfair and arbitrary manner. But their sweeping condemnation is often based on a very particular example: the Selective Service System. Though that System has many strengths, and though it is staffed with dedicated men and women, the procedures under which it works at present are anything but equitable.

Some would answer such a charge by saying that the draft is inherently unfair. When some are called and some stay home, they argue, that is inequitable on the face of it, and there is no point in trying to pretend otherwise. In my view, they are correct in that judgment as far as they take it. But the mere fact that some inequity may be unavoidable does not mean that all inequity should be tolerated. It is our job not to compound injustice but to confine it. And this will be the impact of the President's recent proposals for reforming the Selective Service System.

Congress and the Senate have already deliberated at great length on this problem. The Armed Services Committees of both Houses have already endorsed the principle which the President advocates. So have other prestigious groups which have studied the draft. Now President Nixon has added his own plea for change to those we have already heard. The time has come for congressional action.

We are, after all, asking thousands of young men to give 2 years of their lives to their country. We are asking them to place a high priority on national needs as they plan their education, their careers, their marriages and families. In some cases, we are asking them to sacrifice life itself. The least that the Congress can do is to take decisive action to make the system which calls them to service as fair as possible. That is our obligation. We owe that much to the young men of whom we are asking such great sacrifices.

We recognize that a draft is repugnant to our philosophy of government. We recognize that no practical system can be devised, however much we try, that would be fair and equitable in all respects. But we have no workable alternative than to continue with a draft and, at the same time, to insure that it has a minimum of impact on the lives of our youth. This is the primary purpose of the President's recommendations.

Mr. RHODES. Mr. Speaker, in recent years we have all heard criticisms of the draft. We have heard these criticisms from young and old alike. But no criticism of the current selective service procedures has been more just or more severe than that which speaks of the uncertainty of young Americans as they wait for their draft call.

Uncertainty is never very pleasant. But it is particularly unpleasant at a time in your life—roughly from age 18 to age 26—when you are eager to start a career or learn a trade or go to school. And these are the years of uncertainty which now plague American young men. These are young men who are eager to serve their country, but equally eager to build their own lives.

Uncertainty as to when they will be called hangs over their lives. In many cases it is this uncertainty—not any lack of respect for flag or country—which drives some young men into extreme positions and even into unjustifiable evasions of the draft law.

The system of selection proposed by the President will limit the time of uncertainty to one year, usually beginning when a young man becomes 19 and ending when he becomes 20. Surely it would be better for our Nation and for the world if we didn't have to have a draft at all. But we do, and since we do, we should make it as fair as possible. The President's message has fairness as its goal.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. Speaker, I am particularly pleased to see one part of the President's generally excellent message. I refer to the section in which he states that he will ask the National Security Council and the Director of Selective Service to review all guidelines, standards, and procedures in the area of deferments and exemptions and to report to him their findings and recommendations. While our objective should ultimately be an all-volunteer Army, we cannot delay much-needed corrections in the existing system.

The genius of the United States has long been the ability to make the system fit the person and not the other way around. One of the ways in which this concern for individual differences has been shown is the deferment and exemption procedures built into the Selective Service System.

But even the most humane and the most intelligent concern for the individual cannot overcome cumbersome and often inadequate standards and procedures used in practice. The President's message makes it clear that justifiable deferments and exemptions will still be a part of the system, as they must be, but they will be examined and, where necessary, changed by fairer and more efficient regulations.

Mr. BROCK. Mr. Speaker, I join today in applauding President Nixon's decision to amend the Military Selective Service Act to make the draft more equitable. This legislative proposal will go a long way toward ending the uncertainty which has dominated the lives of many young people between the ages of 19 and 26. At last, an individual will have the opportunity to plan his future and to make commitments without the constant threat of being drafted.

The lottery system suggested by the President will begin to alleviate the basic unfairness of the present method. A method which, in effect, penalizes those less fortunate because it takes only the young men who do not have the ability, financial or otherwise, to go on to college. Even more unfairly it allows those young men to come out of high school,

wait for 2 or 3 years with mounting hopes, finally marry, perhaps have a child and just get started in business, only to have the draft notice arrive. I can hardly blame those who challenge this approach and am encouraged to note that the ultimate objective of the President is to completely end the peacetime draft.

This willingness to revise the system points out once again President Nixon's deep interest in the young people of this country; their lives, and their futures. I urge immediate congressional approval.

Mr. STEIGER of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, for the past several years there has been a good deal of discussion about the inequities built into the present Selective Service System. We have had a number of studies and commissions of the system and a great many recommendations for changing it. None of these has been implemented.

President Nixon has taken up the challenge and urged the Congress to amend the Military Selective Service Act of 1967, in order to permit him to bring greater rationality and equity to our procedures for calling up young men to serve in the Armed Forces. Such reform is long overdue and the President's forthright and imaginative proposal deserves the support of every Member of the Congress.

The alterations to be made in the program make eminent sense in terms of meeting the needs of the Nation and reducing the uncertainties which now plague our young men for up to 7 years of their lives. The administration's proposals will permit a change to a youngest-first order of call, reduce the period of prime draft vulnerability, provide for random selection, continue undergraduate deferments, and provide more equity for calling graduate students.

The need for an indepth study of selective service guidelines, standards, and procedures is obvious. The President has called upon the Director of the Selective Service and the National Security Council to undertake just such a study which will hopefully result in meaningful reforms, insuring that future generations of young Americans will be treated in the fairest possible manner when called upon to serve.

In the past the Selective Service System has been geared primarily to supplying a quota of men each month needed by the armed services. While efforts have been made to satisfy other requirements such as the nonmilitary manpower needs of the Nation, not enough attention has been given to insuring that all individuals run the same risk of being called and that all groups in our society bear equally, in proportion to their number, the burdens of military service. Students who were fortunate enough to attend college could count on an indefinite deferment, while others who were less fortunate were forced to bear the heaviest burdens.

President Nixon's proposals are sound and will serve to eliminate many of the present inadequacies in the System. They will insure an adequate supply of young men while guarantying that no individuals are unfairly discriminated against. Certainly the Congress has the obligation to cooperate in every way possible

to aid the President in achieving his praiseworthy goal.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may extend their remarks at this point in the RECORD on the subject of the President's message.

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

There was no objection.

DREW PEARSON, A LIFELONG SERVANT OF SUBVERSIVES

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

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, during my last primary campaign in the spring of 1968, Drew Pearson, the alleged columnist, charged me with Nazi leanings. I stood up before the electorate of my district and pointed out that I had been a U.S. Army rifleman captured during the Battle of the Bulge and imprisoned in a Nazi prisoner of war camp. I escaped only after three previous attempts.

Now I read in this morning's Washington Post that this same blackguard is accusing Otto Otepka, one of the Government's finest security officers of being a "neo-Nazi." Within the past several weeks he also accused a man who once wrote a book about him of "neo-Nazism." The author of the book, according to the New York Times Index, saw action against the Herman Goering Division and was on Adolf Hitler's personal blacklist. Pearson has accused the minority leader of the other body of assisting "neo-Nazism."

Why does this mud-slinger call those he wants to attack "Nazis." Well, let us remember this same Drew Pearson was connected with the Barnes Red "cell" in World War II, a connection widely known and documentable. Drew Pearson took Chief Justice Earl Warren to the Crimea for a secret meeting with Nikita Khrushchev, who praised this same Drew Pearson in a public speech in Moscow.

Now I suppose it is only to be expected that a man who has been a consistent tool of communism would cry "Nazi" against any who disagree with him or his friends. We should remember that Drew Pearson attacked every chairman of the House Un-American Activities Committee from the start of that committee on.

How long are the editors of this country going to publish Pearson, a lifelong servant of subversives? Every newspaper carrying the column only sullies itself.

EXTENSION OF TEMPORARY DUTY SUSPENSION ON CERTAIN CLASSIFICATIONS OF YARN OF SILK

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (H.R. 2718) to extend for an additional temporary period the existing suspension of duties on certain classifications of yarn of silk, which was

unanimously reported to the House by the Committee on Ways and Means.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object—and I shall not object—I yield now to the gentleman from Arkansas for a brief explanation of the bill.

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, the purpose of H.R. 2718, as reported by the Committee on Ways and Means, is to continue until the close of November 7, 1971, the suspension of duties on certain classifications of spun silk yarn which expired on November 7, 1968.

The duties on certain classifications of spun silk or schappe silk yarn were initially suspended by Public Law 86-235, effective November 8, 1959, and the suspension has been continued on a temporary basis until November 7, 1968. H.R. 15798 of the 90th Congress, similar to H.R. 2718, was approved by the House on June 4, 1968. The substance of that bill was also approved by the Senate, but H.R. 15798 was not enacted due to a failure of the two Houses to agree on a Senate amendment unrelated to the bill as passed by the House.

The suspension of duty was made in order to lower the cost of imported fine silk yarn to domestic producers of fine-yarn fabrics who compete with imported fine-yarn fabrics. The Committee on Ways and Means is advised that the same reasons which justified the original suspension of duties justify the continuation of the suspension.

The committee amended the bill to provide that upon the filing of an appropriate request, import entries made after November 7, 1968, the termination of the last duty suspension, and on or before the date of enactment, may be liquidated or reliquidated as if they had been made after the date of enactment.

No objection to the bill as reported has been brought to the attention of the Committee on Ways and Means.

Mr. Speaker, before concluding, permit me to point out a printing error in the first sentence of the fourth from the last paragraph in the committee report. The date "November 7, 1988" should read "November 7, 1968."

The committee unanimously recommends enactment of H.R. 2718 as reported.

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

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. Could the gentleman from Arkansas say what country or countries are the principal sources of this yarn and what the dollar value of these imports has been?

Mr. MILLS. It is Italy, France, and Japan, primarily, that ship these to us. The gentleman asked for the value of the imports?

Mr. GROSS. Yes.

Mr. MILLS. It is under \$2 million annually.

Mr. GROSS. This is yarn which is not in adequate supply in this country?

Mr. MILLS. That is right. It is, of course, to produce a fabric that is likewise imported into the United States.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I support H.R. 2718, a bill to extend for an additional temporary period the existing suspension of duties on certain classifications of silk yarn. Since September 8, 1959, when Congress enacted Public Law 86-235, the duties on spun silk yarn have been suspended for 3-year periods periodically renewed by legislation enacted by Congress. The suspension of the duties was intended to enable domestic producers to import fine silk yarn duty free in order to make it more economical to produce fine yarn fabrics that compete with similar imported fabrics.

In the last Congress, the House unanimously passed H.R. 15798, a similar bill to the one now before the House, and this bill in substance was approved by the Senate. However, due to a failure of the conferees to agree on an unrelated Senate amendment, the bill was not enacted.

It is my understanding that the reasons justifying the original suspension of this duty on these classifications of spun silk yarn still exist. No objection to the continuation of this suspension has been brought to the committee's attention, and the committee unanimously recommended this legislation.

Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation.

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

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

H.R. 2718

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That subpart B of part 1 of the appendix to title I of the Tariff Act of 1930 (Tariff Schedules of the United States; 28 F.R., part II, page 432, Aug. 17, 1963; 19 U.S.C., 1202) is amended (1) by striking out the termination date applicable to items 905.30 and 905.31, namely, 11/7/68 and (2) by inserting in lieu thereof, the termination date "11/7/71".

With the following committee amendment:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert the following:

"That the matter appearing in the effective period column for items 905.30 and 905.31 of the Tariff Schedules of the United States (19 U.S.C., sec. 1202, items 905.30 and 905.31) is amended by striking out '11/7/68' and inserting in lieu thereof '11/7/71'.

"SEC. 2. (a) The amendment made by the first section of this Act shall apply with respect to articles entered, or withdrawn from warehouse, for consumption after the date of the enactment of this Act.

"(b) Upon request therefor filed with the customs officer concerned on or before the one hundred and twentieth day after the date of the enactment of this Act, the entry or withdrawal of any article—

"(1) which was made after November 7, 1968, and on or before the date of the enactment of this Act, and

"(2) with respect to which the amount of duty would be smaller if the amendment made by the first section of this Act applied to such entry or withdrawal, shall, notwithstanding the provisions of section 514 of the Tariff Act of 1930 or any other provision of law, be liquidated or reliquidated as though such entry or withdrawal had been made on the day after the date of the enactment of this Act."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

EXTENSION OF TEMPORARY DUTY SUSPENSION ON HEPTANOIC ACID

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (H.R. 4229) to continue for a temporary period the existing suspension of duty on heptanoic acid, which was unanimously reported to the House by the Committee on Ways and Means.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object—and I shall not object—I do so only to yield to the gentleman from Arkansas for a brief explanation.

Mr. MILLS. I thank my friend for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, the purpose of H.R. 4229 as reported by the Committee on Ways and Means is to continue the existing suspension of duty on imports of heptanoic acid until the close of December 31, 1970. The bill was introduced by our colleague on the Committee on Ways and Means, the Honorable HALE BOGGS, of Louisiana. The duty on heptanoic acid has been temporarily suspended since September 15, 1960. The existing suspension of duty is scheduled to expire on August 8, 1969.

Heptanoic acid is used principally in the making of special synthetic lubricants and brake fluids particularly for the military and the aerospace industry. At the time of the original suspension of duty and its subsequent extensions on a temporary basis, there was no domestic commercial production of heptanoic acid.

The Committee on Ways and Means is informed that there is still no domestic commercial production of heptanoic acid. However, one domestic chemical producer is planning to further increase its plant capacity for producing an acid considered by some to be suitable for uses similar to those of heptanoic acid.

In calling to the attention of the committee the plans of this domestic producer to increase its productive capability for an acid similar to heptanoic acid, the Department of Commerce suggested that the 3-year extension of the duty suspension originally provided in H.R. 4229 be shortened from August 8, 1972, to December 31, 1970.

Since the shorter period of duty suspension will provide an earlier opportunity for the Congress to review the domestic supply situation for this acid important to the military and the aerospace industries, the committee amended the bill in line with the suggestion of the Department of Commerce.

There was no objection on the part of the interested departments and agencies to the bill as amended.

The Committee on Ways and Means is unanimous in recommending the enactment of H.R. 4229, as amended.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I support H.R. 4229, a bill to extend the existing suspension of duty on heptanoic acid for an additional temporary period. Since 1960, when the duty on heptanoic acid was suspended by Public Law 86-795, heptanoic acid has been admitted duty free pursuant to 3-year renewal periods enacted by the Congress. Under present law, the duty suspension will terminate as of August 8, 1969.

The principal use of heptanoic acid is in making special synthetic lubricants and brake fluids. These products are used by the military and aerospace industries. During the period that the duty on heptanoic acid has been suspended, there has been no domestic production and increased demand in the United States for the product was dependent upon imports.

However, the committee has been informed that one of our domestic chemical producers is planning to increase his plant facilities in order to produce an acid that is adaptable to the same uses as heptanoic acid. In light of this information, the committee has decided to recommend that the renewal of duty-free treatment be extended only until December 31, 1970, rather than for the 3-year period originally provided for in H.R. 4229. This will give Congress an opportunity to evaluate at an early date domestic needs in light of any available domestic production of comparable products that may develop.

The interested executive agencies have no objections to enactment of this legislation, and the committee was unanimous in reporting the bill.

Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation.

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

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

H.R. 4229

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That item 907.30 of the Tariff Schedules of the United States (19 U.S.C. 1202) is amended by striking out "On or before 8/8/69" and inserting in lieu thereof "On or before 8/8/72".

With the following committee amendment:

On page 1, line 6, strike out "8/8/72" and insert in lieu thereof "12/31/70".

The committee amendment was agreed to.

This bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ELIMINATION OF MULTIPLE CUSTOMS DUTIES ON HORSES TEMPORARILY EXPORTED FOR USE IN RACING

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (H.R. 4239) to amend item 802.30, Tariff Schedules, so as to prevent payment of multiple customs duties by U.S. owners of racehorses purchased outside the United States, which was unanimously reported to the House by the Committee on Ways and Means.

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

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object—and I shall not object—I do so in order to yield to the gentleman from Arkansas, the chairman of the committee, for a brief explanation, and I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, the purpose of H.R. 4239, as introduced by our colleagues on the Committee on Ways and Means, the Honorable JAMES A. BURKE of Massachusetts, and as reported by the committee, is to amend the Tariff Schedules of the United States so as to prevent the payment of multiple customs duties in the case of horses temporarily exported for the purpose of racing.

A bill, H.R. 15003 of the 90th Congress, identical to the bill as reported by your committee, was approved by both Houses of Congress. However, H.R. 15003 was not enacted due to the failure of the two Houses to agree on a Senate amendment to the bill unrelated to the substance of H.R. 15003, as passed by the House.

Under existing customs practice, as the result of a Customs Court ruling, horses imported from abroad on which the duty has been paid, when exported for the purpose of racing, are denied duty-free reentry on each reimportation. Special provisions of the tariff schedules do permit other foreign articles duty-free reentry when exported for use temporarily abroad for exhibition or other specified purposes and under certain conditions.

The bill as reported provides a separate line item in the tariff schedules for the duty-free reentry of horses purchased abroad upon which the duty has been paid and which have been exported solely for the purpose of racing.

Favorable comments on this legislation have been received from the Departments of State, Treasury, Labor, and Commerce. An informative comment was received from the Tariff Commission.

The Committee on Ways and Means unanimously recommends enactment of H.R. 4239.

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

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. WATKINS) be permitted to extend his remarks prior to the passage of this bill.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I support H.R. 4239, a bill to amend the tariff schedules to prevent the payment of multiple customs duties by owners of racehorses purchased outside the United States. Under present law, racehorses imported from abroad and subsequently exported for racing purposes are dutiable when they are returned again to the United States. The payment of double duty in the case of horses exported for the sole purpose of

racing is an inequity which should be removed from the tariff schedules.

The present tariff schedules provide for duty-free reentry of foreign articles that are exported temporarily for exhibit at any public exposition, fair or conference, when they are returned to the United States for the account of the person who exported them. However, the Customs Court has ruled that reentry of racehorses exported solely for racing purposes is not within the purview of this statute. The action taken by the committee simply extends the philosophy of this longstanding provision of existing law to the situation involving racehorses.

Favorable reports on this legislation were received from the Departments of State, Treasury, Labor, and Commerce. The Committee on Ways and Means was unanimous on reporting this bill.

Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

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

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

H.R. 4239

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That part 1 of schedule 8 of the Tariff Schedules of the United States (19 U.S.C. 1202) is amended by inserting after item 802.30 the following new item:

" 802.40	In the case of horses, use for racing.	Free	The column 2 rate applicable in the absence of this item.
----------	--	------	---

With the following committee amendment:

Strike out the matter immediately after line 5 on page 1 and insert in lieu thereof the following:

" 802.40	In the case of horses, use for racing....	Free	The column 2 rate applicable in the absence of this item.
----------	---	------	---

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill to amend the Tariff Schedules of the United States so as to prevent the payment of multiple customs duties in the case of horses temporarily exported for the purpose of racing."

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks prior to the passage of the various bills brought up from the Committee on Ways and Means.

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

There was no objection.

TEMPORARY SUSPENSION OF DUTY ON CERTAIN COPYING SHOE LATHES

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consid-

eration of the bill (H.R. 5833) to continue until the close of June 30, 1972, the existing suspension of duty on certain copying shoe lathes, which was unanimously reported to the House by the Committee on Ways and Means.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object—and I shall not object—I do so in order to yield to the chairman of the committee for a brief explanation.

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, I thank my friend for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, the purpose of H.R. 5833 is to continue for 3 years the existing suspension of duty on copying shoe lathes.

Since 1956, the duty on imports of copying lathes used for making rough or finished shoe lasts from models of shoe lasts and capable of producing more than one size shoe from a single size model of shoe last has been suspended. The suspension of duty on these lathes was initially made and has been continued in order to make available to domestic shoe-last manufacturers highly specialized and expensive copying lathes on a duty-free basis. The Committee on Ways and Means is advised that such lathes can only be obtained from foreign sources.

The bill would extend the existing suspension of duty which will expire on June 30, 1969, for 3 years to the close of June 30, 1972.

No objection to the proposed extension of the duty suspension was received from the interested departments and agencies or from any other source.

The Committee on Ways and Means is unanimous in recommending enactment of H.R. 5833.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I support H.R. 5833, a bill to continue the existing suspension of duty on certain copying shoe lathes until the close of June 30, 1972. Pursuant to periodic extensions, the duty on these copying shoe lathes has been suspended since August 6, 1956, when Congress enacted Public Law 84-1012.

These shoe lathes are used for making rough or finished shoe lasts that are capable of producing more than one size of shoe from a single size last. Suspension of duty on these lathes makes available to domestic shoe-last manufacturers these highly specialized and expensive copying lathes on a duty-free basis.

The committee has been advised that these lathes are not available from a domestic source. The interested departments and agencies have filed favorable comments on this bill with the committee and no objection has been received by the committee to the extension of this duty-free treatment. The committee was unanimous in recommending enactment of H.R. 5833.

Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

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

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

H.R. 5833

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That (a) item 911.70 of the Tariff Schedules of the United States (19 U.S.C. 1202) is amended by striking out "On or before 6/30/69" and inserting in lieu thereof "On or before 6/30/72".

(b) The amendment made by subsection (a) shall apply with respect to articles entered, or withdrawn from warehouse, for consumption, after June 30, 1969.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

DUTY ON PARTS OF STETHOSCOPES

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (H.R. 7311) to amend item 709.10 of the Tariff Schedules of the United States to provide that the rate of duty on parts of stethoscopes shall be the same as the rate on stethoscopes, which was unanimously reported to the House by the Committee on Ways and Means.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object—and I shall not object—I do so, however, Mr. Speaker, in order to yield to the chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means, the gentleman from Arkansas, for a brief explanation of the bill.

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the distinguished gentleman from Wisconsin for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, the purpose of H.R. 7311, as reported by the Committee on Ways and Means, is to provide that the rate of duty on parts of stethoscopes shall be the same as the rate of duty on stethoscopes.

Stethoscopes are presently dutiable under Tariff Schedule item 709.10 at 15 percent ad valorem, the second of a five-stage duty reduction from 19 percent to 9.5 percent ad valorem pursuant to the Kennedy round of trade negotiations.

Parts of stethoscopes are presently dutiable under item 709.27 to 28.5 percent ad valorem, the second stage of a five-stage duty reduction from 36 percent to 18 percent pursuant to the Kennedy round agreement.

H.R. 7311, as reported, would provide the same rates of duty on parts of stethoscopes as would be applicable to stethoscopes by adding "and parts of stethoscopes" to the item description of item 709.10 of the Tariff Schedules. As a result, parts of stethoscopes will be subject to the same staged duty reductions agreed to for stethoscopes in the Kennedy round.

The existing differential between the dutiable status of stethoscopes and parts of stethoscopes was created by the Technical Amendments Act of 1965 under which the rate of duty on stethoscopes of 36 percent was reduced to 19 percent ad

valorem in conformity with a U.S. Customs Court decision. The same provision was not made for parts of stethoscopes in the act of 1965. This matter was considered in the 90th Congress when H.R. 6909, a bill similar to H.R. 7311, was unanimously approved by the House on September 30, 1968. However, H.R. 6909 was not acted on by the Senate prior to adjournment of the 90th Congress.

As introduced, H.R. 7311 provided that import entries of parts of stethoscopes made after August 30, 1963, and on or before the date of enactment would be permitted to be liquidated or reliquidated at the lower rate of duty upon a request therefor filed with the customs officer concerned on or before 120 days after enactment. Due to the lack of information indicating that such a retroactive provision for import entries for parts of stethoscopes is warranted, the committee amended the bill to delete that provision.

The Committee on Ways and Means also amended the bill to provide that the dutiable status of parts of stethoscopes established by the bill shall be considered as having been proclaimed by the President pursuant to his trade agreement authority. The purpose of this amendment is to make clear the tariff concession status of parts of stethoscopes in relation to the applicability of the various provisions of trade agreement law, including the trade adjustment provisions of title III of the Trade Expansion Act of 1962.

The Committee on Ways and Means received favorable comments on the bill, as amended, from the interested departments and agencies.

The committee unanimously recommends the enactment of H.R. 7311 as reported.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I support H.R. 7311, a bill which will provide that the rate of duty on stethoscope parts will be the same as the rate on stethoscopes. This legislation is similar to H.R. 6909, which passed the House in the last Congress on September 30, 1968, but was not acted upon by the Senate.

This bill will provide for a uniform rate of duty on the importation of stethoscopes and parts of stethoscopes. At present, parts for stethoscopes are subject to a higher rate of duty than the stethoscope itself. While both the stethoscope and its components were subject to negotiation in the so-called Kennedy round of tariff reductions, because the components started out at a much higher rate of duty than was applied to the stethoscope itself, the negotiators could not achieve a uniform rate of duty applicable to both.

Favorable reports were received on this legislation from the Departments of State, Treasury, Labor, and Commerce. The committee was unanimous in recommending this legislation.

Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

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

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

H.R. 7311

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That (a) the article description for item 709.10 of the Tariff Schedules of the United States (19 U.S.C. 1202) is amended to read as follows: "Percussion hammers, stethoscopes, and parts of stethoscopes".

(b) (1) The amendment made by subsection (a) shall apply with respect to articles entered, or withdrawn from warehouse, for consumption after the date of the enactment of this Act.

(2) Upon request therefor filed with the customs officer concerned on or before the one hundred and twentieth day after the date of the enactment of this Act, the entry or withdrawal of any article—

(A) which was made after August 30, 1963, and on or before the date of the enactment of this Act, and

(B) with respect to which the amount of duty would be smaller if the amendment made by subsection (a) applied to such entry or withdrawal,

shall, notwithstanding the provisions of section 514 of the Tariff Act of 1930 or any other provision of law, be liquidated or reliquidated though such entry or withdrawal had been made on the day after the date of the enactment of this Act.

With the following committee amendment:

On page 1, strike out line 7 and all that follows down through line 13 on page 2 and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"(b) The amendment made by subsection (a) shall apply with respect to articles entered, or withdrawn from warehouse, for consumption after the date of the enactment of this Act.

"(c) The rates of duty in rate column numbered 1 for parts of stethoscopes under item 709.10 of the Tariff Schedules of the United States, as amended by subsection (a), shall be treated as not having the status of a statutory provision enacted by the Congress, but as having been proclaimed by the President as being required or appropriate to carry out foreign trade agreements to which the United States is a party."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

LIMITATION OF DUTY ON CRUDE CHICORY ROOTS

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (H.R. 8644) to make permanent the existing temporary suspension of duty on crude chicory roots, which was unanimously reported to the House by the Committee on Ways and Means.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object—and I shall not object—I do so in order to yield to the gentleman from Arkansas, the chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means, for an explanation of the bill.

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, I thank my friend, the gentleman from Wisconsin, for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, the purpose of H.R. 8644,

as introduced by our colleague on the Committee on Ways and Means, the Honorable HALE BOGGS, of Louisiana, is to make permanent the existing temporary suspension of duty on crude chicory roots.

Since April 16, 1958, the duty on imports of crude chicory has been temporarily suspended and the duty on imports of ground or prepared chicory has been temporarily reduced to 2 cents per pound.

No chicory has been grown in the United States since 1954, and domestic processors of chicory depend on imports of crude chicory. The temporary suspension of duty on crude chicory and the temporary reduction in duty on ground chicory originally provided in Public Law 85-378 and the extensions thereof have provided domestic producers of ground chicory with a 2-cents-per-pound rate differential between imports of crude chicory on which they depend and imports of ground chicory with which they must compete. This temporary duty treatment for crude and ground chicory will terminate on June 30, 1969.

As a result of the Kennedy round of trade negotiations, the regular rate of duty on crude chicory under item 160.30 of the tariff schedules is being reduced from 1 cent per pound to 0.5 cent per pound in five annual stages. Likewise, the regular rate of duty on ground chicory under item 160.35 of the tariff schedules is being reduced from 2.5 cents to 1.5 cents per pound in five annual stages. The last stage of these duty reductions is scheduled to become effective on January 1, 1972.

Thus, under the duty reductions agreed to in the Kennedy round, the regular rates of duty for crude chicory of 0.5 cent per pound and for ground chicory of 1.5 cents per pound would constitute a narrowing of the rate differential to 1 cent per pound.

With the enactment of H.R. 8644, at least part of the existing 2-cent-per-pound rate differential between crude and ground chicory will be preserved. If, as proposed in H.R. 8644, the duty on crude chicory is permanently suspended, the rate differential will be reduced from the existing 2 cents per pound to 1.5 cents per pound, the final stage of the duty reduction on ground chicory, effective January 1, 1972.

No objection to H.R. 8644 was received from any of the interested departments or agencies, and the Committee on Ways and Means is unaware of any other objection to this bill.

The committee unanimously recommends the enactment of H.R. 8644.

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

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I would say to the gentleman from Arkansas that I was drowned in all those figures, and I cannot figure out whether we are going to get back in the business of producing chicory roots or not.

Mr. MILLS. If the gentleman will yield further, I would say to the gentleman

from Iowa that no, it is not that. No one has produced any chicory in the United States since 1954, and I would doubt that anyone would undertake to do so.

Mr. GROSS. Is the reason because it is not profitable?

Mr. MILLS. It has been uneconomical.

Mr. GROSS. Or because they are being shipped in from other countries?

Mr. MILLS. I understand that it was an uneconomical operation here in the United States, but what we want to do is preserve as much as we can of the 2-cent differential between the crude chicory and the ground chicory. It is the ground chicory that is competitive when imported into the United States, but crude is not.

Mr. GROSS. This is used in the flavoring of coffee; is that correct?

Mr. MILLS. In some sections of the United States it is a necessity to add it to coffee.

Mr. GROSS. Do they use any coffee at all in New Orleans, or is it all chicory?

Mr. MILLS. It has been some time since I have had New Orleans coffee, but it is my recollection that it does have a large amount of chicory in it.

Mr. GROSS. The gentleman believes that this legislation is necessary?

Mr. MILLS. I do, to protect our own producers of the ground chicory.

Mr. GROSS. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I support H.R. 8644, a bill to make permanent the existing temporary suspension of duty on crude chicory roots. No chicory has been grown in the United States since 1954 and domestic producers of chicory are entirely dependent on imports of crude chicory.

The duty has been suspended on crude chicory since legislation first enacted in 1958 and periodically renewed through the years. The present temporary suspension will terminate on June 30, 1969.

As part of the temporary suspension of the duty on the importation of crude chicory, the duty on prepared chicory—ground or otherwise—has been maintained at 2 cents per pound. This treatment has provided domestic producers of ground chicory with a 2-cent-per-pound differential between imports of crude chicory which they process and on imports of ground chicory with which they compete. The present bill would maintain this 2-cent differential.

No objection was presented to the committee to the enactment of this bill and the committee was unanimous in recommending this legislation.

Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

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

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

H.R. 8644

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That (a) the Tariff Schedules of the United States (19 U.S.C. 1202) are amended as follows:

(1) Item 160.30 (relating to crude chicory roots) is amended by striking out "0.8¢ per lb." and inserting in lieu thereof "Free".

(2) Item 903.20 (relating to crude chicory roots), item 903.21 (relating to chicory roots ground or otherwise prepared), and the article description immediately preceding such items are repealed.

(b) The rates of duty for item 160.30 in rate column numbered 1 of the Tariff Schedules of the United States, as amended by subsection (a), shall (1) be treated as not having the status of statutory provisions enacted by the Congress, but as having been proclaimed by the President as being required or appropriate to carrying out foreign trade agreements to which the United States is a party, and (2) supersede the staged rates of duty provided for such items in annex III to Proclamation 3822, dated December 16, 1967 (32 Fed. Reg., No. 244, pt. II, p. 19037).

Sec. 2. The first section of this Act shall apply with respect to articles entered, or withdrawn from warehouse, for consumption after June 30, 1969.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

EXTENSION OF TEMPORARY SUSPENSION OF DUTY ON ELECTRODES FOR THE USE IN PRODUCING ALUMINUM

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (H.R. 10015) to extend until July 15, 1971, the suspension of duty on electrodes for use in producing aluminum, which was unanimously reported to the House by the Committee on Ways and Means.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object—and I shall not object—I do so for the purpose of yielding to the gentleman from Arkansas for a brief explanation of the bill.

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, I thank my friend for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, the purpose of H.R. 10015 as reported by the Committee on Ways and Means is to continue until the close of December 31, 1970, the suspension of duty on electrodes imported for use in producing aluminum. This bill was introduced by our colleague on the committee, the Honorable RICHARD FULTON, of Tennessee.

The duty on electrodes imported for use in producing aluminum has been suspended on a temporary basis since October 7, 1965. The existing suspension of duty is scheduled to terminate on July 15, 1969.

The electrodes of the type covered by this bill usually are manufactured by the aluminum producers themselves. They are consumed in great quantities in the electrolysis process of transforming alumina into aluminum. One small aluminum plant which has been importing electrodes due to an insufficient aluminum production to permit manufacture of electrodes at its plant is beginning the construction of a facility to produce its own electrodes.

The Committee on Ways and Means was informed, however, that this com-

pany is not as yet in a position to supply its own needs. In view of the fact that there is some question as to when the small aluminum producer will be able to produce an adequate supply of its own electrodes, the committee amended the bill to provide for a 1-year extension of the duty suspension rather than the 2-year extension provided in H.R. 10015 as originally introduced.

Your committee believes that an extension of the temporary suspension of duty on electrodes imported for use in producing aluminum for a 1-year period as provided in H.R. 10015, as amended, is warranted.

The committee is unanimous in recommending the enactment of this bill as reported.

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

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. FLYNT. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding to me, and I ask the gentleman to yield in order that I might make certain inquiries of the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means.

My first question is, Am I correct in understanding that the basic purpose of this bill is to extend the time during which electrodes for use in producing aluminum will be admitted duty free?

Mr. MILLS. Yes; the basic purpose of the bill is to continue the duty suspension on electrodes provided for in item 517.61 of the tariff schedules when imported for use in producing aluminum.

Mr. FLYNT. My second question relates to the definition of the word "electrode," as used in the report which accompanies H.R. 10015.

The term "electrode" as commonly used in the physical sense includes both cathodes and anodes. According to both technical and basic dictionary sources, the term "cathode" is defined as the negative electrode of an electrolytic cell or vacuum tube. The same sources define the term "anode" as the positive electrode of an electrolytic cell or vacuum tube.

My second question is, For the purposes of the legislation, is it the intent of the Committee and the Congress that the term "electrode" shall include both cathodes and anodes?

Mr. MILLS. A check of the legislative history of the duty suspensions on this item would, clearly, indicate that it was the intent of Congress to suspend the duty of those electrodes which would normally be dutiable under item 517.61 of the Tariff Schedules and the description of which reads "electrodes, in part of carbon or graphite, for electric furnace or electrolytic purposes." While there has not been a detailed discussion of anodes and cathodes in either the committee reports or the floor statements when past duty suspensions were being considered, it was generally understood by the committee that electrodes do include both the anodes, which are usually cylindrical rods and are positive electrodes, and cathodes, or negative electrodes, usually molded in the characteristic shape of the furnace or pot.

Mr. FLYNT. I have raised these ques-

tions because I have been informed that the staff of the Bureau of Customs does not consider cathodes to be electrodes when they are used in the production of aluminum. The Bureau has reportedly prepared an administrative directive which excludes cathodes used in the production of aluminum from the exemption enacted by Congress, and has instructed customs officials at ports of entry to admit anodes duty free but to exact a tariff duty on carbon blocks to be used as cathodes on the spurious theory that, while the anode blocks are electrodes, the cathode blocks used in producing aluminum have ceased to be electrodes, even though physicists and aluminum engineers have always considered a cathode as essential to an electrolytic cell as the anode. I am informed by qualified and reliable physicists and aluminum engineers that there have been no recent scientific developments which would authorize anyone to exclude carbon cathode blocks from the generic term of electrodes.

It is my purpose to establish the legislative history that it is the intent of Congress that upon the enactment of H.R. 10015 that all carbon blocks to be used as electrodes in producing aluminum whether they be used as anodes or cathodes, are to be included in the class of duty-free electrodes.

Mr. MILLS. I would say to the gentleman that it is the intent of the committee in reporting H.R. 10015 that the existing duty suspension be continued for 1 year on electrodes provided for in item 517.61 when imported for use in producing aluminum. As I understand it, both anodes and cathodes have been imported under item 517.61. I would say that the intent of the bill is to provide duty-free treatment for both cathodes and anodes so long as they may be otherwise classified under item 517.61 of the Tariff Schedules.

Mr. FLYNT. If the gentleman from Wisconsin will yield further, I would like to thank the chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means for the explanation which he has given.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker I support H.R. 10015, a bill to continue until December 31, 1970, the existing temporary suspension of duty on electrodes used in producing aluminum.

The electrolysis process by which aluminum is produced requires heavy consumption of electrodes. Most of the major aluminum manufacturers produce their own electrodes at the site where aluminum is produced. There is one small aluminum manufacturing plant which has produced an insufficient amount of aluminum to warrant the production of its own electrodes in the past. However, the committee has been advised that this plant is in the process of constructing facilities for the manufacture of its own electrodes. This legislation will continue the existing temporary suspension of duty for a period of a little more than a year at which time the committee can again take a look at the situation.

The committee was unanimous in recommending this legislation and I urge the House to give it favorable consideration.

Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

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

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

H.R. 10015

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the matter appearing in the effective period column for item 909.25 of the Tariff Schedules of the United States (19 U.S.C. 1202) is amended by striking out "7/15/69" and inserting in lieu thereof "7/15/71".

SEC. 2. The amendment made by the first section of this Act shall apply with respect to articles entered, or withdrawn from warehouse, for consumption on or after the date of the enactment of this Act.

With the following committee amendments:

On page 1, line 6, strike out "7/15/71" and insert in lieu thereof "12/31/70".

On page 1, lines 9 and 10, strike out "on or after the date of the enactment of this Act" and insert in lieu thereof "after July 15, 1969".

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill to extend through December 31, 1970, the suspension of duty on electrodes for use in producing aluminum."

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

TEMPORARY SUSPENSION OF DUTIES ON METAL SCRAP

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (H.R. 10016) to continue until the close of June 30, 1971, the existing suspension of duties for metal scrap, which was unanimously reported to the House by the Committee on Ways and Means.

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

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object—and I shall not object—I do so to yield to the gentleman from Arkansas, the chairman of the Ways and Means Committee, for a brief explanation.

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, I thank my friend.

Mr. Speaker, the purpose of H.R. 10016, which was introduced by our colleagues on the Committee on Ways and Means, the gentlewoman from Michigan, the Honorable MARTHA W. GRIFFITHS, is to continue for 2 years, until July 1, 1971, the existing suspension of duties on certain metal waste and scrap.

Legislation for the temporary suspension of duties on various metal scrap was first enacted in 1942. With various changes, the suspension of duties has been continued from time to time, depending on the scarcity of the particular metals at the time.

This bill would continue for 2 years the temporary suspension of duties on certain metal waste and scrap, principally iron and steel, aluminum, mag-

nesium, nickel, and nickel alloys waste and scrap.

Imports of such scrap have not in the past few years constituted important components of the total supplies of such metals. Imports in some cases, however, have represented important sources of metals for limited numbers of consumers of such metal in some sections of the country.

The U.S. Tariff Commission has indicated to the Committee on Ways and Means that conditions which prompted the initial temporary suspension of duties on metal scrap and the continuation thereof have not materially changed. There is no objection to this bill from the interested departments and agencies; nor was objection received from any other source.

The committee is unanimous in recommending enactment of this legislation.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I support H.R. 10016, a bill extending for a 2-year period—until June 30, 1971—the existing suspension of duties on scrap metals. The continuation of the suspension of duty on metal scrap provided by this bill applies principally to metal scrap of iron and steel, aluminum, magnesium, nickel, and nickel alloys.

The scrap of nonferrous metals—whether domestic or imported—represent a very small part of the supply of such metals. Scrap of ferrous metals—iron and steel—are utilized by the domestic iron and steel industries for the production of steel by the open-hearth process. The U.S. Tariff Commission has advised the committee that the conditions upon which suspension has been based throughout the years in the case of scrap metals have not materially changed. The continuation of present rules is therefore advisable. The committee received no objections to the legislation from the interested departments and was unanimous in recommending enactment of the bill.

Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

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

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

H.R. 10016

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That (a) item 911.12 (relating to articles other than copper waste and scrap and articles of copper) of the Tariff Schedules of the United States (19 U.S.C. 1202) is amended by striking out "6/30/69" and inserting in lieu thereof "6/30/71".

(b) The amendment made by subsection (a) shall apply with respect to articles entered, or withdrawn from warehouse, for consumption, after June 30, 1969.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

EXTENSION OF TEMPORARY DUTY SUSPENSION ON CERTAIN ISTLE

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (H.R. 10107) to con-

tinue for a temporary period the existing suspension of duty on certain istle, which was unanimously reported to the House by the Committee on Ways and Means.

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

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object—and I shall not object—I do so in order to yield to the gentleman from Arkansas, the chairman of the Ways and Means Committee, for a brief explanation. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. MILLS. I thank my friend for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, the purpose of H.R. 10107 as introduced by our colleagues on the Committee on Ways and Means, the Honorable JAMES B. UTT, of California, and the Honorable JACKSON E. BETTS, of Ohio, is to continue until the close of September 5, 1972, the existing suspension of duty on processed istle fiber. Istle fiber is one of the best known and most widely used of all vegetable brush fibers.

The duty on processed istle fiber has been suspended on a temporary basis since September 4, 1957. At the time of the initial suspension of duty, there was no domestic production of raw istle fiber and an insignificant production of the processed fiber from imported raw fiber. The objective of the suspension of the duty was to reduce the burden of higher prices on domestic users of the fiber and of the finished product.

The Committee on Ways and Means is informed that conditions continue to warrant the suspension of this duty.

The committee has received no objection to the 3-year extension of the duty suspension on processed istle fiber.

The committee is unanimous in recommending the enactment of H.R. 10107.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I support H.R. 10107, a bill to continue for a 3-year period—until September 5, 1972—the existing suspension of duty on processed istle fiber. In the absence of this bill, the present suspension of duty on processed istle fiber will expire on September 5 of this year.

Istle fiber is a vegetable brush fiber used principally in the United States in the manufacture of brushes. Crude istle fiber has been admitted duty free since the Tariff Act of 1930. Processed istle fiber is subject to a 20-percent ad valorem duty under the Tariff Act, but that duty has been suspended pursuant to legislation enacted in 1957 and periodically renewed since then.

Since the suspension of duty on istle fiber in 1957, there has been no production of crude istle fiber in the United States and an insignificant production of the processed fiber from imported crude fiber. This situation continues to prevail today. The purpose of duty free treatment in this case is to reduce the prices of brushes and products made from istle fiber to consumers in the United States. In order to continue to attain these objectives the committee unanimously recommends enactment of this legislation. No objection was received from the interested departments and agencies in this legislation and I recommend its favorable consideration by the House.

Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

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

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

H.R. 10107

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That (a) item 903.90 of the Tariff Schedules of the United States (19 U.S.C., sec. 1202, item 903.90) is amended by striking out "9/5/69" and inserting in lieu thereof "9/5/72".

(b) The amendment made by subsection (a) shall apply with respect to articles entered, or withdrawn from warehouse, for consumption, after September 5, 1969.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

COLLECTION OF FEDERAL UNEMPLOYMENT TAX

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (H.R. 9951) to provide for the collection of the Federal unemployment tax in quarterly installments during each taxable year; to make status of employer depend on employment during preceding as well as current taxable year; to exclude from the computation of the excess the balance in the employment security administration account as of the close of fiscal years 1970 through 1972; to raise the limitation on the amount authorized to be made available for expenditure out of the employment security administration account by the amounts so excluded; and for other purposes, which was unanimously reported to the House by the Committee on Ways and Means.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object—and I shall not object—I do so in order to yield to the gentleman from Arkansas, the chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means, for an explanation of this bill. I yield now to the gentleman from Arkansas.

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, I thank my friend, the gentleman from Wisconsin, for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, the purpose of H.R. 9951 is to provide relief for an immediate problem with respect to funding the operation of the employment security program. This program carries out the dual operation of administering the unemployment insurance system and the employment service.

Although Congress determines the actual amounts that may be spent by Federal and State agencies in administering the unemployment insurance and the employment service programs through annual appropriations, the source of funds to pay these expenses is limited by law to a portion of the Federal unemployment tax.

According to estimates of the Department of Labor, the program's administrative expenses, under President Nixon's revised budget for fiscal year 1970, will exceed revenues from the Federal

Unemployment Tax Act available to finance these operations by about \$26 million.

The bill we are now considering would provide temporary relief for this problem by means of a permanent change in the law which I believe is desirable in itself. The bill calls for a shift from the present method of collecting unemployment taxes on an annual basis at the end of each year to quarterly collections during the year.

The bill specifically exempts from the quarterly payment requirement any employer whose tax liability for a collecting period does not exceed \$100. Thus, no employer would be required to make a quarterly payment until he owes more than \$100 in Federal unemployment taxes.

The changeover from annual to quarterly payments would be gradually phased-in over a 3-year period under the bill in order to ease the financial impact on employers. In the first year, an employer with a tax liability in excess of \$100 would deposit only one-third of his quarterly tax at the end of the first three quarters and would pay the remainder of his tax with his annual return at the end of the year. In the second year, the quarterly tax payment would be increased to two-thirds of the quarter's tax and beginning in the third year and thereafter, the full quarterly amount would be paid at the end of each quarter.

Mr. Speaker, this legislation will not result in increasing the unemployment tax liability of employers. It will, however, through the speeding up of collections, provide additional funds to finance the employment security program during the next 3 years. During that time, Congress will have an opportunity to explore the alternatives for achieving a more permanent solution to the problems of funding the program. Indeed, this is a matter which I have discussed at some length on several occasions with representatives of the Interstate Conference of Employment Security Agencies, and one which they are continuing to study in cooperation with the U.S. Department of Labor.

Mr. Speaker, the committee unanimously recommends enactment of this legislation.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I support H.R. 9951, a bill to provide for the collection of the Federal unemployment tax in quarterly installments during each taxable year, and to provide for the use of additional funds resulting therefrom.

The administrative costs attributable to the Federal-State employment security program have been increasing along with other costs in recent years. In the near future, Congress will have to consider the long-range financing needs of the Federal-State unemployment system, and in that connection will want to carefully review the various administrative costs of the unemployment system to which the Federal unemployment tax is devoted. However, the system is presented with an immediate problem in that the program's administrative expenses will exceed the revenues from the Federal unemployment taxes by about \$26 million in fiscal year 1970, and the de-

ciency will increase in succeeding fiscal years.

The present bill will resolve the problem for fiscal years 1970 through 1972 by requiring that the Federal tax be deposited quarterly by covered employers. Under present law the employer pays the tax for the entire calendar year when he files his return for that year in the following January. This legislation would require employers whose tax in a calendar quarter exceeds \$100 to deposit the amount of tax due on a quarterly basis. However, the employer would continue to file his return annually in the January following the close of the calendar year.

As in the past when the committee has enacted legislation to make taxes payable on a more current basis, the committee has phased in the new rules. Under this bill an employer will pay only one-third of his taxes on a quarterly basis in 1970, two-thirds of his taxes on a quarterly basis in 1971, and not until 1972 will all of his Federal unemployment taxes be paid on a quarterly basis. During this period the amount not paid on a quarterly basis during the calendar year will be due when the Federal unemployment tax return is filed in the following January.

This legislation represents an improvement in the law that will insure that our Federal-State unemployment system is adequately financed in the near future. I urge that the House take favorable action on this bill.

Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

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

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

H.R. 9951

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 3306(a) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 (relating to definition of employer) is amended to read as follows:

"(a) EMPLOYER.—For purposes of this chapter, the term 'employer' does not include any person unless on each of some 20 days during the taxable year or during the preceding taxable year, each day being in a different calendar week, the total number of individuals who were employed by him in employment for some portion of the day (whether or not at the same moment of time) was 4 or more."

SEC. 2. COLLECTION OF FEDERAL UNEMPLOYMENT TAX ON QUARTERLY OR OTHER TIME PERIOD BASIS.

(a) QUARTERLY PAYMENT OF FEDERAL UNEMPLOYMENT TAX.—Subchapter A of chapter 62 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 (relating to place and due date for payment of tax) is amended by redesignating section 6157 as 6158, and by inserting after section 6156 the following new section:

"SEC. 6157. PAYMENT OF FEDERAL UNEMPLOYMENT TAX ON QUARTERLY OR OTHER TIME PERIOD BASIS.

"(a) GENERAL RULE.—Every person who for the calendar year is an employer (as defined in section 3306(a)) shall

"(1) if the person in the preceding calendar year employed 4 or more employees in employment (within the meaning of section 3306(c) and (d)) on each of some 20 days during such preceding calendar year, each

such day being in a different calendar week, compute the tax imposed by section 3301 for each of the first three calendar quarters in the calendar year, and

"(2) if paragraph (1) does not apply, compute the tax imposed by section 3301—

"(A) for the period beginning with the first day of the calendar year and ending with the last day of the calendar quarter (excluding the last calendar quarter) in which such person becomes such an employer, and

"(B) for the third calendar quarter of such year, if the period specified in subparagraph (A) includes only the first two calendar quarters of the calendar year.

The tax for any calendar quarter or other period shall be computed as provided in subsection (b) and the tax as so computed shall, except as otherwise provided in subsection (c), be paid in such manner and at such time as may be provided in regulations prescribed by the Secretary or his delegate.

"(b) COMPUTATION OF TAX.—The tax for any calendar quarter or other period referred to in paragraph (1) or (2) of subsection (a) shall be computed by multiplying the amount of wages (as defined in section 3306(b)) paid in such calendar quarter or other period by the number of percentage points (including fractional points) by which the rate of tax specified in section 3301 exceeds 2.7 percent.

"(c) SPECIAL RULE FOR CALENDAR YEARS 1970 AND 1971.—For purposes of subsection (a), the tax computed as provided in subsection (b) for any calendar quarter or other period shall be reduced (1) by 66½ percent if such quarter or period is in 1970, and (2) by 33½ percent if such quarter or period is in 1971."

(b) ASSESSMENT AUTHORITY.—Section 6201 (b) of such Code (relating to assessment authority) is amended to read as follows:

"(b) AMOUNT NOT TO BE ASSESSED.—

"(1) ESTIMATED INCOME TAX.—No unpaid amount of estimated tax under section 6153 or 6154 shall be assessed.

"(2) FEDERAL UNEMPLOYMENT TAX.—No unpaid amount of Federal unemployment tax for any calendar quarter or other period of a calendar year, computed as provided in section 6157, shall be assessed."

(c) TREATMENT OF QUARTERLY PAYMENT OF FEDERAL UNEMPLOYMENT TAX.—Subchapter B of chapter 64 of such Code is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new section:

"SEC. 6317. PAYMENTS OF FEDERAL UNEMPLOYMENT TAX FOR CALENDAR QUARTER.

"Payment of Federal unemployment tax for a calendar quarter or other time period within a calendar year pursuant to section 6157 shall be considered payment on account of the tax imposed by chapter 23 of such calendar year."

(d) TIME TAX CONSIDERED PAID.—Section 6513 of such Code (relating to time return deemed filed and tax considered paid) is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"(e) PAYMENTS OF FEDERAL UNEMPLOYMENT TAX.—Notwithstanding subsection (a), for purposes of section 6511 any payment of tax imposed by chapter 23 which, pursuant to section 6157, is made for a calendar quarter or other period within a calendar year shall, if made before the last day prescribed for filing the return for the calendar year (determined without regard to any extension of time for filing), be considered made on such last day."

(e) INTEREST ON UNDERPAYMENTS OR NONPAYMENT OF TAX.—Section 6601 of such Code (relating to interest on underpayment or nonpayment of tax) is amended by redesignating subsection (k) as subsection (l) and by adding a new subsection (k) to read as follows:

"(k) EXCEPTION AS TO FEDERAL UNEMPLOYMENT TAX.—This section shall not apply to any failure to make a payment of tax imposed by section 3301 for a calendar quarter or other period within a taxable year required under authority of section 6157."

(f) TECHNICAL AND CLERICAL AMENDMENTS.—

(1) The table of sections for subchapter A of chapter 62 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 is amended by striking out

"Sec. 6157. Payment of taxes under provisions of the Tariff Act."

and inserting in lieu thereof

"Sec. 6157. Payment of Federal unemployment tax on quarterly or other time period basis."

"Sec. 6158. Payment of taxes under provisions of the Tariff Act."

(2) The table of sections for subchapter B of chapter 64 of such Code is amended by adding at the end thereof the following:

"Sec. 6317. Payments of Federal unemployment tax for calendar quarter."

SEC. 3. EMPLOYMENT SECURITY ADMINISTRATION ACCOUNT.

(a) Paragraph (3) of section 901(c) of the Social Security Act is amended to read as follows:

"(3) For purposes of paragraph (1)(A), the limitation on the amount authorized to be made available for any fiscal year is an amount equal to 95 percent of the amount estimated and set forth in the budget of the United States Government for such fiscal year as the net receipts during such year under the Federal Unemployment Tax Act; except that this limitation is increased by any unexpended amount retained in the employment security administration account in accordance with section 901(f)(2)(B). Each estimate of net receipts under this paragraph shall be based upon a tax rate of 0.4 percent."

(b) Paragraph (2) of section 901(f) of such Act is amended (1) by striking out "The" and inserting in lieu thereof "(A) Except as provided in subparagraph (B), the", and (2) by adding at the end thereof the following:

"(B) With respect to the fiscal years ending June 30, 1970, June 30, 1971, and June 30, 1972, the balance in the employment security administration account at the close of each such fiscal year shall not be considered excess but shall be retained in the account for use as provided in paragraph (1) of subsection (c)."

SEC. 4. EFFECTIVE DATE.

(a) The amendments made by the first two sections of this Act shall apply with respect to calendar years beginning after December 31, 1969.

(b) The amendments made by section 3 shall take effect upon enactment of this Act.

With the following committee amendments:

On page 2, beginning in line 13, strike out "re-designating" and all that follows through line 15, and insert: "striking out section 6157 and by inserting in lieu thereof the following:"

On page 3, lines 17 and 18, strike out "subsection (c)," and insert: subsections (c) and (d).

On page 4, strike out the quotation marks at the end of line 9 and after line 9 insert:

"(d) SPECIAL RULE WHERE ACCUMULATED AMOUNT DOES NOT EXCEED \$100.—Nothing in this section shall require the payment of tax with respect to any calendar quarter or other period if the tax under section 3301 for such period, plus any unpaid amounts for prior periods in the calendar year, does not exceed \$100."

On page 5, line 4, strike out "time".

On page 6, strike out the last line of the matter following line 9 and insert quotation

marks at the end of the preceding line in such matter.

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

TAX TREATMENT OF INDIVIDUALS SERVING ON U.S.S. "PUEBLO"

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (H.R. 8654) to provide that, for purposes of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954, individuals who were illegally detained during 1968 by North Korea shall be treated as serving in a combat zone, which was unanimously reported to the House by the Committee on Ways and Means.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object—and I certainly do not intend to object—I do so in order to yield to the gentleman from Arkansas, the chairman of the Ways and Means Committee, for a brief explanation.

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, I thank my friend, the gentleman from Wisconsin, for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, the purpose of H.R. 8654, as reported by the Committee on Ways and Means, is to afford members of the crew of the U.S.S. *Pueblo*, who were illegally detained by North Korea, the same treatment for purposes of the tax laws as if they had served in a Presidentially designated combat zone during the period of their detention by North Korea.

Mr. Speaker, under present law four tax benefits are provided for members of our Armed Forces who are in active service in a Presidentially designated combat zone:

First, section 112 of the Internal Revenue Code presently provides an income tax exclusion for pay received for active service by a member of the Armed Forces for any month during which he either served in a combat zone or was hospitalized as a result of wounds, disease, or injury incurred while serving in a combat zone. In the case of an enlisted person, the exclusion applies to all his pay. In the case of a commissioned officer, the exclusion applies to up to \$500 per month of his pay.

Second, section 692 of the code presently provides for a waiver of income tax of a member of the Armed Forces who dies while in active service in a combat zone or as a result of wounds, disease, or injury incurred while in service in a combat zone. This waiver applies to the taxable year in which the death occurs and also to any income tax for any other years which is unpaid at the date of his death.

Third, section 2201 of the code now provides an exception from the Federal estate tax—except that part against which a credit for State death taxes may be taken—for any member of the Armed

Forces who is killed in action while in active service in a combat zone or who dies as a result of wounds, disease, or injury suffered while in active service in a combat zone.

Fourth, and finally, Mr. Speaker, present section 7508 of the code provides for an extension of time for performing various actions such as filing tax returns, paying taxes, or filing a claim for credit or refund of tax applicable to any individual who is serving in the Armed Forces or in support thereof in a combat zone or who is hospitalized outside of the United States as a result of an injury received while serving in a combat zone.

Mr. Speaker, the applicability of the four provisions I have just enumerated is conditioned on the person being in service in a combat zone. A combat zone under present law is defined as an area which the President designates by Executive order as an area in which the U.S. Armed Forces are engaged in combat. Vietnam and adjacent waters is the only area currently designated by the President as a combat zone. As a result, the four tax provisions discussed above currently are applicable only with respect to service in Vietnam or adjacent waters.

Mr. Speaker, in view of the hardships, maltreatment, and loss of life incurred by the *Pueblo* crew during their detention by North Korea and the obvious comparability of the hazards of combat to the risks to which they were subjected, the Committee on Ways and Means believes it is appropriate to extend to the *Pueblo* crew the same tax benefits which are available with respect to service in a combat zone. H.R. 8654, therefore, provides that the crew of the *Pueblo* are to be treated as serving in a Presidentially designated combat zone during the period that they were illegally detained by North Korea. They therefore would receive the four tax benefits that presently attend service in a combat zone.

Mr. Speaker, the Committee on Ways and Means is unanimous in recommending approval of H.R. 8654 by the House.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from Washington (Mrs. MAY).

Mrs. MAY. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 8654, to provide that, for purposes of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954, individuals who were illegally detained during 1968 by the Democratic People's Republic of Korea shall be treated as serving in a combat zone.

As author of a similar measure, H.R. 8653, I wish to commend the esteemed chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means for introducing this measure and setting aside the tax reform hearings long enough to take up and approve this legislation for the personnel of the U.S.S. *Pueblo*.

H.R. 8654, Mr. Speaker, will not only correct an injustice, but it will also provide the officers and crewmen of the *Pueblo* a pecuniary award as a visible token of our country's gratitude for their service and as partial compensation for the hardships they endured at the hands of the North Koreans.

I should like to briefly outline the reasons for my introduction of legislation

in this area and to explain the reasons this special legislation is necessary.

I first became aware of the situation in March of this year when I received a letter from the father of one of the returned crewmembers. A few telephone calls to the Navy Department and the Internal Revenue Service verified what the sailor's father had told me. The 82-member crew of the *Pueblo* had discovered that after an 11-month captivity, Uncle Sam had to levy tax on their pay which they earned during the period of their ordeal in North Korea.

It was a quirk of fate that the crew members had found themselves in this quandry, because had they been officially designated as prisoners of war, or had they been in Vietnam at the time of their capture, they would not have been subjected to such taxation.

However, because they happened to be assigned to North Korean waters and not to Vietnam, under the law they were not legally classified as having served within a combat zone. The members of the *Pueblo* crew, therefore, were not subject to the special tax treatment that would have been theirs had they been in a hostile war area like Vietnam. Yet, these crewmembers have been unfortunate enough to have undergone continuing torture just as though they had been prisoners of war in a combat zone.

To my way of thinking, Mr. Speaker, a lessening of their tax burden is a very small thing for us to do for them in return.

H.R. 8654 will provide the crew members of the *Pueblo*, during the period of their captivity in North Korea, the same Federal tax treatment that is accorded members of our Armed Forces who serve in officially designated combat zones. Its enactment, it seems to me, is the least we can do for the gallant officers and men of the *Pueblo*.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I support H.R. 8654, a bill to extend to the crew of the *Pueblo* certain income tax benefits that are available to members of the Armed Forces serving in a combat zone.

Under present law, the military pay received by enlisted members of the Armed Forces is excluded from taxable income for months during which they served in a combat zone. A similar exclusion limited to \$500 a month is made applicable to officers serving in a combat zone. Additionally, income taxes due when an individual dies while in active service in a combat zone or as a result of wounds, disease or injury incurred in a combat zone and not paid at the date of death are waived. A similar exception is provided for Federal estate tax. Finally, individuals are granted an extension under present law for filing tax returns, paying taxes, or filing a claim for credit or refund while they are serving in a combat zone or convalescing from injuries received in a combat zone and for 180 days thereafter.

Under the law, a combat zone is any area designated by the President by executive order as an area in which the Armed Forces of the United States are engaged in combat. Vietnam and adjacent waters is the only area currently designated as a combat zone.

The risks and sacrifices endured by the *Pueblo* crew during their incarceration required a sacrifice on behalf of both the crew and their families that was as great as any they would be subjected to if the crew had served in a combat zone. The circumstances under which the *Pueblo* crew was imprisoned in Korea are the kind of circumstances that are contemplated by the combat pay exclusion, but the benefits of the law are not afforded the crew due to the definition of a combat zone. This legislation will provide that the *Pueblo* crew will be considered to have served in a combat zone during the period of their detention in North Korea. The bill will extend the intent and philosophy of the combat pay exclusion to the members of the crew of the U.S.S. *Pueblo*. I strongly urge my colleagues to join me in supporting this legislation.

Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation.

THE SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

H.R. 8654

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, for purposes of sections 112, 692, 2201, and 7508 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954, individuals who were illegally detained (or who died while being illegally detained) by the Democratic People's Republic of Korea at any time during the calendar year 1968 shall be treated while so detained as serving in an area designated by the President of the United States by Executive order as a combat zone for purposes of section 112 and during the period designated by the President by Executive order as the period of combatant activities in such zone for purposes of such section.

SEC. 2. The provisions of this Act shall apply—

(1) for purposes of section 112 of such Code, with respect to compensation received for periods of active service after December 31, 1967, in taxable years ending after such date;

(2) for purposes of sections 692 and 2201 of such Code, with respect to decedents dying after December 31, 1967; and

(3) for purposes of section 7508 of such Code, with respect to individuals who were detained after December 31, 1967.

With the following committee amendment:

On page 1, line 4, after "were" insert: "removed from a United States vessel and".

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PERMISSION TO REVISE AND EXTEND

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that I may be permitted to revise and extend the remarks I made in connection with the bills just passed and also that the sponsors of the bills desiring to do so may be permitted to include their remarks prior to the passage of each of the bills.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to

the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

There was no objection.

THE MYSTERY OF THE 77-DAY SALE OF SECRETARY KENNEDY'S STOCK OPTION

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

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, the Treasury Department has created as much confusion as possible about the Secretary's \$1.2 million stock option with the Continental-Illinois National Bank.

Through the Treasury's General Counsel, Paul W. Eggers, the Treasury Department has dropped a heavy curtain of fog in hopes that the press and the Congress will be fooled about the true nature of this most amazing transaction.

At the time of his confirmation, Secretary Kennedy attempted to indicate that he would either exercise or relinquish the option to buy 30,855 shares of Continental-Illinois National Bank stock before he took the oath of office. The fact is that Secretary Kennedy exercised this option after he became Secretary.

The Treasury's General Counsel issued this statement April 29 in an effort to confuse what has happened on the stock option:

Mr. Kennedy exercised the option and within a few days thereafter sold all the shares so acquired. From my discussions with the people who handled this sale, I determined that this was an arms-length transaction. Mr. Kennedy has completely divested himself of any interest whatsoever in this stock.

The Wall Street Journal, of Friday May 9, has thrown some important new light on Mr. Eggers' statement.

The Wall Street Journal quotes a Treasury official as saying that Mr. Kennedy sold his 30,855 shares on April 9.

Mr. Speaker, I know from other sources—and this cannot be contradicted—that Secretary Kennedy notified the Continental-Illinois National Bank late in the afternoon of January 22 that he had decided to exercise his option on this stock. In other words, on January 22, Mr. Kennedy cemented his legal right to that block of stock.

After that date—January 22—the value of the bank stock became of utmost importance to David M. Kennedy.

Any time after January 22, the Secretary had control of those 30,855 shares. They were not in a trust. They were controlled in such a manner as to give Mr. Kennedy a direct pecuniary interest in the shares while he served as Secretary of the Treasury.

Now the Wall Street Journal of last Friday reveals, from a Treasury source, that this stock was actually not disposed of until April 9. Mr. Kennedy had the right to that stock and the actual control of it for 77 days while he served as Secretary of the Treasury in the Cabinet of President Nixon.

Mr. Paul W. Eggers was engaging in a blatant and disgraceful effort to mislead the Congress and the American pub-

lic when he issued his news release on April 29. Mr. Eggers said:

Mr. Kennedy exercised the option and within a few days thereafter sold all the shares so acquired.

Now what Mr. Eggers was pulling was a fast shuffle of dates. He was using some of the technical aspects of the stock transaction to indicate that Secretary Kennedy had legal right to the 30,855 shares for only a few days. What Mr. Eggers was referring to was an actual physical delivery of the option on April 7 and the actual sale on April 9.

But, what Mr. Eggers leaves out—in an attempt to mislead—is that Secretary Kennedy decided to exercise that option on January 22 and so notified the bank by telegram. He did not sell that stock “a few days thereafter” the January 22 date as alleged by Mr. Eggers. He sold it 77 days later.

Why does Secretary Kennedy persist in playing this misleading game with the Congress and the public? Why does he not tell all the facts with dates, places, and times? And most important, why does he not tell us who handled the transaction and who bought the stock?

This is a very large block of bank stock. It is many more times what is normally traded on any given day. Therefore, it was undoubtedly a negotiated sale. And, if this is the case, it is essential that we know all the facts about the negotiations.

Mr. Speaker, it is also important that we have firm information about the actual date that Secretary Kennedy sold this stock. The Wall Street Journal quotes an anonymous Treasury source about the April 9 date. This may be the correct date but this can be determined only if we are furnished essential papers involved in the transaction. In light of the recent statements that have been issued by the Treasury Department, it would be foolish to accept the report of a “Treasury source” as the final word. We must have more evidence than this.

I think it is obvious that Secretary Kennedy is fearful of making the facts known because he realizes that the holding of the legal rights to this stock constituted a violation of section 208 of title 18 of the United States Code, because he was able to affect its value through official acts.

The penalty for violation of this section is a fine of not more than \$10,000 and a prison term of not more than 2 years or both.

He also knows that the exercising of the option and the buying and the selling of the stock and other activities he has engaged in are questionable practices under section 1003 of title 31 of the United States Code. A person violating this section “shall be deemed guilty of a high misdemeanor and forfeit to the United States the penalty of \$3,000, and shall upon conviction be removed from office, and forever thereafter be incapable of holding any office under the United States.” This section is traced directly back to the original act of September 2, 1789, which created the Treasury Department and which set out provisions to prevent conflicts of interest in that Department.

Mr. Speaker, I do not think that this Congress can allow a Secretary of the Treasury and his General Counsel to engage in hoodwinking the public about these issues without some sort of specific accounting. I intend to get to the bottom of this matter and to learn all the facts about this stock option. I hope these facts come to the Banking and Currency Committee on a voluntary basis and I hope that President Nixon will do whatever is needed to see that this information is furnished.

Mr. Speaker, today I have discussed only the stock option which Secretary Kennedy has engaged in since he took office. As I have noted elsewhere, the Secretary has many other ties to the Continental-Illinois National Bank. All of these ties should be severed if he desires to continue as Secretary of the Treasury.

THE PARAMOUNT IMPORTANCE THAT JUDICIAL INTEGRITY OF THE SUPREME COURT BE ENTIRELY ABOVE SUSPICION

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

Mr. BUSH. Mr. Speaker, at a time when our entire system is subject to severe strain, it is of paramount importance that the judicial integrity of the Supreme Court, and each of its members, be entirely above suspicion. Justice Fortas is no longer above justifiable general suspicion; therefore, I think, it is proper for us to expect him to resign.

Though my personal views may be contrary, for the purposes of argument, let us assume that Justice Fortas sincerely believes in the propriety of his actions and that they were motivated by sincere ideals or beliefs. He has still exercised careless judgment and this is not a valid defense to the charge that he has by his injudicious actions compromised the integrity of our Supreme Court in the mind of the public.

It is more accurate to say that as of now he has compromised only one Justice, but if he remains on the bench barring reprimand by the Court itself, he will compromise the whole Court because the public will feel—and with some justification—that he remains there only because the rest of the Court allowed him to do so.

To the average American reading a magazine or newspaper article on the situation, it will seem a natural conclusion that the Court is crooked. The intricacies of the Constitution and the judicial system will not appeal to him. And later when he reads that the Justice is still there he will again conclude that the Court is crooked, but this time with stronger doubts about the system and the correctness of his own ethical standards. And I find this possibility extremely disturbing.

By admitting that he accepted money he should not have, Mr. Fortas admitted that he was guilty of a judicial impropriety which, when it becomes public knowledge, requires his resignation regardless of any question of actual illegality.

Not many of us consider money deposited in a bank account and 11 months later “returned” or repaid in equal amount to be money that was “not accepted.” The distinction between “tendered” and “accepted” is one that does not make sense to me or to the public. Whether or not Justice Fortas’ statement represents an accurate portrayal of his subjective thought processes is immaterial, because millions who read it are generally convinced that he is not telling the truth. And I am convinced that we cannot afford, or at least we need not afford, to have a man sitting on the Supreme Court whom the general public believes to be untruthful.

Unfortunately, experience has proven that our society and present institutions can withstand general public awareness of impropriety and even illegality on the part of prominent members of the executive and legislative branches. I have never felt that we should accept this and have fought for higher ethical standards since my election to the House of Representatives. Now at a time when the Supreme Court, the highest symbol of law and order, is under attack—at a time when the concept of law and order itself is under attack—it seems to me that it is fair to ask whether or not we can afford a general suspicion of the judicial integrity of the Supreme Court. It seems to me that every high official in this country should be very careful about his legal and moral obligations. This is simply not a good time to be careless or to let impropriety go unnoticed.

This incident will cause harm to this country however it goes. I think a prompt resignation would tend to minimize the harm. It is true that the public will in time forget the details of this unhappy case, but if no action is taken there will remain a residual decrease in the general adherence to the principle of the rule of law, the ultimate effect of which no one can accurately forecast or calculate.

Mr. Speaker, I call upon Justice Fortas to promptly resign from the Supreme Court.

LADY CABINET OFFICERS

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

Mr. FULTON of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, some time ago Assistant Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, Patricia Hitt, is alleged to have told a news conference:

I would not today give you the name of a single woman who would have the background, training and ability to head a Cabinet department—and who would also be free to do the job.

Mr. Speaker, as you may no doubt have guessed, this remark, whether taken in or out of context, immediately drew the ire of hundreds of thousands of American women who know full well that there are very many able and distinguished women in this country who are as well-qualified and could do as well a job in the Cabinet or at any level of government as any man.

One of those who protested Secretary Hitt's comment was Mrs. Drue Smith. Mrs. Smith voiced her views in a letter to the editor of the Washington Evening Star which was printed on Friday, February 21, 1969.

Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I include Mrs. Smith's letter in the RECORD at this point, and commend it to the attention of my colleagues, particularly those female colleagues who we are also privileged to have here in the House of Representatives and who serve so ably, with such dedication and with such ability:

LADY CABINET OFFICERS

SIR: I hesitate to disagree with one so charming as Assistant HEW Secretary Patricia Hitt, but I am compelled to speak out on behalf of "my fellow women." I was shocked at her statement, as quoted in the press: "I could not today give you the name of a single woman who would have the background, training and ability to head a Cabinet department—and who also would be free to do the job."

From wide ranging and long observation of groups such as Business and Professional Women, Radio and TV Women, Newspaper Women, the National Council of Negro Women, women in government and political parties and from serving on the Defense Advisory Committee with distinguished women from 50 States, I can tick off names which jump to mind without time for research.

For instance, from the House (the same dome from which sprung Melvin Laird) there are Reps. Leonore Sullivan, Charlotte Reid, Patsy Mink, Catherine May, Margaret Heckler, Martha Griffiths, Florence Dwyer, Edith Green, Shirley Chisholm, and Julia B. Hansen. From the Senate: Margaret Chase Smith.

From successful business empires: Olive Beech (Beech Aircraft), Joan Crawford (Pepsi Cola), Lucille Ball (Desi-Lu), Mildred Custin (Genesco), Mary Wells (who got a whole airline off the ground), Gwen Cafritz, Jacqueline Cochran, and Senator Louise Gore (combination of government and business).

True, many of these outstanding women are already too involved in their field they may have no free time. But, would they serve their country, if asked? Robert McNamara did, and, more recently, Winton Blount.

From the arts: Marya Mannes, Shirley Temple Black, Susan Sontag, Gloria Vanderbilt. From government councils: Marietta Tree, Eva Adams, Eleanor Guggenheimer, Esther Peterson (also Labor). From the political arena: Mary Brooks and Elly Peterson.

From education: Dr. Bennetta Washington and Dr. Margaret Mead; from the law, Patricia Harris; from publishing, Katherine Graham and Ruth Sulzberger Golden; from communications, Pauline Frederick, Liz Trotta, Fay Wells, and Nancy Dickerson, and from Defense Services, Col. Elizabeth Holsington, USA, and Capt. Rita Lenihan, USN.

The list is growing off the page, but there are still Dorothy Helght, Mary Lasker, Coretta King, Mrs. Lyndon Johnson, judges, doctors, scientists, community leaders ad infinitum. And let us not forget those long time "Washington Watchers," Mary McGory, Marie Smith and Sarah McClendon, who would be qualified to quote Mrs. Hitt, "by background, training and ability." They would certainly have needed no orientation or transition period.

The women mentioned are the highly publicized ones who come to mind instantly. There are many just as capable, who are known only by the people with whom they work in their field or specialty. They should

be ferreted out by recommendations of their colleagues, the way many men are chosen. Where did they find a Pat Hitt or an Esther Peterson in the first place?

The sad thing is that Mrs. Hitt is now in a position to recommend but instead of uncovering talented members of her sex she states they are "not qualified for cabinet positions." I strongly disagree. They are as well qualified as George Romney, Walter Hickel and others.

This foot-in-the-mouth statement cannot be blamed on Spiro T. Agnew.

DRUE SMITH.

REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION: RELIEF OF INNER CITY ISOLATION

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

Mr. GUDE. Mr. Speaker, Mayor Walter Washington has proclaimed this week of May 11 as District of Columbia Transportation Week, it is indeed appropriate that today legislation supported by President Nixon is being introduced in the House which will authorize the 97-mile regional rapid rail transit for Metropolitan Washington.

This legislation of which I am a co-sponsor calls for the Federal support of this regional transit system in the amount of \$1.047 billion for the remaining Federal share for the proposed Washington area subway, with funds to be appropriated over a 12-year period. The local jurisdictions of Maryland and Virginia and the District participating in this regional compact authority, have already committed themselves to \$573.5 million support for their local share. With the Federal share this will make possible the funding for the badly needed rail transit system here.

However, enactment of this legislation will be of little consequence unless the local District of Columbia government discards its tragic policy of isolationism as demonstrated by its failure to implement long-held regional transportation plans. I am deeply troubled with the continuing course of the city government to isolate the city from the metropolitan area by its refusal to support the concept of regional freeways. The area's burgeoning suburban counties, faced with the demands of growth and for the movement of goods and people, will be looking to lateral and not radial transportation routes to the growing commercial and residential satellites in the 30-mile radius of the Capitol. One of the first effects of this will be an ever-increasing tax base for the suburbs, and an ever-diminishing tax base for the District.

At the present time only about 30 percent of Montgomery County's wage-earners work in the District, and about 25 percent of Prince George's wage-earners do likewise. From this it is easy to see that the majority of the Maryland wage earners make their livings in their own counties. With the prevailing and apparent continuing pattern of transportation planning implementation in the city, it would appear that "the donut" around the city will continue to grow at the expense of the city.

The Washington Sunday Star edi-

torial of May 11, 1969, sets forth the challenges facing the National Capitol region and the administration to resolve Washington area transportation problems. I commend it to the attention of my colleagues and everyone concerned with a solution. The article follows:

TOWARD AN AREA TRANSPORTATION COMPROMISE

The most sensible assertion to emerge from the recent tumult and shouting at the District Building over Washington's transportation controversy was a wry comment by Deputy Mayor Fletcher. Someone else, he observed in a moment of frustration the other day, is going to have to step into the picture and resolve the issue. He is right.

The current political deadlock between Congress and the city government is blocking the construction of both freeways and the area's rail transit program. In brief, Congress has put a hold on further transit appropriations until the District complies with a 1968 law which ordered an immediate start on a moderate degree of freeway construction. City officials, responding to anti-highway protests from the community, have refused to budge.

Fletcher's own efforts to seek a rational way out of this absurd impasse through conversations with House members fell apart last week. Mayor Washington, returning from an out-of-town trip, had nothing of value to add. City Council Chairman Gilbert Hahn's contribution was a series of anti-highway pronouncements which served merely to compound the confusion. For the moment, Congress is awaiting further developments.

This destructive stalemate, which has prevailed for months, might well be a hopeless standoff if the scenario involved the same old characteristics who held the stage in the Johnson administration.

Fortunately, the cast is not the same. The notable new face is President Nixon's Secretary of Transportation, John A. Volpe, who thus far has not tipped his hand as to his position in the dispute.

His firm obligation, however, is to see that it ends. As a newcomer to the scene, Volpe is bound by none of the policies of his predecessor. Owing no commitments to anyone, he is free to move on his own toward a realistic compromise. There are three lines of activity that he ought to pursue.

As a first order of business, Secretary Volpe should use the full weight of his office to try to persuade Congress to release, immediately, the rapid transit funds which are being held hostage. He should couple this action with assurances to Congress that the administration is determined to see freeway construction resumed. And he should assure the community, finally, that the highways involved will be built in a manner to enhance the values of the city rather than destroy them.

This triple undertaking is formidable, but when the facts are viewed in perspective, surely not impossible. One major problem is that too many aspects of the controversy by now are almost totally obscured by emotionalism.

The myth persists, for example, and indeed it is being nurtured by those who oppose "another inch" of freeways in Washington, that the real choice is between freeways and subways. The truth is that the two systems of transportation have been carefully planned as parts of a single program, each dependent on the other, neither sufficient alone. By permitting the rail transit program to proceed now, Congress can defuse the emotionalism on this point at least.

There is a more important reason, however, for unfreezing the rapid-transit money. Construction costs have escalated to such a point that a further delay of any consequence could wreck the financial structure of the entire project. Thus far, about \$44.5 million has

already been spent to pull together the transit plan, which has the support of the whole region. Actual construction could begin within 75 days of the date Congress releases the funds. This program must be allowed to go ahead.

In the effort to revive the highway program, there are other distortions and misunderstandings which also need to be set straight.

Council Chairman Hahn has been saying, for instance, that the "real issue" posed by Congress' 1968 directive is between freeways and housing, the implication being that the city must choose one or the other. On the same theme he says that the council's main concern is the proposed North-Central road between the District and Maryland.

But the fact is that two of the four projects which Congress ordered last year involve no housing displacement—and a third is already under way. As to the North-Central proposal, Congress specifically authorized a period of further study. Its construction at the moment, in other words, is not even at issue.

The freeway opponents make one point, especially relating to housing, which is valid, and with which we agree. For too long, urban freeways have been built merely to serve the single purpose of moving vehicular traffic. But there is no reason why modern freeways need be merely ribbons of concrete. Indeed, properly planned, they need not decrease the total supply of city housing by a single dwelling unit. Through the utilization of air space, through ingenious architectural design and through the coordination of public highway and housing programs, new freeways have the potential to produce positive social and economic values which cities desperately need. This thought, which is not new, has been very slow in maturing. But it is not too late for Secretary Volpe, if he will do it, to use the vast technological resources available to Transportation Department to develop and apply this concept in the Washington area.

The first responsibility of the administration, however, is to pull together a proposal which will enable the Washington area's circulatory system to develop as it should.

Chairman Hahn argues, quite absurdly, that the District government is powerless to comply with Congress' freeway directive since the City Council and the National Capital Planning Commission formally adopted a thoroughfare plan last December which specifically rejected some of the projects ordered by Congress. He cites, in partial defense of this claim, a provision of a 1962 federal highway law requiring that freeways must comply with "comprehensive" plans.

One fallacy of that argument is that the 1962 requirement related specifically to plans of a regional nature in urban areas, not to those of central cities alone. Last February, in fact, the Washington area's duly constituted regional transportation planning agency adopted a resolution accusing the District council and planning commission of improperly precluding regional review of their December plan. And in mid-March, the Department of Housing and Urban Development—whose grants to the District and other local areas are supposed to be contingent on compliance with regional plans—also questioned the legality of the council plan.

Whatever the facts may be as to the legal argument, however, the council's plan is wrong in concept.

It is based essentially on the supposition that, if no more freeways are built, no more automobiles will come into the District. A lack of freeways, of course, would not stop the automobiles. They would continue to flow in, and they would saturate existing city streets to the inevitable detriment of established residential and commercial neighborhoods.

The greatest error of all in this destructive idea, however, is the apparent notion that the inner city does not have to worry about its communications with the suburbs. Actually, the future well-being of Washington depends upon a steadily increasing degree of regional cohesion—in transportation no less than in housing and employment. The District cannot survive in isolation.

A COMMISSION ON GOVERNMENT FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

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

Mr. NELSEN. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing for the entire Republican membership of the District of Columbia Committee and for our distinguished minority leader, the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. GERALD R. FORD), a bill to establish a Commission on Government for the District of Columbia. This is the proposal referred to by President Nixon in his message to the Congress laying out his program for the District of Columbia.

It is the purpose of our bill to establish this Commission with the duties and responsibilities to study and determine ways in which the structure of the government of the District of Columbia may be improved and the methods by which the residents of the District of Columbia may achieve a greater voice and responsibility in their local government. This purpose is in accord with the statement in the President's message wherein he said:

My aim is to increase the responsibility and efficiency of the District of Columbia's new government which has performed so ably during its first perilous years.

Our Nation's Capital City is certainly unique among cities in the Nation in that it is constitutionally the seat of our National Government. This fact in itself results in peculiar problems and conditions which are of interest and concern to the Congress and to all citizens who recognize Washington as their Nation's Capital. Naturally, this Federal interest contributes to the unique problems of the government of the District of Columbia. It is in this area that the Reorganization Plan of 1967 left some questions unanswered, and I trust that this Commission when it is established will do a complete study of the conflicting agencies and authorities which have been established independent of the District Government itself and the proper role they should play in the affairs of our city. These would include such agencies as the National Capital Housing Authority, the National Capital Planning Commission, the National Capital Transportation Agency, the Redevelopment Land Agency, just to name a few.

Unique as our National Capital City may be in some respects, I am sure we all recognize that it is not unique at all in the various metropolitan problems which do exist here. We know something of the crime rate here, of the problems of the educational system, the transportation system—or lack of it—housing problems and various other municipal matters which are common to all the major cities in the Nation today.

I point up these matters to indicate that a Commission on Government for the District of Columbia has a huge task ahead of it and to point up the fact that our primary purpose in establishing such a Commission is to seek the best and most responsible government possible for our Nation's Capital City. To make it possible for the Congress to act in the public interest, we are asking this proposed Commission to take a broad-based view of the present government of the District and to recommend to us structural changes that would complement its proposals for a greater degree of responsible self-government. The citizens of the District of Columbia should have a meaningful voice in the affairs of our city government, but I know we all recognize that the mere provision for self-government is no end in itself, and to accomplish our overall objectives we must emphasize the broad approach to the question of how to provide the best, the most efficient, and most responsible government possible for Washington, D.C.

JOINT MEETING ON SPECIAL COMMITTEE ON SCIENCE POLICY OF THE CANADIAN SENATE AND MEMBERS OF THE COMMITTEE ON SCIENCE AND ASTRONAUTICS

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

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, I deem it well worth noting that on last Thursday, May 8, a joint meeting took place between 15 members of the Special Committee on Science Policy of the Canadian Senate and members of the Committee on Science and Astronautics, which I have the honor to chair.

So far as is known this was the first meeting of its kind, although it was not a formal proceeding of the Congress.

The Canadian committee was headed by Chairman Maurice Lamontagne, of Quebec, and met with the Science Subcommittee of the House Committee on Science and Astronautics, headed by the gentleman from Connecticut, Representative DADDARIO, and other members of the committee.

The legislators of the two committees discussed a variety of mutual problems as well as legislative mechanisms for handling the great potentials and dangers posed by a rapidly developing technology. I should like to emphasize my belief that, as this meeting and our space efforts have shown, the unique character of science makes it a useful tool for the assistance of diplomatic missions as well as for intrinsic merit.

Sir Hugh Enor, Secretary of the Department of Education and Science of Australia, also attended the meeting, and we were most grateful that our distinguished minority leader, the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. GERALD FORD), took time out from his busy schedule to join with us.

The meeting evolved from a series of informal discussions held with Canadian and State Department officials over the past several years—and is the first time

a Canadian Senate committee has conferred outside its own country as a group.

Members of Parliament present were Maurice Lamontagne, committee chairman; Donald Cameron, vice chairman; Rheel Belisle, Maurice Bourget, Chesley Carter, Allister Grosart, Mary Kinnear, Louis Giguere, James Haig, Frederick McGrand, Orville Phillips, Joseph Sullivan, and Paul Yuzyk.

Committee Research Directors Gilles Pacquet and Philip Pocock accompanied the group, as well as Patrick Savole, committee clerk.

We regretted very much the fact that the Speaker was prevented from joining us due to the untimely death of a loyal friend and servant who served with you for so many years. With the permission of the House, I should like to include in the RECORD at this time the remarks which the Speaker had planned to make at this occasion and which were presented to the Canadian group on his behalf:

STATEMENT BY SPEAKER McCORMACK

Mr. Chairman and my colleagues of the House: I am indeed delighted to be here this morning and to join with you in welcoming our fellow legislators from the great nation of Canada to this meeting of the members of our Committee on Science and Astronautics and the Senate Committee on Science Policy of the Canadian Parliament. I also want to extend a warm welcome to Sir Hugh Enor, Secretary of the Department of Science and Education of the Australian Parliament, who is going to sit with us today.

I am particularly pleased by the fact that an international meeting of political leaders deeply concerned with the relationship of science and government is taking place. It is an indication of steady growing awareness throughout world on the part of government leadership of profound importance in scientific research and applied technology to the welfare and continued progress of people everywhere.

I think it is singularly apropos to our time in history and the deep social unrests of society we are witnessing that we join together here in a serious discussion how best to bring the great benefits of science to our fellow citizens. The tasks involved in such an endeavor for your country and mine are indeed of enormous dimension and extreme complexity, and they will ever be insofar as we can perceive the future.

Science has given us enormous power. It has given us a wealth of knowledge which cannot possibly be fully comprehended. No nation can morally justify the hoarding or the withholding of that knowledge from other peoples who wish to lift themselves up out of poverty, disease and despair. Meetings such as these are the first steps that can be taken by enlightened governments such as yours and mine to attack the problem of establishing intelligent and workable policies that can be formulated in establishing the role of government in the use and application of science.

For many years during my tenure in the House, I have been deeply concerned with such meetings. I can look back over long and often difficult periods in which this country has been confronted by the awesome responsibility of world leadership. It has been our tremendous strength made possible by industry through science that has thrust that leadership upon us. As a legislator and a Member of the House of Representatives for 44 years, I have had the duty of participating in the creation and passage of many Acts of Congress that have had a direct bearing on the creation of that power,

and I assure you gentlemen, that I have been keenly aware of how heavy that responsibility can be. I believe that we have used science and its products as responsibly as frail and fallible men could possibly do. I also believe that Americans, Canadians, Australians and the other nations of our world community must continue the never-ending search for knowledge on how our governments can turn the fruits of research toward the creation of a world filled with hope and blessed by peace.

SUPREME COURT PROBLEMS EMPHASIZE NEED FOR A COURT OF ETHICS FOR ALL GOVERNMENT SERVICE

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

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. Speaker, I have for several years supported the idea of establishing a Court of Ethics to make decisions on alleged improprieties in Government—legislative, executive, and judicial.

Theoretically, cases of serious misbehavior are supposed to be handled by impeachment. As a practical matter, only questions of very grave consequence are usually so handled; and it has become almost customary to consider impeachment to be limited to cases of moral turpitude. The American people deserve better oversight of the department of Government officials than that.

Problems now present in the Supreme Court are in my opinion of the sort that should be handled by a Court of Ethics such as I have suggested in House Joint Resolution 116, which reads as follows:

H.J. Res. 116

Joint resolution to establish a Court of Ethics to hear complaints of unethical conduct in Government service

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Congress hereby affirms and declares that public office is a public trust which requires the exercise of high ethical standards in the official conduct of Federal employees and officeholders. To achieve and maintain the ethical standards in Government to which the American public is entitled, there is need for a permanent court charged with the responsibilities specified in this joint resolution.

ESTABLISHMENT OF A COURT OF ETHICS

SEC. 2. The President shall appoint, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, a chief judge and two associate judges who shall constitute a court of record known as the United States Court of Ethics. Not more than two of such judges shall be appointed from the same political party.

TENURE AND SALARIES OF JUDGES

SEC. 3. Judges of the Court of Ethics shall hold office during good behavior. Each shall receive a salary of \$30,000 a year.

DUTIES OF CHIEF JUDGE; PRECEDENCE OF JUDGES

SEC. 4. (a) The chief judge of the Court of Ethics, with the approval of the court, shall supervise the fiscal affairs and clerical force of the court. The chief judge shall assign or reassign, under rules of the court, any case for hearing, determination, or both; and promulgate dockets.

(b) The chief judge shall have precedence and preside at any session of the court which he attends. If he is temporarily unable to perform his duties as such, they shall be performed by the judge in active service, who is present, able and qualified to act, and next in precedence.

(c) Judges shall have precedence and preside according to the seniority of their commissions. Judges whose commissions bear the same date shall have precedence according to seniority in age.

DUTIES OF THE COURT

SEC. 5. (a) The court shall hear complaints of unethical conduct by Federal officers and employees if it determines that such a hearing is of sufficient public interest and importance to be warranted. Such complaints shall be based on standards of conduct established by law or resolution, including those provided in title 18, United States Code, and in the concurrent resolution passed July 11, 1958 (72 Stat. B12). After hearing a complaint of unethical conduct in the Government service, the court shall render a decision on whether proper ethical principles have been violated and shall state all of its findings of fact, opinions, and the reasons for such decision. If the court determines there is probable cause for believing that any person is guilty of an act or omission which constitutes a violation of any law of the United States it shall forward a copy of its decision and all facts pertinent thereto to the Attorney General of the United States.

(b) If the court determines that ethical principles have been violated (1) by an officer or employee of an agency of the Federal Government it shall forward a copy of its decision to the head of such agency; (2) by a Member of the House of Representatives or an officer or employee thereof it shall forward a copy of its decision to the Speaker of the House of Representatives; (3) by a United States Senator or an officer or employee of the Senate it shall forward a copy of its decision to the President of the Senate; (4) by an officer or employee of the judicial branch of the Federal Government, it shall forward a copy of its decision to a judge of the court concerned; (5) by a person who may be impeached it shall forward a copy of its decision to the Speaker of the House of Representatives.

(c) Each person advised of a violation of ethical principles under this subsection may take such disciplinary action with respect to the officer or employee guilty of such violation as such person may deem appropriate and as is permitted by law.

(d) The court may render advisory opinions when requested to do so by the head of any Federal agency.

As used in this subsection—

(A) the term "agency of the Federal Government" includes any department, agency, independent establishment, commission, administration, authority, board, a bureau of the United States, or a corporation in which the United States is a majority stockholder; and

(B) the term "Member of the House of Representatives" means a Member of the United States House of Representatives and the Resident Commissioner from Puerto Rico.

SESSIONS

SEC. 6. The Court of Ethics may hold court at such times and places as it may fix by rule.

QUORUM

SEC. 7. Two judges of the Court of Ethics constitute a quorum. The concurrence of two judges is necessary to any decision of the court.

RULES OF PROCEDURE

SEC. 8. The proceedings of the Court of Ethics shall be conducted in accordance with such rules of practice and procedure as the Court of Ethics may prescribe and in accordance with the rules of evidence applicable in trials without a jury in the United States District Court for the District of Columbia.

PUBLICATION OF DECISIONS

SEC. 9. All decisions of the Court of Ethics shall be preserved, published, and open to inspection.

COURTS OF REVIEW

SEC. 10. The United States Courts of Appeal shall have exclusive jurisdiction to review the decisions of the Court of Ethics, except as provided in section 1254 of title 28 of the United States Code, in the same manner and to the same extent as decisions of the district courts in civil actions tried without a jury; and the judgment of such court shall be final, except that it shall be subject to review by the Supreme Court of the United States upon certiorari, in the manner provided in section 154 of title 8 of the United States Code.

EXPENSES OF THE COURT

SEC. 11. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary to carry out this joint resolution.

LEASING OF MANNED
SUBMERSIBLES

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

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, in reviewing the proposed budget for the Defense Department, I was both surprised and concerned to find that the entire program for leasing of manned submersibles has been eliminated.

In the way of background, the Office of Naval Research requested \$3 million to be used for leasing of submersibles for oceanographic work for fiscal year 1970. I would point out that this sum is not for use by Navy programs alone. The money represents a common pool and was to be used for all Government departments and agencies in addition to universities and private institutions, as well. Through this type of pool arrangement, the money and programs involved would be more coordinated and effective. Duplication, we had hoped would also be minimized if not eliminated.

Within 30 days after the notice of intent went out, more than 1,600 requests were filed with the Office of Naval Research. Even with the \$3 million, it is estimated that only between 300 and 400 dives could have been made.

I think we all agree that tight budgetary measures are needed in all areas of the Federal Government.

But in the case of the submersible pool, the budget does not cut to the proverbial bone, the budget amputates an entire limb which is vitally needed to the present and future development of oceanography and marine-related programs.

As we moved to unify our oceanographic efforts, we found that programs relating to oceanography were scattered in more than 20 governmental agencies and departments. The common submersible leasing pool was one of the first efforts to unify and consolidate these efforts.

This program is not a subsidy program. It is not research and development for the sake of improving industry's capability in the area of manned submersibles. Nor is it to be considered a pilot project as the Government and universities have been leasing submersibles for some time now.

Indeed, industry has invested more than \$100 million since 1962 in the area of developing manned and unmanned submersibles. Industry has done this because of its confidence in the future of

oceanography. And I might add that this investment and this confidence has grown despite the Federal Government's lack of aggressive nature in the field of oceanography.

But now even the \$3 million set aside for leasing of submersibles apparently is marked for the chopping block. I think this will have an adverse effect on industry's faith in the Federal Government's interest in ocean work. The \$3 million will not make nor break any of the almost 20 companies which now have submersibles for lease. That is not the question.

It would mean that the Government is canceling all marine work which involves the use of submersibles other than those which the Navy now has outside of lease arrangements.

There is a great demand for the use of submersibles, as witnessed by the requests of more than 1,600 for the common lease pool funds. The Government is engaged in many activities which need the service of submersibles and we should not completely terminate our efforts.

I feel it would be a grave error to allow all funding to halt in this area. When the Government should be taking strides to move our oceanographic effort, this budget cut represents a giant step backward.

It would mean, in theory, that when we are prepared to resume Sea Lab III operations, the Government would be without funds for a submersible to survey and monitor those operations. And I would remind that the Deep Star 4000 was the first to spot the helium leak in earlier Sea Lab III operations.

And it was Government-leased submersibles which helped find the lost bomb off the coast of Spain. Industry has developed these vehicles because there are definite needs.

If we are to look into the condition of oil pipelines in the Gulf of Mexico and off the coast of California, what will the Department of the Interior use if there are no funds for leasing of submersibles?

The United States presently is the undisputed leader in deep ocean work and the development of submersibles. We have arrived at this point because of the investment and confidence of industry in the future of oceanography.

Mr. Speaker, I think that the program of leasing submersibles is a vital one and I am writing the President, the Secretary of Defense, and the Vice President, who as Chairman of the Council on Marine Science, Engineering, and Resources, is in a position of leadership, urging they closely examine and reconsider the proposed elimination of this program from the budget.

RAPID RAIL TRANSIT SYSTEM

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

Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I rise to support, as a cosponsor, legislation introduced by my colleague, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. FUGUA), that has been a long time in preparation

and a long time in the planning stage. Now, finally, this bill represents the climax of a program that has, in one form or another, been consistently approved by Congress since 1958. That program is for the construction of a rapid rail transit system within the District of Columbia and the adjoining States of Virginia and Maryland, forming the area known as the National Capital region.

I do not believe that I need to tell you today why this legislation is important. I am sure that each and every Member of this House who drove to Capitol Hill this morning saw for himself the reasons why it is essential to build a rapid rail transit system. As we looked around us this morning we saw thousands upon thousands of motor cars attempting to squeeze through the traffic bottlenecks surrounding the center city, then trying to drive on the bottlenecks that we call city streets. Let us not forget that this city, our Nation's Capital, is slowly but surely being strangled by traffic congestion. Your Nation's Capital suffers as almost no other urban area in this land suffers from congestion; not alone does it have the normal work-hour peak loads of traffic but all through the day, particularly at this season of the year and continuing until the late fall, you will see constant streams of buses and visiting cars from every district in the Nation. People come here to their Nation's Capital wishing to enjoy it, wishing to take home with them a spiritual reawakening for having come to the heart of their homeland. Only too frequently do these visitors, people from your district and my district, go home disillusioned and disappointed because the streets of their Nation's Capital have become little more than one great series of slow-moving parking lots. This is what we must correct. This is our responsibility. The Congress must correct this.

Resulting also from this congestion is the new city disease called urban blight. The center city cannot long maintain its growth when transportation breaks down. The center city is not just a place where people work. It is not just a place to which people come in the morning and from which they go at night. The center city is a place where other thousands live and work, where they have their homes, where they seek their recreation, where their children must go to school in an atmosphere that is strangled by a transportation breakdown. And of course what so seriously affects the center city will spread into the surrounding suburban areas as well.

Oh, to be sure, traffic congestion—traffic problems are not the sole cause. No indeed. But the failure to solve traffic congestion is a major contributing factor to the breakdown of the city. The purpose of this bill is to create a 97.7-mile rail rapid transit system including 37.7 miles of service in the District of Columbia, 29.9 miles in Maryland and 30.1 in Virginia. The system has 86 stations, 44 in the District, 22 in Maryland, and the remaining 20 in Virginia. Forty-seven miles of the system, mostly in the highly developed central portion, will be in subway. The balance will be on grade or elevated.

This legislation will authorize a Federal grant to construct the rail rapid

transit system to be matched on two-thirds/one-third basis by local money coming from taxes levied upon the citizens of this area and from the fare box. These fare box revenues that will support the bonding program together with the local tax contributions will provide approximately 55 percent of the gross cost of the subway system. The Federal Government would provide the remaining 45 percent through grants.

The Federal Government has a very real commitment to the welfare of the Capital City and when I say Capital City I am referring in the broadest sense to the National Capital region. In this area are the people who work in Government and thousands upon thousands of people who support the people who work in Government, the research group, the legal people, the grocers, the doctors, the lawyers, all the many persons necessary to create a working seat of Government.

Every citizen of this Nation must be proud of his Nation's Capital but in one respect this Capital of the most prosperous nation on the earth lags behind, way behind. Most of the capitals of the nations of the world have for many years enjoyed rail rapid transit both in subway and on the surface. London, Paris, Rome, Madrid, Tokyo, and Moscow are among them. However, we in the Capital of these United States have talked for many years but have not built. The time has come now to build and with the passage of the legislation introduced today for that purpose we will be on the way to catch up with other capitals of the world. While we have been talking about beginning to build, most of these systems have even been modernizing and going ahead into the future as in Canada, in Montreal, in Toronto.

Mr. Speaker, we owe it to our Nation to provide its Capital City with a modern transportation system. We have not hesitated to spend billions of dollars to carve out a path to the moon and to other stars but, Mr. Speaker, we need to carve out a path for the people who, right here on earth, every morning and every evening spend so much time traveling to and from work. We must indeed bring the space age back out of the heavens onto the ground for the benefit of each of us who must accomplish the simple chore of going to and from work in ever-increasing traffic congestion.

The President in his April 28 message to the Congress on the District of Columbia said:

I urge that Congress promptly enact the necessary authorizing legislation for the 97-mile system.

He has said that the local governments of Virginia and Maryland have already passed bond referendums or taken other appropriate action to finance their contributions of \$347 million. But action by Congress is needed to authorize grants sufficient to cover the \$1.1 billion Federal two-thirds share of the net project cost and capital contribution of \$216 million for the District portion of the local one-third share.

The President and all of the other residents of the National Capital region are looking at us today and urging us to provide them with a modern rail rapid transit system so that our Nation's Cap-

ital can join the other nations of the world who have progressed so far in the field of urban transportation.

I urge early consideration and adoption of this bill.

ARMS CONTROL TALKS BETWEEN THE UNITED STATES AND THE SOVIET UNION

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

Mr. BINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, I was very happy to see in this morning's Washington Post a press report by Chalmers Roberts to the effect that the U.S. Government plans to undertake arms control talks with the Soviet Union starting this summer.

I believe that this is a matter of the utmost urgency particularly because of the rapid development of the so-called MIRV, or multiple independently targeted reentry vehicles.

If this weapon is brought to operational readiness it will make virtually impossible an arms control agreement without on-site inspection.

At the present time there is a good chance for effective arms control agreements because of the general state of the balance that exists between the two major powers and because of the possibility of satellite surveillance of missile deployment.

Further development of the MIRV by the United States at this time risks the very real possibility that the Soviets will conclude before talks get underway that the United States already has an operational MIRV system. Such a mistake on the part of Soviet leaders would make it inevitable that they would proceed with their own MIRV development, producing further escalation of the arms race. An immediate freeze on U.S. development of MIRV's, on the other hand, would eliminate the possibility that potential United States-Soviet arms talks could be subverted in this way, and would make our stated desire to reach mutual arms control accord more credible.

In my view, the time is most propitious for Soviet-American arms control talks, and we cannot afford to risk losing the opportunity. I hope, therefore, that the reports that the Nixon administration is preparing to approach the Soviets to get such talks underway are accurate, and that a mutual freeze on MIRV's will be the first order of business at any such talks.

For these reasons, Mr. Speaker, I am circulating among various Members of the House a resolution calling for immediate deferment of further development and testing by the United States of MIRV's until every effort has been exhausted to reach a mutual MIRV freeze agreement with the Soviets. I intend to introduce this resolution with cosponsors shortly. In the belief that it will be of interest to a substantial number of Members, a copy of the draft resolution is included below.

DRAFT OF ARMS CONTROL RESOLUTION

Whereas the present is an especially propitious time for Soviet-American arms control negotiations because of (1) the approximate

state of balance that exists through mutual deterrence, (2) the existing techniques of surveillance by satellite that make it possible for each side to keep track of the other's missile capabilities without on-site inspection, and (3) the present non-belligerent attitude of the Soviets as evidenced by their unprecedented cancellation of the traditional display of military power in their May Day parade; and

Whereas the successful development of a multiple, independently targeted reentry vehicle (MIRV) weapons system by either the United States or the Soviet Union would not only threaten the present balance, but make much more difficult the achievement of a missile arms control agreement by making it impossible to check on warhead deployment without on-site inspection; and

Whereas both the United States and the Soviet Union are currently pressing ahead with efforts to develop a MIRV system, and the United States is reportedly more advanced with its development program; and

Whereas effective nuclear arms control offers the best, if not the only, hope of preventing a continuing arms race between the United States and the Soviet Union at disastrous cost to both sides and with no security for either: Therefore be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That it is the sense of Congress

(1) that the President should proceed with efforts to convene nuclear arms control negotiations with the Soviet Union with utmost urgency; and

(2) that the United States should defer further MIRV development and testing until every effort has been made to achieve a mutual freeze on MIRV development; and

(3) that such a mutual freeze should be a part of more comprehensive arms control agreements respecting both offensive and defensive missiles; but should not be delayed pending the working out of all aspects of such comprehensive agreements.

PIRNIE AND GOODELL CONTINUE FIGHT FOR JUSTICE IN CASE OF DISCHARGED AMERICAN LEAGUE UMPIRES

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

Mr. PIRNIE. Mr. Speaker, for 8 months I have been working closely with the distinguished junior Senator from New York, Mr. GOODELL, on a matter of vital importance and because of the widespread interest in our efforts it is our desire to provide our colleagues with a report on the status of the case and our intended course of action.

Reluctantly, but with sincere conviction and firm resolve, we are today launching a new phase in our pursuit of justice for former American Baseball League umpires Al Salerno and Bill Valentine.

Following this statement we will—
First, commence an intensive campaign to enlist additional congressional support for the effort to obtain reinstatement of Salerno and Valentine;

Second, undertake an immediate study to determine if congressional review of baseball's "privileged" status is warranted; and

Third, endeavor to bring to the attention of the American people, through factual disclosures, the plight of two men whose professional careers were abruptly halted because they sought,

through an orderly process, to unify their colleagues in the quest for improved working conditions.

We follow this course confident that the American sense of fairplay will prompt many others to share our indignation about the manner in which umpires Salerno and Valentine have been treated. However, we are realists. We know that despite the important principle involved—the right of workers to organize for the purpose of collective bargaining—a groundswell of public opinion in support of this cause is unlikely.

Umpires are nameless men in blue who are always wrong when they call a decision against the home team. They are constantly low men on the popularity totem pole. They are frequently subjected to verbal, even physical, abuse. They must work under constant pressure and, like all of us, are far from perfect.

All this is no secret to millions of baseball fans across the country. We count ourselves in that number and therefore recognize from the beginning that what we are doing—championing the cause of two umpires who find themselves on the receiving end of a "bum decision"—will probably serve only to develop an awareness of the merit of this effort. We ask no more than that.

Before proceeding with our narrative, we wish to stress that we have no desire to be interventionists with respect to the day-to-day operations of organized, professional baseball.

It has been suggested by at least one noted columnist that by mentioning the possibility of congressional hearings to consider baseball's exemption under antitrust laws, we are threatening those from whom we seek a favorable decision on our bid for the umpires' reinstatement. As this sword of Damocles version goes, the two factors are totally unrelated, hearings are warranted or they are not warranted; the unjust dismissal of Salerno and Valentine should not be a consideration. We disagree.

In the past, each of us, at one time or another, has been closely identified with baseball. We remain ardent fans. Our understanding of the game and our appreciation of its unusual business aspects under normal circumstances would lead us to conclude that organized, professional baseball is unique and therefore deserving of its "privileged" status.

The case in question does not involve normal circumstances. It is our feeling that the exemption from coverage under our antitrust laws is merited only as long as the problems that arise within baseball are resolved without disregarding the rights of the individual. Human values are most important. We cannot close our eyes and permit the blatant disregard for those rights knowing that if a "privileged" exemption under the law did not exist those rights would be protected.

The summary firing of umpires Salerno and Valentine was the lead sports story for all news media last September 17. The "incident" had special interest to rate such extensive coverage. It was so much more than just another report of men losing jobs. Such accounts, unfortunate though they may be, are sel-

dom of sufficient national interest to warrant coast-to-coast attention.

The Salerno-Valentine case was different. These two men were leading an effort to organize their American League colleagues in the formation of an Umpires Association similar to one established by their National League brethren in 1963. Just 3 days prior to the astounding dismissal announcement from League President Joe Cronin, Salerno had met with the National League umpires group to lay the foundation for an identical venture in his league.

It did not require a sixth sense to recognize the journalistic value of the firing episode. Veteran reporters knew that a hot pennant race with an uncertain outcome was headed for the wire, a situation requiring experienced men in blue. They also knew that Salerno had been a big league umpire since 1961; Valentine since 1962. And they realized that the season—and the expiration of the umpires' contract—was only 2 weeks away. All this combined to prompt incredulous writers to question the motive for long-distance telephone calls from the league president to tell two of his senior men they were through. Not just for the season. Through. Period.

Quickly Salerno's organizing activities and Valentine's forthright support of those activities were discovered. Further checks revealed the widespread disparities in the compensation received by umpires in the two leagues, with the American League crew coming out on the short end of every comparison.

Interviews unearthed more pertinent information. The organizing effort had been a topic of discussion among American League umpires for several months, but no major step in that direction had been taken until Salerno's move, 72 hours before the click of a telephone receiver put an end to his 7-year career.

The immediate reaction was to go to the source, Joe Cronin. The twofold question asked of him: "Why the sudden dismissals and did they relate to the organizing activities?" His reply: "They were inefficient, no." The American League president claimed the organizing effort was "news" to him. He further observed that he did not know what the National League umpires were making.

In short, inquiring reporters were told the firing and the organizing activity were completely unrelated, a coincidence. To put it in the mildest of terms, we find the so-called coincidence extremely hard to accept. Locker room jargon would probably put it in more colorful, less diplomatic language.

The initial shockwave created by the questionable dismissal of Salerno and Valentine made interesting copy for a few days but the excitement of the pennant race and the thrilling World Series eventually forced the sequels to less prominent positions. Soon football and basketball took over and the umpires, like the spikes and gloves, were put on the shelf.

A grave injustice to another, especially someone far removed, is soon forgotten. Although the American League's Umpires Association for which they fought was to become a reality, the martyred

Salerno and Valentine were still on the outside looking in. It was during this period, what we refer to as our first phase of quiet representations, that behind-the-scenes efforts were made in an attempt to obtain the only fair settlement of this dispute—the reinstatement of the two umpires.

We were after headway, not headlines. Statements to the news media were intentionally avoided because we recognized Mr. Cronin's position. Obviously, if we hammered away by focusing continuing attention on what we feel was his unwise and unfair decision, it would have made it more difficult for him to reverse that decision. We were searching for an "understanding," one that would allow certain individuals to save face and yet accomplish the desired result in the form of reinstatement for Salerno and Valentine.

Unfortunately, the American League president summarily dismissed our interest in the case in much the same way he discharged the two umpires. We then had but one alternative and that was to take the matter to the commissioner of baseball.

The commissioner's post was vacant for several weeks and it was not until early this year that there was someone with whom a dialog could be initiated.

In the interim, the attorney for the Umpires Association, Mr. John Reynolds, contacted the American League president's office on several occasions. Attempts were made to secure provisional reinstatement for Salerno and Valentine. The appeal was simple: give them a trial, if they perform, fine, if not, that is it, no complaints. The response was negative.

However, apparently someone in Boston began to have second thoughts on the matter. Perhaps conscience prompted the offer, no one really knows, but soon a counteroffer, involving only Salerno, was forthcoming. It was suggested that he might be an effective American League umpire scout, one that could search the minor leagues for needed talent. This was an unusual development—a man who was told he was fired because he was "inefficient" suddenly was adjudged the proper candidate to determine the efficiency of other men competing for the job from which he was discharged. And the offer came from the man who dismissed him in the first place.

Salerno, maintaining that he was improperly discharged and hoping that his claim would eventually be judged on its merits, thereby permitting his return to the umpire ranks, declined the offer.

Finally, reaching an impasse, counsel advised the umpires to bring their case to the National Labor Relations Board where it is now pending. NLRB proceedings are lengthy and involved, and anyone familiar with the Board's history knows that baseball has long had a privileged status in connection with its responsibilities under Federal statutes.

With this in mind, we continued our efforts to contribute to an early and satisfactory settlement, one that would not tarnish the image of our national pastime, but yet one that would bring justice to the fore.

The new baseball commissioner, Bowie

Kuhn, was on the job and we stressed to him, through several telephone conferences, the sincerity of our conviction and the firmness of our resolve. We requested, for the good of baseball, that he become personally involved and lend the weight and prestige of his office to our effort.

On Tuesday, April 29, in my office, we conferred for more than an hour with the commissioner and his counsel, Mr. Paul A. Porter. We stressed to these two gentlemen our position in the case and urged the commissioner to thoroughly review all of the facts and take decisive steps which would lead to the reinstatement of the two umpires. The commissioner was non-committal, but he agreed to contact us "in a day or two."

Regretfully, Mr. Kuhn elected to remain detached and not become involved. We learned of his decision through a telephone report from Mr. Porter.

These are but the highlights of what has happened during these past months. There is more to the story that would not be appropriate to reveal at this time. Subsequent statements will be issued as the occasion warrants.

We conclude by reemphasizing the sincerity of our conviction and the firmness of our resolve. In the interest of justice, in the interest of baseball, Salerno and Valentine should be reinstated.

THE CASE FOR A COMPREHENSIVE MANPOWER POLICY

The SPEAKER. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. STEIGER) is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. STEIGER of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, on May 5, I introduced the Comprehensive Manpower Act of 1969 into the RECORD together with a section-by-section analysis and additional explanatory material. Today I rise to elaborate further upon some current problems encountered in the development and implementation of an effective national manpower policy and the remedies I propose in my bill to offset those problems.

PROBLEMS CONFRONTING OUR CURRENT MANPOWER EFFORTS

The rapid development of new manpower programs in recent years has generally reflected a healthy period of innovation and progress in the manpower field. We have identified and to some extent explored the needs of groups outside the labor force, developed more effective educational techniques to prepare trainees for today's, rather than yesterday's jobs, and provided a whole gamut of services for those applicants whose needs extend beyond matching the man and the job. At the same time we have now reached a point where program proliferation is interfering with the development of long-range manpower planning, hampering the efforts of State and localities to adapt national programs to the widely differing circumstances within each community, and acting as a barrier to the effective linking together of educational, manpower, health, and other services needed by numerous individuals prior to employment.

A. PROGRAM PROLIFERATION AND THE ABSENCE OF LONG-RANGE MANPOWER PLANNING

Despite congressional enactment and Federal budgetary support, it is misleading to speak of Federal manpower programs. As Garth Mangum points out in "The Emergence of Manpower Policy"—forthcoming—with minor exceptions, manpower programs are initiated and administered by State and local agencies. The manpower development and training program and the Vocational Education Act of 1969 are administered by long-established State agencies. The MDTA experimentation and demonstration and the Economic Opportunity Act programs have bypassed the States and local government agencies, showing a preference for ad hoc community groups and private nonprofit organizations. Each Federal funding source, in turn, has generated its own local constituency encouraging proliferation at that level.

Competition among agencies in the development and implementation of programs can stimulate improvement in the quality of services provided to the individual. Until recently such competition in the manpower field has proven beneficial. There comes a point however where excessive duplication of services endangers program effectiveness and where the costs in economy and efficiency of implementation outweigh the benefits of competition among programs. The advantages of such competition are particularly questionable when administrative and legal obstacles prevent agencies from competing on an equitable basis but at the same time do not prevent any of the agencies involved from thwarting development of a national manpower policy.

Various combinations of Federal, State, and local agencies are now entangled in a confusing and frustrating competition to serve the same manpower clientele. Funds from the older programs are distributed by Federal agencies to the States on the basis of fixed formulas, but the budget of the Economic Opportunity Act program is disseminated largely at administrative discretion. Even with fixed formulas, Mangum observes, some of the laws provide that unused funds available under programs requiring initial local application can be redistributed at the discretion of Federal administrators. Furthermore, some communities receive more than their share of funds on the basis of their population and need, while others, less skilled at "grantsmanship," have difficulty gaining equal access to available funds. At the same time, where formulas are fixed and appropriations not reallocable, allocations to unaggressive—though not less needy—States have often remained unused. Those communities adept at hauling in Federal moneys have proven considerably less skillful in using those funds to piece together effective and comprehensive local manpower programs.

Project-by-project approval of these new programs remains cumbersome and time consuming. Delays have discouraged State and local program development and caused the curtailment of well-conceived projects because of the loss of

scarce instructors and other personnel unwilling to work in an atmosphere characterized by uncertainty and tension. Without the project-by-project approach however the Federal Government has little means of controlling the quality of services and assuring that the target population is served. As a result of these concerns, funds for outreach can now be sought from nine manpower program sources, adult basic education from 11 funding groups, prevocational and skill training from five programs, and supportive services from nine sources.

Just as there are numerous Federal sources for funding each manpower service, no State or community has a unified manpower planning or operating organization. The development of State and local projects has depended upon the initiative of a diverse group of agencies, and all services have emanated from a bewildering assortment of sponsors. It may be that all of the participating agencies are making valuable contributions through their manpower efforts, but it seems clear that the talents and energies of all these agencies would be far better utilized if they were part of a systematic plan spelling out the manpower needs and goals of the community and how each program would help to achieve those goals.

B. PROGRAM PROLIFERATION AND THE NEEDS OF THE COMMUNITY

The proliferation of programs at the national and local levels is also encouraged by a number of widely divergent views on the appropriate responsibilities and relationships of Federal, State, and local governments in social policy. Mangum has described six models of Federal-State-local relationships mutually co-existing in the administration of manpower programs. They are: First, the vocational educational-vocational rehabilitation grant-in-aid model providing Federal funds for discretionary State use within legislatively prescribed limits but with little Federal guidance or control; second, the Employment Service trust fund model with full Federal funding but State operation, though with somewhat more stringent Federal guidelines for allocation of funds; third, the MDTA model consisting of Federal determination of objectives and guidelines but State initiative in planning projects for Federal approval, allocation of funds by formula but reservation of a portion for Federal discretion and the right to recover and reallocate funds not committed within a prescribed length of time; fourth, the QEO model bypassing the States and often local governments to make grants and contracts with ad hoc community organization; fifth, the CEP model with Federal choice of target areas deserving priority and Federal determination of available funds but considerable local, and no State, discretion in their use; and, sixth, the work incentive model which apparently will involve a federally specified package of services which State and local agencies will deliver as nondiscretionary contractors.

Much of the impetus for this proliferation of programs and models stems from the dilemmas which confront a Federal agency, as it attempts to deal with State

and local jurisdictions. On the one hand, disbursement of funds through State governments reduces the number of required Federal contact points and the need to become directly involved in local problems; on the other hand, a number of States have proved disappointing in their lack of responsiveness to community, particularly large urban, problems. On the one hand, funding on a project basis often excludes communities with the greatest need but the least energetic leadership; on the other hand, formula allocation may tie up limited funds in the hands of the apathetic while the more capable and aggressive States are neglected.

On the one hand, project-by-project funding provides a Federal agency with leverage to force appropriate action and in some cases to bypass various layers of State and/or local bureaucracy; on the other hand, the vast number of cities, counties, and other jurisdictions far exceeds the limited capacity of Federal agencies to negotiate, monitor, and evaluate contracts.

These dilemmas will not even begin to be resolved until we begin asking the questions: "What can Federal, State, and local governments and related private agencies each do best?" and "How can we strengthen the capacity of each level of government to perform its role more effectively?" Authority and funds must be placed in the hands of State and local public and private agencies. More extensive training must be conducted to prepare additional personnel to administer and work in State and local manpower programs. The concept behind the cooperative area manpower planning system, consisting of area, State, and regional coordinating committees working closely with the Secretary of Labor and with the Secretary of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare on educational matters is sound, but until funds, staff, and decisionmaking responsibility are vested in such groups, the resulting agreements will serve merely as paper documents which alienate those State and local officials who took them seriously from working in the future on such program plans with the Federal Government. Program proliferation is in part a reaction to the inability of some States and localities to tailor a series of programs well designed to meet the particular needs of a community. But program proliferation has itself now become so great in the manpower field, that it stands as a major barrier to the development of a concerted, flexible Federal-State-local response to the demands and needs of the local community.

C. PROGRAM PROLIFERATION AND THE NEEDS OF THE INDIVIDUAL

The ultimate consideration in the structure and administration of manpower programs must be the packaging and delivery of all services needed by the individual. These needs will vary by community, target group, and individual, and rapid changes may occur both in the intensity and the nature of manpower problems. The unemployment rate may shift rapidly or concern may in a short period of time shift from the plight of the worker displaced by automation to the needs of the hard-core unemployed. We

cannot continue to treat each such fluctuation as signaling the need for yet another program. At some point we must come to grips with the nature of the delivery system itself.

It is difficult to think of any manpower service which could not be found somewhere within the complex structure of current laws and practices. Yet only in the vocational rehabilitation program, do we even make available to a particular client all of the services for which he is eligible. Until all manpower programs are dissolved into a single program encompassing all budgets without earmarking for particular services, the necessary flexibility will not be achieved.

If services are to be available to clients in accord with their need, then Mangum is fully justified in concluding:

National decisions cannot be made which arbitrarily fix the combinations of services to be available in states and communities.

Small nonindustrial States may have little use for on-the-job training but might benefit from an expanded institutional training program. Cities with considerable heavy industry and high demand for semiskilled workers have different needs from those urban areas which are predominantly white collar. In adapting manpower programs to the needs of the particular State, city, and individual, there is no substitute for a State and local manpower planning and implementation mechanism.

THE CHALLENGE OF A COMPREHENSIVE MANPOWER POLICY

According to the national manpower policy task force:

The present challenge is to apply the lessons of the early 1960s to develop a coherent manpower policy, not just for the moment but for the 1970s and beyond.

It is time now to build upon the trends already underway to strengthen the capabilities of communities and States to plan their own manpower programs to implement national objectives with the financial support and technical assistance of the Federal Government.

The central administrative question remains however, as James Sundquist points in the Brookings Institution's "Agenda for a Nation":

Whether the federal government will allow any local system to work. So far, it has followed an ambiguous course.

On the one hand, local decisionmaking mechanisms such as the CAA's, CAMPS, and CEP's are instituted to coordinate program activities at the community level. On the other hand, programs are launched at the same time which bypass these structures and make many of the essential decisions without prior consultation or clearance.

As Sundquist stresses:

The federal government cannot have it both ways.

It must decide whether the complex of manpower and related programs is to be conceived and operated as a predominantly national system or whether those programs are to be treated as federally aided community programs that have to be meshed by local and State leadership into community systems. The choice is patently clear. It is in the communities

that the manpower institutions operate; it is there that they must be designed in relation to the economy they serve.

But the challenge extends beyond the development of community manpower systems as the primary objective of a comprehensive manpower policy. If such a policy is to succeed, new administrative approaches must be adopted. Uniformity in the design of local programs must give way to flexibility. Federal agencies must shift their emphasis from a reviewing and approving role to a consultative role. Federal agencies must find ways to feed into the State and local planning process their general advice and technical information, their more cosmopolitan perspective, and their evaluation data on local experiments. The focus of Federal concern must be upon the procedures comprising State and local program planning and operation thus assuring that all relevant interest groups are involved in the decisionmaking process and that adequate technical and planning capacity are available. The substantive content of programs however must remain strictly within the area of local and State jurisdiction.

A COMPREHENSIVE APPROACH TO A NATIONAL MANPOWER POLICY

A single comprehensive manpower bill would not solve all of these administrative problems but it would alleviate many of them.

The authority and budgets included in the Comprehensive Manpower Act of 1969 would be the total of those funds currently allocated to the remedial manpower programs—those programs addressed to the problems of people already through school and in or on the verge of entry into the labor market. This would encompass the present MDTA and the manpower programs under the Economic Opportunity Act, a total of \$1 billion in fiscal year 1969. Vocational education, though a vital part of a national manpower policy is essentially preventive rather than remedial and coordination of vocational education with remedial manpower program is left, therefore, to the discretion of the States and localities.

In response to the problems confronting our current manpower efforts, the objectives of the Comprehensive Manpower Act of 1969 are: First, to facilitate long-range planning; second, to adapt the manpower program mix to community circumstances; and, third, to allow packaging of services according to individual need. The legislation proposes an administrative policy which would strengthen the State and local role while maintaining Federal guidance.

The Federal agency would issue guidelines each year much as is presently done under the cooperative area manpower planning system—CAMPS. The guidelines would undertake to detail the outlook for the year ahead and provide overall employment estimates for the next 3 years. They would estimate the total manpower funds available throughout the Nation and by State. They would forecast the economic climate, describe the existing and foreseeable manpower situation, and identify national manpower priorities for the coming year and for the next 3 years. Important con-

siderations concerning such matters as target groups and program mix would be included along with the criteria by which program performance would be judged. Performance would be evaluated annually and the following year's budget would vary according to the extent to which State and community objectives were achieved. Funds are allocated to the States by formula but with the provision that where a State has failed to come forward with an acceptable plan, the money should be spent within the State by the Federal agency using either State or local public agencies or private institutions as contractors to provide the desired services.

The guidelines would be implemented by a State planning group, appointed by the Governor with Federal approval of the structure but not the personnel. This planning group would have staff and budget supplied from the manpower program allocation. Included among the planners would be representatives of all State agencies involved in the delivery of services under the federally funded manpower programs, closely related private agencies, representatives of labor and management and the public and the Governor's designees. However, the decisions of the Governor would prevail in the absence of consensus. The State planning group in turn would prepare similar guidelines for the local communities.

Community and neighborhood centers would bring representatives of all participating agencies within reach of client groups. The relative assignments to various agencies would be determined by the State plans, requiring only that at least one agency in each city and in the State have the responsibility for giving personal counseling to and developing an individualized plan for each client. This agency need not be responsible for delivery of services to that client, though it should be his advocate in assuring the quality of the services provided. That agency would probably, in most cases, be the Employment Service, but that decision would be left largely in the hands of the Governors and would presumably depend upon what agencies are providing manpower services most effectively.

The differences between this approach and the current manpower policy are incremental but important. Federal guidelines are currently issued under CAMPS but they are so detailed in terms of characteristics of enrollees and program mix that they leave few decisions to be made at the State and local levels. The Federal agencies currently enjoy considerable discretion in the amount of money flowing to a particular State but there is little coordination among them in determining a sensible allocation of these program funds within the State.

There are area CAMPS—usually in large metropolitan areas—but they also have little discretion. The essence of this proposal is to move from a program to a functional approach, allow the States to determine, with Federal approval, what mix of functions or services they prefer to provide with their allocated funds, and encourage an individualized approach to the needs of each client. The reservation of a large proportion of the

funds—30 percent—would preserve the Federal role in research and demonstration and allow funding of interstate, regional, and national programs. Where a State fails to meet its responsibilities, the resulting program vacuum would be filled by the Federal Government using the State's allocation but channeling it through public and private contractors.

The impetus behind the Comprehensive Manpower Act of 1969, Mr. Speaker, is my conviction that if we did things a little more rationally, they would turn out a little more rationally.

ABM "NONEXPERTS" SHOULD HEED PHYSICIST

The SPEAKER. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. GERALD R. FORD) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, it is highly disturbing to me that opposition to President Nixon's Safeguard missile defense system has taken on the nature of a movement in which little or no attention is being paid to the great weight of distinguished scientific opinion favoring deployment of the Safeguard system. Instead, we find that many non-experts are seeking to persuade the American people that their judgment is "the last word" on the subject of missile defense. Columnist Richard Wilson has done an excellent commentary on this situation. I invite all of my House colleagues to read his column as it appeared Monday, May 12, 1969, in the Washington Evening Star.

The column follows:

ABM "NONEXPERTS" SHOULD HEED PHYSICIST

(By Richard Wilson)

It is puzzling why Congress and the country listen to nuclear non-experts like Sen. Edward M. Kennedy and Hubert H. Humphrey on the ABM issue and pay no attention to a very substantial body of expert scientific opinion on the other side.

By all indicators the country is quite exercised on this issue, equating the ABM with the Vietnam war as a disgraceful manifestation of American militarism which is outraging world opinion and robbing the nation of desired social gains. Therefore, it should do no harm to know that there are very able men, equally as "involved" as Kennedy's team of scientists, who firmly state views exactly opposite and vigorously support deployment of the Safeguard system.

One of them is a Nobel prize winner and the only physicist to have been awarded the four highest honors a physicist can receive: the Nobel prize for physics, the National Medal of Science, the Fermi Award, and the Atoms for Peace award. He is Prof. Eugene Wigner of Princeton University.

Recently in Washington Dr. Wigner engaged in a debate with Prof. Hans A. Bethe, Nobel laureate of Cornell University, and Prof. George Rathjens, former director of the weapons system evaluation division, Institute for Defense Analysis, Massachusetts Institute of Technology. Dr. Donald Brennan of the Hudson Institute also took part in the symposium on the same side of the issue as Dr. Wigner. Dr. Wigner devoted part of his presentation to demolishing Dr. Bethe's arguments as scientifically erroneous, which saddened him because of his regard for Dr. Bethe.

Dr. Wigner also recalled another painful incident some years ago in which the distinguished scientist, Nils Bohr, had convinced

most of his audience that a nuclear chain reaction could not be established and had very sound reasons for this view which have, of course, been proved entirely erroneous.

Dr. Wigner might have noted also, but did not, that Dr. Robert Oppenheimer, the "father" of the atomic bomb, did not believe in the feasibility of the thermonuclear reaction of the hydrogen bomb largely because in his heart he hoped it could not be made to work.

The Princeton physicist could have recalled also, but he did not, that a large part of the scientific community saw no sense in the Russian development of the fantastically destructive 50 megaton warhead. But the utility of that warhead is now seen in its capability of destroying American Minuteman missile sites.

Dr. Wigner's arguments were profound and well beyond the comprehension of the average layman or the average congressman. But he made two very strong points which can readily be understood.

First, the Soviet Union is overtaking us in general nuclear capability, not withstanding the soporific statements of two Democratic secretaries of defense, Robert S. McNamara and Clark M. Clifford. Russia is moving into that range of nuclear capability which could cause its more extreme leaders to think that they could win an all-out nuclear confrontation with the United States. This condition is brought about in large part by its own nuclear defenses, not alone its ABM deployment but its extensive and massive plans and training in civil defense which extend down to the lowest levels in the public school system and which are unknown in this country.

Second, the assumption that the deployment of a defensive system by the United States would serve as a provocation to the Soviet Union is illogical to a dangerous degree and contrary to the official position of the Russian government that defensive measures do not accelerate the arms race.

"One could almost claim," said Dr. Wigner, "that the absence of true defense is considered provocative by the USSR. Doing nothing in the face of the by-now alarming USSR military buildup would give the impression that the leadership of the country does not consider defense to be important."

We have become accustomed in this country to think of ourselves as having nuclear superiority over the Russians. This is thought of as our ultimate protection. All that has changed during the period since Stalin's death when every American president, dating back to 1953, has sought a new era in Russian relations. The nuclear balance has shifted toward the Russian side during this period and now we are faced by new and ominous conditions.

AMERICANIZATION DAY CELEBRATION

The SPEAKER. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. DANIELS) is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. DANIELS of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, one of the great events in Jersey City, N.J., is the annual Americanization Day celebration which is jointly sponsored by the Clinton E. Fisk Post No. 132, of the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States and the city of Jersey City.

This year's celebration was held on April 27, 1969, and the grand marshal was the Honorable John V. Kenny, former mayor of Jersey City and presently leader of the Democratic Party in Hudson County.

I include following my remarks, a

speech made by Maj. Gen. John G. Cassidy, commanding general of the 78th Division, U.S. Army Reserve on the occasion of the 38th annual Americanization Day parade, and two news stories which appeared in the Hudson Dispatch and the Jersey Journal, two leading newspapers published in the 14th District of New Jersey.

Mr. Speaker, as a citizen of Jersey City, I am very proud to associate myself with this great event and look forward each year to participating in it. It is a great day for all of us from Hudson County, N.J., and it shows that old-fashioned patriotism still exists in our part of the Nation. My constituents came from every part of the world. The only real common denominator is that they all love this Nation and its traditions and are proud to be Americans.

I salute the Fisk Post and the city government for its part in making April 27, 1969, a great day for Jersey City.

The material referred to follows:

REMARKS BY MAJ. GEN. JOHN G. CASSIDY, COMMANDING GENERAL OF NEW JERSEY'S 78TH DIVISION, U.S. ARMY RESERVE, ON THE OCCASION OF THE 38TH ANNUAL AMERICANIZATION DAY PARADE IN JERSEY CITY, N.J., APRIL 27, 1969

Honorable Grand Marshal Mayor John V. Kenny, Reverend Clergy, distinguished people on the dais, friends and loyal Americans all. It is my extreme pleasure to be here today to again participate in this magnificent display of patriotism and loyalty to our country, the greatest country in the world, the United States of America.

As a past grand marshal in the Americanization Day parade I feel doubly proud to act today as an aide to the grand marshal of this 38th annual Americanization Day parade, Mayor John V. Kenny of Jersey City. He is a true patriot and a fighter for the rights and freedoms of all peoples. As a former resident of Jersey City and Union City, I can remember vividly his courageous fight in May of 1949. He won that battle and has been victorious ever since.

I salute you, John V. Kenny, as a man who has fought for the rights and liberties of peoples and for the veterans of our country and for our flag for these more than 50 years. Congratulations to the Capt. Clinton E. Fisk Post, 132 of the VFW and the city of Jersey City for once again producing the most spectacular display of patriotism and loyalty to flag and country ever in the country. You can feel justly proud.

I would also like to thank the city of Jersey City and the Fisk Post Parade Committee and in particular my friend Sam Bardach, the Parade's general chairman and Mayor Thomas J. Whelan of Jersey City—for dedicating this 38th annual Americanization Day Parade to the "Army Reserve's April Community Month" program and the Army Reserve's 61st anniversary. The members of the Army Reserve and New Jersey's 78th Division (training) also express their deep gratitude.

This weekend, as on almost every other weekend of the month, men and women who have spent their weekdays at desks, drawing boards, behind store counters and in classrooms and factories will gather in groups in cities and towns all over the country.

These gatherings won't be for weekly bowling sessions, friendly poker games or to discuss the stock market or the baseball team.

These men and women are citizen-soldiers who, because of their dedication to the preservation of the nation's defense, are members of the United States Army Reserve, this nation's largest Reserve component.

They are also your neighbors . . . your employees . . . your fellow businessmen . . .

and your fellow taxpayers. In Jersey City there are 2,000 men and women in Army Reserve units. You probably know some of them. Majors Carmine P. Giordano and J. Leonard Hornstein.

This month is a special occasion for us. We are celebrating Community Month in April to pay tribute to the communities in which we live, to our employers and our families, neighbors and friends.

We feel that people are paying tribute to us throughout the year by accepting the inconveniences caused by our being members of the Army Reserve. Our friends and families, for example, often have had to hold reunions and barbecues without us because we were spending a weekend training at (mention name of training site). Our employers have had to operate shorthanded, at times, because we had to be away during a particular two-week period for annual training.

We appreciate everyone's support and want to salute them this month.

While the general store has given way to the supermarket and shopping center . . . and the town green as a communications center has been made obsolete by mass media, the tradition of the citizen-soldier has probably taken on greater significance during the past three decades than ever before in America's history.

A shrinking world . . . together with an increasing amount of greed on the part of certain nations . . . have combined to make the threat to national security an everyday matter of concern. As a nation, however, we have continued to adhere to our principle of fielding a relatively small standing Army with strong dependence upon Reserve forces in times of emergency.

Since 1941, the United States Army Reserve has responded four times to the call of the national emergencies.

During World War II, 26 out of the 82 divisions formed for combat were mobilized from the ranks of the Army Reserve.

Almost a quarter of a million men of the Army Reserve were called to active duty during the Korean Conflict.

During the Berlin Crisis of 1961, 75,000 Army Reservists were mobilized. And, during 1968, with the Vietnam build-up, thousands of members of the Army Reserve were called to active duty by the President. In addition, almost 80 percent of the officers and warrant officers serving in Vietnam today hold Army Reserve commissions or warrants.

I am proud to say that both local members and units of the Army Reserve have responded to our nation's call to duty during these four build-ups.

You might think that the almost continuous threat to our national security . . . with frequent call-ups . . . might discourage men and women from joining and remaining in the Army Reserve and might affect the readiness of our units.

Nothing is further from the truth.

Today, the nation can boast of having the strongest, best trained and best equipped Army Reserve force in its history. It is more than one million strong. Forming the nucleus of the Army Reserve are 3,478 highly trained Ready Reserve units which includes 45 units mobilized in May 1968. More than 260,000 men and women are members of these units which vary in type to include combat, combat support and combat service support. These include training divisions, maneuver area commands and infantry brigades, organized and equipped to fight in sustained combat in any part of the world.

An additional 738,000 men and women are assigned to the Individual Ready Reserve and, in case of war, would be used to reinforce units of the Army, Army Reserve and Army National Guard. Some of the officers assigned to the Individual Ready Reserve have been pre-selected, because of civilian specialty or military training, to fill an authorized position at a selected Army headquarters. These officers, called mobilization

designees, serve two weeks each year at the headquarters, in the position they would fill in case of war.

Rounding out the Army Reserve strength are the 262,000 members of the Standby and 235,000 members of the Retired Reserve. These men and women, who do not train with any units, can be called to active duty in time of war or national emergency declared by Congress.

Perhaps the most outstanding characteristic of the men and women in the Army Reserve is the large reservoir of special skills and experience they represent. Many officers and non-commissioned officers, as well as many enlisted men in the lower grades, hold civilian occupations that correlate with their military duties. This is evident right here in our community.

At the beginning of this talk, I mentioned the fact that we in the Army Reserve are celebrating the month of April as Community Month. We hope that you will join us in this celebration by visiting the Army Reserve Training Center so that you can see, in person, who we are . . . what we do . . . and with what equipment we train. We hope that you will also join us in other activities we will be voluntarily sponsoring during this month.

In closing, I would like again to thank you—our neighbors, our employers, our families and friends—for your support and encouragement throughout the year.

We in the Army Reserve are dedicated to the proposition of providing strength to our national security through a strong Army Reserve. Without hesitating we make personal sacrifices to meet this commitment. And, we hope, as a result, this will be a better world . . . a better nation . . . a better community in which to live.

[From the Hudson (N.J.) Dispatch, Apr. 28, 1969]

SOME 30,000 PARADE FOR UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

Former Mayor John V. Kenny yesterday led a stirring demonstration of patriotism and loyalty to country and flag as the grand marshal of the 38th annual Americanization Day Parade in Jersey City. More than 30,000 marched and nearly 75,000 lined the streets cheering every contingent enthusiastically.

Sponsored by Capt. Clinton E. Fisk Post 132, Veterans of Foreign Wars, and the City of Jersey City, the parade was hailed as "a tremendous display of patriotism and a tribute to Mayor Kenny and Jersey City," by Brig. Gen. William C. Doyle, national commander of American Legion. Others who called the parade "the greatest ever" included Maj. Gen. John G. Cassidy, the commanding general of 78th Division (Training), U.S. Army Reserve; Rep. Dominick V. Daniels, Mayor Thomas J. Whelan and State Sen. Frank J. Guarini Jr.

The day was perfect as 30 bands and marching units took part. The assembly point was at Kennedy Blvd. and Belmont av., Jersey City, and then along the boulevard to the reviewing stand at Pershing Field. At the reviewing stand, more than 5,000 were present as Kenny reviewed the parade. He also presented trophies to band groups.

Kenny, who addressed a luncheon crowd of 250 at the Holiday Inn, Jersey City, prior to the parade, said he was deeply honored to be named grand marshal and called the assignment "one of the cherished highlights in his life."

In his address, Kenny added, "In this day of rebellion against the principles of democracy, we, in Jersey City, will prove today to the nation that patriotism and loyalty to country and flag still exist. We are a freedom-loving people and America is the greatest country, today, tomorrow and forever."

WITH WOLFE, HAHN

Kenny rode in a car from the assembly point with Freeholder Walter W. Wolfe and Judge Frank G. Hahn of Union City. Preced-

ing him in the line of march were Jersey City's mounted police, state police escorts, the 730th Air Force Band from McGuire Air Force Base, a Hercules missile and a Marine color guard. Directly behind the grand marshal were his aides: Medal of Honor recipients John "Chuck" Meagher, Jersey City, Steve Gregg, Bayonne, and Nick Oresko of Bergenfield; Gens. Cassidy and Doyle, Lt. Col. Charles F. Kenny, Maj. Carmine P. Giordano, Lt. Col. Philipp Kunz and Maj. Erwin E. Pollack.

Judge Hahn acted as master of ceremonies at the luncheon where the grand marshal was the guest of honor. Guests at the luncheon included notables from the state.

They included the grand marshal's aides, Thomas Flaherty, president of Jersey City Council, and Councilmen Evelyn Holender, Fred Martin, Frank Culloo, John Kelaheer, Thomas McGovern, Thomas Maresca, Surrogate Joseph H. Kenny, Mr. and Mrs. Paul J. Hanly, the grand marshal's daughter and son-in-law; Mrs. Charles F. Kenny, William Killen, secretary to Surrogate Kenny, Sheriff Bonelli, Police Director George Whelan and Fire Director Grover Enny, state senator William F. Kelly, Brig. Gen. David B. Kelly, state police superintendent, Superior Court Judge Joseph Hanrahan, James Fitzgerald of North Bergen, state commander of VFW; various other veteran's organizations commanders, HADM Arthur H. Padula, Col. Frank B. Chapman, Jack W. Kuepfer and Gabe Gaetano, aide to Bonelli, Rev. Chester A. Wing of Second Reformed Church, Jersey City, said the invocation and Rev. George O'Gorman of Our Lady of Fatima Church, North Bergen the Benediction.

Outstanding marching units included the 78th Division (Training) band, led by S/Sgt. Richard Pinter, 50th Armored Division Band, Second Brigade of the 78th Division (Training), commanded by Lt. Col. George Van Leuven of Dumont; first battalion Jersey City's 113th Infantry, New Jersey National Guard, commanded by Col. Kunz; United States Naval Reserve and Gold Star Mothers.

Departments of Connecticut, New Jersey, Maine, Pennsylvania and New York of the Veterans of Foreign Wars, 23 posts from the American Legion, Thunderers, Greenlanders, Meadowlarks, Vagabonds, Imperial Guardsman, Jersey City Lassies, Audubons, Jersey City Elks, Veterans of World War I, and St. Aloysius Bell and Drum Corps from Ridge-wood, N.Y.

Col. Kenny, a past grand marshal and Hudson County's coordinator of civil defense, summed up the thoughts of those who participated in the parade and spectators along the route, when he said: "Today's outpouring of people is a tribute to the ideals of America and a salute to John V. Kenny as grand marshal, a true patriot. Sam Bardach was the parade's general chairman for the 10th straight year. He was assisted by Evelyn Dovey, Arthur Dovey, Wilbert Phelps, commander of Fisk Post, A. Pat Menendez and his wife, Nora.

The parade was dedicated to the 50th anniversary of American Legion and a salute to the Army Reserve's April Community Month.

[From the Jersey Journal, Apr. 28, 1969]

AMERICANIZATION DAY PARADE: 35,000 JOIN LOYALTY MARCH

Former Mayor John V. Kenny led Jersey City's demonstration of patriotism as the grand marshal of the 38th annual Americanization Day parade yesterday afternoon.

More than 35,000 marched behind the grand marshal as nearly 100,000 people lined the streets cheering enthusiastically every contingent.

Sponsored by the Capt. Clinton E. Fisk Post, 132 of the Veterans of Foreign Wars and the City of Jersey City, the parade was hailed as the "most outstanding display of patriotism ever shown" by Brig. Gen. William C. Doyle, national commander of the American Legion. He was a speaker.

Others who hailed the parade included Maj. Gen. John G. Cassidy, commanding general of the 78th Division (Training), U.S. Army Reserve; Rep. Dominick V. Daniels, Mayor Thomas J. Whelan, and State Senator Frank J. Guarini, Jr.

It was bright and sunny as 30 bands blared in spectacular fashion along the parade route which began at Belmont and Kennedy Boulevards and proceeded north along the Boulevard to the reviewing stand at Pershing Field. Kenny reviewed the parade at Pershing Field.

Kenny, addressing a luncheon crowd of 300 at the Holiday Inn in Jersey City prior to the parade, said he was never before so honored. He called his grand marshal assignment "one of the cherished highlights of his life." "In this day of rebellion against the principles of our democracy and the revolt of dissident groups, we, in Jersey City, have proved to the nation that patriotism and loyalty to country and flag still exists."

In the line of march were Jersey City mounted police, State Police escorts, Hudson County Sheriff George M. Bonelli escorts, 730th Air Force Band from McGuire Air Force Base, U.S. Marine Color Guard from New York; a Hercules Missile from the 52nd Artillery Brigade, Fort Hancock, Medal of Honor winners John Meagher, Steve Gregg and Nick Oresko; Rep. Daniels, Gen. Cassidy; Gen. Doyle, Lt. Col. Charles F. Kenny; Mayor Whelan, Freeholder Walter W. Wolfe and Judge Frank G. Hahn.

Judge Hahn acted as master of ceremonies at the pre-parade luncheon.

Other units which paraded included: the 78th Division (Training) band led by SSG Richard Pinter and the division's Second Brigade from Lodi; Commanded by Lt. Col. George Van Ledven of Dumont, 113th Infantry, 1st Battalion commanded by Lt. Col. Philipp Kunz, New Jersey National Guard from Jersey City; St. Aloysius Bell and Drum Corps, United States Naval Reserve Training Center, Jersey City; Jersey City Fire Department, Boy Scout troops, Girl Scout groups, Jersey City Lassies, Meadowlarks of Secaucus, Brownies of America, Imperial Guardsman Drum and Bugle Corps, Vagabonds, Greenlanders, Thunderers and American War Mothers.

Also, Gold Star Mothers', Departments of New York, Pennsylvania, Maine, Connecticut, VFW, Audubon band from Audubon; 23 American Legion posts from Hudson County; Amvets and Catholic War Veterans and Disabled American Vets; Jewish War Veterans', St. Francis Hospital Student Nurses', Jersey City Elks', Sabre Cadets and labor groups. Mayor Kenny awarded trophies to band groups at Pershing Field.

Floats and the military units were resplendent in their neat attire added to the colorful procession.

Dignitaries participating in the luncheon and parade activities included Thomas Flaherty, Jersey City Council president, members of the city council; Brig. Gen. George Whelan, director of Jersey City Police; Grover Enny, director of Jersey City's Fire Department. Mr. and Mrs. Paul Hanley, Mr. and Mrs. Bernard F. Kenny, William Killeen secretary to Surrogate Kenny and Mr. and Mrs. Charles Sarno, Gabe Gaetano, Jack Kuepfer of Clifton, State VFW Commander, James Fitzgerald of North Bergen, State Commander of the VFW; State Senators William F. Kelly and William V. Musto; Rep. Cornelius E. Gallagher, Rev. Victor R. Yantelli, president of St. Peter's College and Marion Glendinning, president, Dept. of New Jersey VFW Auxiliary.

Also, Admiral Arthur H. Padula of the U.S. Naval Reserve; Comdr. William Stuhr of Weehawken, Col. Frank B. Chapman of Jersey City, and Brig. Gen. David B. Kelly, Surrogate Joseph H. Kenny, and Sheriff Bonelli and Jim Deevy.

The parade was dedicated to the 50th anniversary of the American Legion and April

U.S. Army Reserve Community Month. Sam Bardach was the parade's general chairman for the 10th straight year. Assisting was Arthur and Evelyn Dovey, Commander Wilber Phelps, Michael Berger of the Fisk Post, Sgt. George Bradley and Sgt. Michael Berger assisted the grand marshal. Rev. Chester A. Wing of the Second Reformed Church, Jersey City said the invocation and Rev. William O'Gorman of Our Lady of Fatima North Bergen gave the benediction at the luncheon.

THE UNITED STATES—A MORE GENEROUS CREDITOR TO FOREIGN NATIONS THAN TO AMERICAN CITIZENS

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

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I am today introducing a concurrent resolution which would, if approved, express it as the sense of Congress that France should be required to repay her World War I debt to the United States. Although this obligation now exceeds \$5 billion, France has the resources to meet it, and the French Government has never contested the validity of this debt. It is not unreasonable, therefore, to require that these loans, made to support the French war effort and immediate postwar rehabilitation, be repaid. The resolution which I am introducing would provide for payment in 20 annual installments, and I feel that this is a fair and workable plan.

What is not generally known about this obligation is that the United States has been extremely generous in dealing with the French about payment. Originally, the loans bore a 5-percent interest rate and were payable upon demand, with the exception of \$407 million which was due 10 years after the loan was made. To ease the burden for the French, the U.S. Congress in 1922 approved the conversion of these loans to long-term indebtedness. Even more important, the debt was made interest free until 1930, at which time the interest rate was to increase gradually from 1 percent in 1931 to 3½ percent in 1966 and later years. This agreement, approved by France, was indeed generous, and for practical purposes resulted in a writeoff of about 60 percent of the overall indebtedness.

After Germany renounced her World War I reparations payments, France failed to service her debt, even though the United States has never recognized any connection between German reparations payments and France's World War I obligations. For over 35 years, therefore, France has made no payments on either principal and interest, and for almost 20 years the United States has made no substantial effort to secure payment of the debt. Still, this obligation is carried on the active books at the Treasury Department where necessary adjustments are regularly made as each unsatisfied payment comes due.

It seems inconsistent that our Government, which is so diligent in collecting debts of American taxpayers, is so remiss in requiring satisfaction of this obligation by a wealthy foreign nation. It also seems unfair to Finland, which has made regular payments on its debt, as well as to the American people who

have paid their share of the cost of World War I, through loss of life, military expenditures during the war, and the long term of payment and low rates of interest allowed on the French debt. I might add in this connection, that many Americans would be more than glad to borrow money at the 3½-percent interest rate which applies to the French debt.

This situation should not be allowed to continue—it is hypocrisy to carry on our books obligations incurred more than a half century ago on which no payments have been made in more than three decades, and our citizens have a right to expect the same diligence in collection of foreign debts as in the satisfaction of domestic obligations.

Over \$16 billion is outstanding in World War I loans to foreign nations, and it is my hope that the approval of a resolution such as I am introducing will not only result in prompt action to settle the French debt, but the obligations of the 11 other sovereign countries which are in arrears on their World War I obligations.

RESOLUTIONS TO COLLECT FRENCH WORLD WAR I DEBT

House Concurrent Resolution 9, by Hon. ELIGIO DE LA GARZA, of Texas.

House Concurrent Resolution 13, by Hon. JOSHUA EILBERG, of Pennsylvania.

House Concurrent Resolution 16, by Hon. O. C. FISHER, of Texas.

House Concurrent Resolution 23, by Hon. JERRY L. PETTIS, of California.

House Concurrent Resolution 27, by Hon. JOHN R. RARICK, of Louisiana.

House Concurrent Resolution 32, by Hon. ROBERT L. F. SIKES, of Florida.

House Concurrent Resolution 33, by Hon. M. G. SNYDER, of Kentucky.

House Concurrent Resolution 37, by Hon. JOE D. WAGGONER, JR., of Louisiana.

House Concurrent Resolution 51, by Hon. DON FUQUA, of Florida.

House Concurrent Resolution 120, by Hon. CLAUDE PEPPER, of Florida.

All these resolutions were referred to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Seventeen nations have total World War I indebtedness to the United States of over \$16 billion. Finland is the only country making regular payments on its debt. Four nations are no longer sovereign entities which received U.S. World War I payments—Latvia, Estonia, Lithuania, and Armenia.

NOT OKINAWA TOO

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

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, sometimes it is difficult to understand that the U.S. State Department and the U.S. Department of Defense are parts of the same Government working for the same objectives. In its zeal to be nice to everyone the State Department sometimes seems too easily swayed by foreign governments. Particularly has this been the case in nations where the United States has operated military bases.

The Russians are constantly agitating in those countries openly or behind the scenes for removal of U.S. forces.

When this provokes local demand for base closure, it is seldom that the State Department has taken a hard position for retention or that it has been willing to pay a price which military leaders believe justifiable. As a result, all over the world, U.S. bases, which once ringed the perimeter of Communist countries, have been closed.

The United States now appears to be on the verge of giving up its important base in Pakistan, a base which could have been held had we recognized the importance of Pakistan's friendship rather than siding with India, a perennial ingrate.

The Spanish base question is far from settled, in part because some State Department officials are impressed with the Socialist governments of a number of European countries and are opposed to Franco's hardline conservatism.

But the latest in this series of base problems may be the most important of all. It has to do with Okinawa. Japan wants Okinawa returned. Japan also is reluctant to give the necessary guarantees for the use and operation of military installations by the United States on Okinawa. A glance at the map will show the essentiality of Okinawa as a U.S. bastion and increasing problems with leftist militants in Japan have caused the removal of much of our military strength from Japan, and U.S. commanders foreseeing the inevitable weak Japanese Government are making plans for further shifts away from Japan.

A return of Okinawa to Japan would simply transfer the agitation for the closing of U.S. bases to that island. Japan has been put on its feet through lavish American help and now is one of the principal competitors with U.S. manufacturers for trade even here at home. Yet, Japan has contributed virtually nothing to the common defense and little to a strong anti-Communist policy.

It would cost \$3 billion to rebuild U.S. bases now in Okinawa even if there were a place to build them, and there is not. Okinawa has been involved in the Vietnam war from the start principally as a logistics base supporting air and sea shipments to the war theater. The same situation will be true in any involvement of American forces in the Far East. The strategic position of Okinawa places U.S. forces there in striking distance of every danger area in the area. The United States simply cannot afford to relinquish its control over these installations. The easiest way to avoid future confrontations on the subject will be to maintain complete control by the United States over Okinawa itself.

The United States is now undergoing one of its periods of aversion to war and it is during these periods that the problems of maintaining an adequate defense are the greatest. It is also during these periods that the pacifists in and out of the State Department exercise the greatest influence. They can do the United States and world freedom great harm by pushing for a return of Okinawa to Japan.

PAPAYA MARKETING ORDER BILL

(Mrs. MINK asked and was given permission to extend her remarks at this

point in the Record and to include extraneous matter.)

Mrs. MINK. Mr. Speaker, today I introduce legislation designed to increase the market for Hawaiian papayas.

As anyone who has tasted them will agree, papayas are one of the most delicious and succulent fruits on earth—they are rivaled only by such products as Hawaiian pineapples. Because of the expanding public demand for our papayas, the industry foresees a greatly increasing market in the continental United States. Already, large shipments of papayas are being flown to cities on our east coast for the enjoyment of large numbers of people. As more people learn about our papayas, this trend toward increased consumption should continue.

Because of the growth of their industry, Hawaii's papaya growers now seek coverage under a Federal marketing order as provided for in the Agricultural Marketing Agreement Act of 1937, as amended. The required number of growers have already indicated their desire to participate in such a system, which will insure orderly marketing of mature, high-quality fruit.

No legislation is required to allow a marketing order to be issued for papayas, but the growers want their order to include authority for the advertising and promotion of Hawaiian papayas. Since the 1937 act does not provide for automatic inclusion of this authority in each marketing order, a special amendment must be added for each commodity whose producers desire the right to promote their product in this manner. Previously, such authority has been granted by Congress to producers of nectarines, California olives, Tokay grapes, and Texas citrus. My legislation would simply add Hawaiian papayas to the list of commodities now covered by such amendments.

This bill is noncontroversial in that it has the overwhelming support of the growers, the only group which will vote on whether to be included under a marketing order. Since they are taking this step to insure high-quality standards of their products, they simply want the right to inform the public of these advances.

I believe that our consumers are entitled to have luscious, high-quality Hawaiian papayas, and my legislation would allow growers of this fruit to "tell their story" to the public. Thus, this bill would benefit both the industry and the consumers of this popular commodity.

THE NATION REQUIRES A NATIONAL MASS URBAN TRANSIT PLAN AND PROGRAM

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

Mr. PODELL. Mr. Speaker, America is choking on city traffic and accompanying pollution. Masses of vehicles, ever-growing in quantity, are clogging arteries of commerce, communication, and individual movement. As this phenomenon mounts in volume, menace, and intensity, we turn our backs upon our only possible solutions.

Detroit will never give us an answer.

Denials of auto pollution are still emanating from automakers. Do autos, buses, and trucks cause air pollution? How could we even think such a thing? Look at the skies over Los Angeles. Remember the last time you rode behind a diesel truck or bus. Their stench and clouds of filthy smoke are unmistakable as well as unbearable.

In order to accommodate this ever-increasing flood of vehicles powered by internal combustion engines, America is falling in love with low-grade asphalt and concrete. The liver and lights of scores of cities have been torn out and trampled in the name of expressways, freeways, and other transportation disasters accommodating vehicles at expense of people, quality of urban life, and destruction of taxable property and historical sites.

As air pollution mounts, so do waste problems at the other end of this cycle. Autos are being junked in ever-increasing numbers. Their eventual disposal has created major difficulties—clutter and ugliness among them.

There is deliberate ignoring of answers immediately available to us by those who can implement solutions. Instead of urban mass transit, the ultimate and only answer, we hear arguments in favor of Government subsidization of the SST, complete with sonic boom—at expense of other social needs. Do we propose to reform transport by placing the jackass into the cart? Instead of preposterous belchings, there must be action to appreciably alter or alleviate our situation. America must enunciate a clearly defined transportation policy, setting forth priorities which cater to cities. Foremost on such a list must be urban mass transit, both above and below ground.

For years, builders of highways have been able to proceed with our now almost completed Interstate Highway System because of the Federal Highway Trust Fund. Now overseen by the Department of Transportation, it thrives because of contributions in form of user taxes. Money is doled out to each State on a quarterly basis; in turn allocated through appropriate authorities to various projects underway. In this manner, our entire Interstate System has reached a point of near completion. Why can we not create a trust fund for urban mass transit exactly like or similar to the existing one? Such a measure has already been introduced in this House, and I have joined in sponsoring it with my distinguished colleague, the gentleman from New York (Mr. KOCH).

Mr. Speaker, it seems Government has yet to realize that our cities are immutable facts, containing a growing, overwhelming majority of our people, struggling to live in them. Rural America bulges with public works and subsidies obtained through Federal favor. Watershed projects, dams, roads, access arteries, subsidized crops, direct payments for nonuse of land and innumerable Federal installations. Special committees cater to it on a Federal level in both Houses of Congress. Such is not the case with cities.

Yet it is our cities which produce most of our wealth, providing Government with most of its annual revenue—in par-

ticular cities in a few States. Why then must cities sit silently in patronized isolation, begging for a jot and tittle of their own money? The people that our cities represent are in the national majority and deserve power, influence, and catering to their interests.

My home State of New York pays more than \$23 billion annually to the Federal Treasury, receiving in return a shade under \$2 billion annually in Federal moneys. New York City contains 8 million Americans, and cannot obtain adequate Federal aid for its mass transit system. We must end such an intolerable situation.

Urban Congressmen have gone along with too many noncity programs without a murmur. They have begged and pleaded for too long in vain. Certainly I see no reason to approve or even tolerate an SST or emphasis on an airport plan which will immediately have the effect of shoving mass transit to the bottom of our list of national transportation priorities.

We must have significant Federal subsidization of subways and high-speed trains, as well as upgrading of already existing modes and routes of mass transit. Creaking buslines would also be upgraded, and VTOL and STOL aircraft should be commercially developed. The list is as endless as our needs. I might also note that construction of mass urban transit systems will be as long term and profitable as creating highways.

Money now being siphoned into the existing fund for highway construction could well be partially diverted into this new trust fund. Most of all, there must be a sense of public and national urgency. Time grows short in which we can bask in the luxury of hesitation and procrastination. Instead of unneeded plans and preposterous public posturing, let there be action. We know the problems, which have been studied to death. We possess solutions, which are instantly at hand. There is no further need to torture facts to death.

I would compare cities, suburbs, and rural areas to three people tied together and thrown overboard. Without cooperation, all will drown. So unless one or two of them can breathe under water, I suggest they work together. It would be the best form of travel ever discovered.

FROM COMPLEX TO MIND TO STATE—IN THE NAME OF WHAT?

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

Mr. PODELL. Mr. Speaker, we must dig under the acrimonious debate now raging in our Nation over the military-industrial complex, as it has been called. We must look beyond the frontline battle of ABM, C-5A, poison gas, biological warfare agents, Korean intelligence-gathering missions, Vietnam, and overkill. It is the very essence of our Nation which we must seek to examine, because I feel it is endangered.

First I offer a word of respect for our military. They have become objects of attack because they are visible and seeking to do either their jobs or protect legitimate interests.

A time has come, however, when we must choose what kind of an America we wish, both internally and in terms of the image we project to the world, allies, neutrals, and enemies alike.

America has not been, until Korean war times, a military state with a massive standing armed force in peacetime. Yet since 1953 we have become possessed by an ethic that seems to demand we maintain a military capability to fight both an Asian and European conflict. Thrown into this equation has been the capability to deal with at least one limited conflict somewhere. This has in turn necessitated a massive and ever-present American military presence, complete with accompanying bases and intelligence gathering efforts, almost everywhere in the world. Our flag flies in every sphere, and our young men serve under it. This is fact, not conjecture.

Our presence is at times provocative in many areas of the world. We become a convenient target. When struck at, we are forced to react or look less than militarily omnipotent. National pride and its symbols immediately follow the flag, wherever we choose to commit it. Thus, we become embroiled in local nationalisms, regional alliances and civil conflicts, which at times demand commitment of armed forces. This inexorably leads to executive action which in turn erodes congressional authority. For none of these innumerable brushes require declarations of war.

Finally, and most fraught with peril for our country, is the fostering of a military ethic as a way of life. It is natural for major armaments industries to grow up in such an atmosphere, dominating individual political constituencies. What is fraught with greatest long term menace for our country is an all-pervasive, eternal military cast of thought we have been fostering and gently foisting upon the vast majority of our people.

Military production becomes an economic necessity. A state of war evolves into a state of mind. A state of mind becomes a state of siege. Our mentality as a nation is evolving into a frightening military cast of national thought. Military solutions are instantly preferred in response to political challenges. War is rapidly becoming a way of life to many of our people. Peace is recalled as a mere interlude between conflicts. We are raising our children increasingly within a military framework of reference. Our society is becoming permeated with military symbols, military usage and military activities. Is this the America of our past? Is this that peaceful land which was always last to draw its sword? Would Franklin recognize it, Jefferson sympathize with it, or Carl Schurz love it? Is this why Lincoln saved the Union or why we fought "over there"? Is it why Jane Adams founded Hull House or men fought to unionize?

Preparedness for combat in time of peace is, of course, necessary. Yet must we enshrine and turn it into a national fetish, adorning it with our symbols and rationalizing acts in its name which would shame our heritage and disgrace our fathers? I think not.

Is it not time for us to rethink our priorities as a national state, taking into

consideration our goals as a republic? Is this not a worthy exercise as well as criticizing wars, excess military expenditures, and our military-industrial complex?

Our military people are not monsters. They are simply carrying out national policies we have allowed to become our order of the day. They are not happily seeking to kill or intrude into daily lives of foreign states and their people. They are merely carrying out strict directives and treaty obligations we as a nation have freely entered into. Military contractors are not monstrous ogres stalking a tortured earth with blood dripping from their fingertips. They are simply businessmen catering to and profiting from a need our national policies and their execution have fostered and created.

I think it is time to deescalate the process of evolution of the United States into a military state. In my humble opinion, we are not endowed with the luxury of taking our time about this exercise.

Existing missile and thermonuclear technology obviates the need for such massive standing forces of a conventional nature as we now possess. We only invite instant Soviet competition. What we have in the shape of shiny new military toys of any kind, they too must have. By all means, let us insure that in the basic defense of our Nation, we are even or ahead of them. Then, however, let us call a halt. We do not require striking forces to take us into every nook and cranny of God's earth.

Massive forces such as these eventually acquire a life all their own, becoming factors in and of themselves in our national power equation. They capture us, become prime movers, and can destroy us. We must reassert our mastery over them.

America has always been a light to the world. Her institutions and ideals have always found noblest expression, even when we went to war. An unnecessary presence leading to a useless conflict only denigrates our ideals as well as consumes our substance and wastes the lives of our young men. There are too many widows, orphans, and cripples in our country, and they are a strange, unnerving sight to me. Also, they are a message to each of us.

We must, without indulging in the futile exercise of isolationism, seek a new balance within our Nation between military and civilian influences. We must reemphasize our civilian nature as a nation, as well as reassert ourselves as a peace-loving state. We can easily reduce our presence and resulting provocativeness in many areas of the world. Sums of money saved in this manner, and they would be vast, indeed, could be put to work here at home, where they are so badly needed.

A time is at hand when we must choose where we are going and what identity we shall assume as a power in the world. Bristling with weapons and in evidence everywhere, we shall continue along the same nasty road. It leads to national disaster and protofascism here at home. We must, at all costs, evade this fate.

Let us instead, emulate those who created our Nation. Their message is still vibrantly clear and enormously relevant. They were strong, yet did not parade it in the eyes of the world. Ever ready for war, they practiced peace, never making a fetish of preparedness or parade of might. It would behoove us to choose that road, which is open and beckoning to us as a nation. Let us but follow it.

Men forever curse bringers of war, and remember best and with reverence practitioners of peace. I would rather that a man a thousand years hence should say to his son, "Look at that piece of work. It was built by the Americans to help uplift and upgrade the lives of people. What an amazing nation of builders and workers for all that is good in man—those Americans."

REPRESENTATIVE ROTH INTRODUCES BILL TO REMOVE TAX-EXEMPT STATUS FROM PRIVATE FOUNDATIONS ENGAGED IN QUESTIONABLE PROPRIETY WITH OFFICIALS OF THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT

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

Mr. ROTH. Mr. Speaker, I am today introducing a bill to remove the tax-exempt status from private foundations which engage in transactions of questionable propriety with officials of the Federal Government. The bill is identical to S. 2075 introduced in the other body last week by the senior Senator from Delaware (Mr. WILLIAMS).

The bill, if enacted, would also impose a tax of 100 percent on all income received by Government officials from such tax-exempt foundations.

Quite frankly, Mr. Speaker, this proposal is the result of the serious allegations made against Associate Justice Abe Fortas. I do not, however, believe that Congress should impose higher standards of conduct on officials of the executive and judicial branches than Congress itself lives under. Accordingly, this bill applies to Congress as well as to high officials of the administration and the courts.

The acceptance by Justice Fortas of \$20,000 from the Wolfson Family Foundation, even though temporary, is a most serious blow to the dignity and integrity of the Supreme Court. As such, the Nation is faced with a much broader question than Mr. Fortas' suitability to continue to serve on the Court. The specific case involving Justice Fortas should be dealt with separately from the issue of judicial ethics and conduct.

Last Tuesday, I wrote the able and distinguished chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary urging that the committee conduct hearings on the subject of judicial ethics. Out of these proceedings I hope will come responsible and enforceable standards of ethics and conduct applicable to the Federal judiciary.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to insert a copy of my May 6 letter to Chairman CELLER at this point in the RECORD:

HOUSES OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D.C., May 6, 1969.

HON. EMANUEL CELLER,
Chairman, House Committee on the Judiciary,
Rayburn House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: I strongly urge the Committee on the Judiciary to conduct hearings as soon as possible on ethics and conduct of Justices of the Supreme Court and judges of lower Federal courts. The controversy surrounding Associate Justice Abe Fortas—the second in less than a year—raises in the mind of the public serious questions that threaten the dignity of the Court. Indeed, there are those who would use this issue to attack the Supreme Court as an institution.

I feel there should be three objectives of hearings before the Committee:

First, hearings should focus on the question of proper conduct for members of the Bench. An effort should be made to define what is and is not acceptable conduct for individuals possessing the immense prestige, power, and responsibility of serving on the courts of the United States.

Second, the Committee should give careful attention to the matter of judges serving in positions of responsibility not directly related to their court functions. The appointment of Chief Justice Warren to head the Commission investigating the assassination of President Kennedy is the best example of both potential conflict of interest and possible violation of the Constitutionally outlined separation of powers.

Third, the Committee would be wise to consider the difficult question of members of the courts serving in quasi-official or informal advisory capacity to other government officials. The reported involvement of Justice Fortas in preparing the 1968 law providing Secret Service protection to Presidential and Vice-Presidential candidates is, in my judgment, contrary to the doctrine of separation of powers and flies in the face of the long-standing tradition against members of the courts rendering advisory opinions.

While the present controversy centers on Mr. Fortas, I am more concerned with the dignity and independence of the Supreme Court. Mr. Fortas' conduct has cast a dark shadow over his stature as a Justice, but this is a problem that must be dealt with separately. By his actions, however, he has brought into focus a wide range of important public policy issues demanding answers.

It may well be that all of these issues do not lend themselves to statutory or other Congressional remedies. Even if this is the case, I nevertheless feel that the House, through its Judiciary Committee, has a duty to explore the matter thoroughly. Hopefully, these hearings could result in promulgation of an officially recognized and enforceable code of conduct, applicable to the Federal judiciary.

Sincerely,

WILLIAM V. ROTH, Jr.

INVESTIGATION OF CIVILIAN REACTOR PROGRAM

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

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, in view of a recent statement by Dr. Glenn T. Seaborg, Chairman of the Atomic Energy Commission, I would suggest that still more of my colleagues may wish to join those of us who have sponsored resolutions to investigate the nonmilitary activities of the AEC.

I quote the following paragraphs from

Air/Water Pollution Report for April 28, 1969:

AEC TELLS MINNESOTA POLLUTION AGENCY IT CANNOT REGULATE RADIOACTIVE WASTE DISCHARGES

States do not have authority to regulate the discharge of radioactive waste from nuclear power plants, Dr. Glenn T. Seaborg, Chairman of the Atomic Energy Commission, told a press conference at the American Chemical Society meeting in Minneapolis. Seaborg said that the problem is "primarily a legal one," when questioned about Minnesota Pollution Control Agency's pending decision on Northern States Power Company's application for permit to discharge radioactive wastes into the Mississippi River at its nuclear generating plant at Monticello, Minnesota.

Seaborg said that AEC told the state agency that since Congress has given AEC regulatory authority over radioactive discharges, the state cannot also regulate such discharges.

Mr. Speaker, in this posture, the Federal Government is guilty of a conflict of purpose in its air and water pollution control programs. Under the Water and Air Quality Acts, individual States have every right to set more rigid standards than whatever criteria may be established by Federal authority.

Section 107(b)(1) of the Air Quality Act of 1967 states:

The Secretary shall, after consultation with appropriate advisory committees and Federal departments and agencies, from time to time, but as soon as practicable, develop and issue to the States such criteria of air quality as in his judgment may be requisite for the protection of the public health and welfare.

The following paragraphs are from Water Quality Standards, a pamphlet just published by the Federal Water Pollution Control Administration:

If the Secretary of the Interior finds some standards adopted by a State unacceptable or that none has been set by a State for an interstate stream, he may under the law prepare new or revised standards after giving reasonable notice of his intention.

Then, if the State does not submit acceptable standards within six months or petition for a public hearing, the Secretary may put these standards into effect.

In neither case has the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare or the Secretary of the Interior stated or indicated that standards more exacting than Federal criteria should be considered unacceptable. On the contrary, any such exceptions would likely be looked upon as national goals, with other States encouraged to attain the same quality of air or water in the shortest possible time.

Why, then, should another agency of Government be able to deprive States and communities of setting limits on the discharge of the most feared contaminant—radioactive waste?

At this point I should like to quote from a news story by Fred Jones, Pittsburgh Press conservation editor, appearing in the issue of Friday, May 2:

HARRISBURG.—Pennsylvania conservation forces turned their big guns away from the coal industry today and trained them on "the far greater danger of pollution from atomic energy plants."

Leonard A. Green, first vice president of the Pennsylvania Federation of Sportsmen Clubs, said the conservation problems caused

by the coal industry "look like small potatoes compared with those we face in the future."

Speaking at the annual Pennsylvania Environment Improvement Conference sponsored by the State Chamber of Commerce, Mr. Green called for added safeguards against nuclear disaster.

"Despite the reassuring words of the Atomic Energy Commission (AEC) and private industry promoting the construction of atomic energy plants, there is a clear and present danger of not only pollution but of accidents that could wipe out the lives of thousands of people," he said.

Mr. Green said AEC files contain reports of accidents at atomic power plants where utter disaster was averted "only by seconds and the grace of God."

"In the rush to develop atomic power, both national and state governments have been ignoring these dangers and gambling with lives of thousands of people.

"The general public has been lulled into a sense of false security by the failure of government and private industry to tell us just what we are letting ourselves in for when we build atomic power plants in our State," he added.

Mr. Green said that if the State and Federal authorities fail to make these facts known and set up proper safeguards, conservationists should and would make these facts public.

Mr. Speaker, it is reassuring that the conservationist groups in Pennsylvania are undertaking to diffuse the AEC propaganda and to demand the right for people to protect themselves not only against exposure to the deadly effects of air and water pollution from nuclear reactors, but also against the catastrophic potential of an incident in the operation of an atom plant.

The State of Pennsylvania was also involved in a plan contrived by the AEC to subject an area to an underground detonation of immense proportion. I commend to my colleagues' attention an article, "Blasts Can Start Quake, Nuclear Scientist Says," from the Washington Star of the past April 26.

I should also like to refer my colleagues to the publication, "Peaceful Use of Nuclear Explosives—Some Economic Aspects," which was sent to me by Resources for the Future, Inc. Its authors are David B. Brooks and John V. Krutilla. The following paragraph is extracted from the chapter on "Safety Considerations":

It may well be that ground shock and air blast will, in the end, set the limits on the maximum yield of individual detonations, but it is radiation which arouses most concern. Radiation is derived largely from the fission trigger of a thermonuclear device, but is also induced in surrounding materials by the thermonuclear blast itself. Thus, even the cleanest device will distribute some radioactivity. And if the explosive device is large enough to be economically feasible in excavation applications, it is very likely (despite improvements in excavation technology) to cause fallout over an area of several hundred square miles. The fallout problem is particularly serious because certain of the most worrisome isotopes (strontium-90 and cesium-137) have gaseous precursors and are therefore widely distributed.

Mr. Speaker, the many other ramifications of utilizing the atom to blast out underground storage space for natural gas are carefully outlined. I suggest you consider them before agreeing to further AEC expenditures on such projects or before subjecting your own congress-

sional districts to such experimentation. Conceding that projects likely to be tested in the near future show a "reasonable probability of proving at least marginally economic," Brooks and Krutilla conclude:

However, it appears that really significant net returns from peaceful application of nuclear explosives can only come when they are detonated in large blasts. It is obvious that such blasts raise all of the uncertainties and potential for adverse effects (to say nothing of political considerations) to positions of primary importance. Thus, assuming that the Plowshare program is to continue—a question that is ultimately political rather than economic—there is great need for investigating the economics of such projects in the broadest terms, including as many influences and factors as possible, rather than treating them as 'geographic engineering' feats. Clearly, a more than marginal reorientation of research effort toward the sorts of questions posed above is called for.

To me, Mr. Speaker, the Brooks-Krutilla study is further evidence that AEC is desperately seeking out ways to keep its bureaucracy booming at any cost. Whether the disclosure of earthquake danger will bring any hesitation in the underground blasting program is yet to be determined, but you can be certain that residents of the Lock Haven, Pa., area are thankful that the subterranean bomb project near that community was not carried out. Their protest was directed at air and water hazards, but the staggering news about underground explosions and earthquakes emphasizes another dread consequence that might have come had the program materialized.

House Joint Resolution 83 provides for a complete investigation of the Nation's civilian reactor program. Through it we can also determine the AEC's intentions with respect to subsurface explosions and other programs that may be imperiling life and property. In addition, I am confident that the study of the Commission's nonmilitary activities can result in annual savings of millions of dollars so desperately needed for other Federal programs.

FUTURE U.S. TRADE POLICY

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

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, earlier this year the President's special representative for trade negotiations issued a report entitled "Future U.S. Trade Policy." It was heavily endorsed, with few dissenting opinions, by a public advisory committee on trade policy of 36 members.

Since the appointment of Carl Gilbert as the President's special trade representative foreshadows a continuation of the trade policy pursued by his predecessor, William Roth, the report of the Advisory Committee on Trade Policy remains a document that may be regarded as a guide to current and projected trade policies of this country.

It is for this reason that I offer a critique of the report prepared by O. R. Strackbein, who is president of the Nation-Wide Committee on Import-Export Policy. The Nation-Wide Committee is

composed of industries, agricultural and labor groups that bear the brunt of rising import competition and would suffer the consequences of further trade liberalization.

The author examines critically some of the fundamental assumptions and notions that support the free-trade position. He not only finds them falling short of their supposed value as guides but sees them as mischief makers in the form underlying assumptions. He illustrates the fallacy of these assumptions in the controlled and regulated economies such as are characteristic in the world today. In so doing he demonstrates the competitive disadvantage under which numerous American industries operate in the face of imports that derive their competitive advantage, not from greater efficiency, but from lower unit wage costs.

Mr. Speaker, I commend the reading of Mr. Strackbein's analysis to all Members who are interested in our foreign trade policy, and include it in the RECORD immediately following these remarks:

FUTURE U.S. TRADE POLICY

(By O. R. Strackbein)

The President's Special Representative for Trade Negotiations issued a Report to the President, dated January 14, 1969 under the title "Future United States Trade Policy."

The Report was reviewed by a Public Advisory Committee on Trade Policy, consisting of 36 members. The Committee approved the Report but some members dissented at various points and their observations were printed as footnotes in the pertinent sections of the Report.

It is the purpose of this paper to comment on the general philosophy and assumptions that shaped the conclusions and recommendations of the Report.

BASIC PHILOSOPHY OF THE REPORT

The Report is oriented to freer trade, and uncritically accepts the notion that the dismantlement of trade barriers represents the supreme economic good in the field of international trade. In doing so it accepts the Adam Smith economic philosophy of two centuries ago as the gospel.

Unfortunately such uncritical acceptance led also to tacit if not express assumptions that go hand-in-hand with the free-trade philosophy. This philosophy in its turn rests for its effectiveness on certain assumptions without which it would be without integrity.

Free trade among the nations, for example, for its proper operation, presumes a free enterprise system based on uninhibited interplay of prices and other economic forces under the sway of competition. The competing forces must be free so that unhealthy commitments of land, capital and labor must soon show their folly by being forced out of profitable operation by competition.

In this respect only the economically most fit enterprises would survive. The unfit ones would fall by the wayside. Thus would the productive resources and energies of the different countries be driven into the most fertile and productive enterprises. Capital and labor would be blessed with the highest possible compensation in the form of produced wealth.

The simplest example is usually found in the obvious advantage possessed by the tropical regions in the production of tropical fruits, spices and similar items that thrive in the torrid zone. The cooler climes should devote their land and energies to plant and animal life that in turn thrive in the temperate zone. By such specialization each area would achieve the maximum benefit from its climate and natural resources.

The natural basis of trade lies in such comparative productivity among different countries or areas of the world. A free ex-

change of goods would rebound to the mutual benefit of all concerned. Coffee-growers would do well to pursue coffee-growing while buying their wheat from areas that do best with that crop. Wheat growers on their part should not grow coffee since that represents economic inefficiency. They should buy their coffee from the tropical lands.

By extrapolation the same principle is then extended to industrial products, minerals, etc.

Such a theory, of course, was Heaven-sent for England as a guide during and after the Industrial Revolution. Her colonies were to supply raw materials to the mother country, which, because of her advantage, could manufacture more cheaply than the colonies, while they in turn because of their natural resources of soil and climate could produce the raw materials more advantageously than England. Thus free-trade was a godsend to the colonial system, with England at the apex. The colonies could enjoy lower-priced manufactured goods while England obtained her needed raw materials at low cost.

The American colonies were the first to revolt. The War of 1812 confirmed the need for manufacturing in this country if we were to maintain a viable republic.

The free-trade theory has persisted, inculcated in our students of economics in our colleges and universities.

Adherence to the principle of free trade by industries and agricultural pursuits that benefit handsomely from exports, and by importers, is, of course, not surprising. A direct economic benefit such as theirs usually prevails over objective philosophy but yet frequently insists on donning the robes of objectivity in public utterances.

The members of the Advisory Committee were overwhelmingly from the sectors that gain most from enlarged foreign trade.

As for the Office of the President's Special Representative for Trade Negotiations, it would be useless to expect a contrary philosophy from that source. Therefore, with the exception of a few clear dissents from the handful of members of the Advisory Committee of a different persuasion, the Report was faithful to the free-trade philosophy. This fact, of course, weighs heavily against its value as a guide to national policy.

We shall examine some of the tacit assumptions on which the Report is based through its fidelity to the philosophy of free trade.

FALSE ASSUMPTIONS

To repeat, if free trade is to perform its function, a *laissez-faire* economic regime must prevail. Competition must be free to the maximum extent compatible with public health and safety if free trade is to work its benefits. Free trade cannot countenance substantial interference with economic forces. This taboo extends to State or political interference with such economic forces as wages, hours of work, the free movement of labor, including immigration and emigration, bargaining between employers and the work force, welfare and social security payments and much else that would interfere with the play of natural economic forces. To the extent that the economic forces are restrained, controlled, modified or diverted free trade is distorted and denied its theoretical goals.

It has been a characteristic of the assumptions of free-trade or freer-trade advocates that international trade barriers are the principal culprits destroying the benefits of free trade, and that if these barriers were removed free trade could flourish.

Yet upon examination of the conditions on which free trade rests we may see that free trade may encounter its death knell within individual economies. *Free trade among nations represents only one aspect of free trade, and really the smaller part of it. Domestic policies within nations may so interfere with economic forces that free international trade becomes untenable as a practice.*

Usually it is internal political factors that generate domestic measures incompatible with free international trade; or it may be national aspirations that become political factors, such as the National Socialism of the Nazis.

Ironically, as this country moved toward ever tighter interference of the government with the domestic economy during and after the Great Depression, bringing many economic operations and activities under regulation and thus moving farther and farther away from free enterprise or *laissez-faire* economics, it insisted on moving in the opposite direction in respect of trade policy. As we interfered successively with farm prices, wages and hours of work, collective bargaining, bank deposits (in the form of insurance), money and interest rates, stock-market operations, unemployment and much else, thus stifling specifically and categorically the natural competitive forces, we began dismantling the tariff and thundered against import quotas as if such interferences with the free flow of economic forces were anathema.

It was indeed a strange performance. As we upheld farm prices against the downward pressure exerted by competition, and established minimum wages; and as we set up unemployment compensation, however justified these measures may have been under the ruling political climate, we were abandoning wholesale the principles of free trade and free enterprise. *In so interfering we made a shambles of the principle of international free trade.* Yet we insisted on our topsy-turvy policy to the extent of enshrining liberalized trade as a cornerstone of national policy. This is the tribute we paid to the mental economic conditioning dispensed over several generations by our colleges and universities which in turn could not resist the Adam Smith philosophy because it was so crystal clear and beautiful.

A FEW SPECIFICS

In the full knowledge that it is virtually hopeless to go against the citadel of conditioned thought, it seems nevertheless worth pointing to a few incontrovertible evidential data that cannot be brushed aside without doing violence to economic reality.

The classical economists, the time-honored apostles of free trade, maintain that *significant international differentials in unit cost of production cannot persist because of competition.* Therefore it follows that those who contend that American costs of production in many lines of products are higher than their foreign counterparts must be wrong, the victims of shallow economic thinking.

The difficulty in the premises of those who bring the indictment is that they assume a world such as free-trade pictures and such as is dearest to its devotees' hearts but that does not exist, indeed has never existed and is not likely to exist in the foreseeable future.

That international cost differentials do exist and do persist year after year has been common knowledge among practical people. Free trade would level the differentials by driving out the higher cost enterprises. It is in this way that maximum world productivity of capital investment, land and labor would be achieved. World-wide specialization would be the rule. The underdeveloped countries would remain forever the raw material producers for the industrialized countries. The colonial system would be perpetuated.

Unfortunately for the theory governmental interferences with economic forces have been eagerly multiplied throughout the world during the past generation and free competitive forces have been the victim. They have been stifled in deference to national economic planning and other motives.

THE AMERICAN MERCHANT MARINE AS AN EXAMPLE

The American merchant marine offers a prime example of a persistent cost-differen-

tial between domestic and foreign enterprise, both in ship construction and ship operation. We have recourse to this example because in this instance Federally-substantiated cost data resulting from surveys provide us with concrete evidence. Our government makes wage and cost surveys both at home and abroad as a guide for the Federal maritime subsidy, without the existence of which no American flag ships could ply the high seas as competitors in ocean transport.

The difference in costs is revealed to be a little over 100%, our costs being a little more than double the foreign. The source of the differential lies, of course, in the higher U.S. wages. That we are actually more productive per man than our foreign maritime competitors follows from the fact that our costs are not as far above the foreign as our wages tower over foreign wages. Thus while our wages are three to five times as high as the foreign our costs are only a little over twice as high. Were we not more productive per man-hour or man-year our costs would be three to five times as high as the foreign.

In the ten-year period of 1955-65 the differential widened some 10% rather than narrowing or disappearing as the assumptions of the classical economists would demand.

Here is solid evidence of the persistence of cost differentials despite the international competition that American ships encounter. It will be said immediately that the subsidies cause the persistence of the differential; and that is indeed true; but the subsidy did not generate the differential. It represented an effort to offset the effects of cost-increasing governmental interferences and burdens laid on the domestic industry but not borne by the foreign competitors.

It is precisely such internal interferences of a great variety on a broad scale that upset the free-trade doctrine.

While in this instance the governmental subsidy makes possible a minimal American participation in ocean shipping, it was previous interferences with wages, principally indirectly through a variety of national legislative enactments, including obligatory collective bargaining, and other cost-enhancing measures, that destroyed our competitive capability in the first place. It was the general interference with the rough forces of relentless competition, to create a more humane economy, or call it what you will, that made of free international trade in shipbuilding and ship operation a lethal luxury that we could not face as a national policy.

Those who would abolish the subsidy would say that our inability to compete is attributable to relative inefficiency; but such an indictment, we have seen, would fly in the face of the demonstrable facts. The free-trade philosophers would turn their backs on the merchant marine and abandon it as a sacrifice to the free-trade ideal while they themselves as voters very likely supported the national policies that caused our competitive lag. In their compartmentalized thought they fail to link their contribution to the cause with its unwelcome effect.

BENZENOID CHEMICALS AND THE AMERICAN SELLING PRICE

Another measure of the persistence of a cost differential is available in the comparative cost of foreign and domestic synthetic chemicals, usually referred to as the benzenoids.

Because the tariff on such chemicals is based on the American manufacturers' selling prices rather than the foreign value of imports, and because steps were taken looking toward elimination of this basis for levying the duty (virtually all other products being dutiable on their foreign rather than their American value), the United States Tariff Commission was called upon for a survey to determine the difference between the American selling price and foreign value

of the competing chemicals. In a report made in 1966 the Commission tabulated the 1964 imports of 84 classifications of *competitive benzenoid chemicals* and reported the differentials then existent. In only 6 classifications was the foreign value higher than the American selling price. The remainder were all at lower levels. The arithmetical average of all 84 classifications showed the American selling price 86% above the foreign value.

This differential is somewhat lower than that prevailing in the maritime industry, as set forth above, but yet very impressive. It does demonstrate once more the persistence of cost differentials, inasmuch as the American selling price basis for levying the duty was established in 1922.

To say that the American tariff caused the differential and perpetuated it would be tantamount to saying that European costs of producing these chemicals were determined by the American tariff. This would be a very unlikely explanation since employee compensation, except under monopoly conditions, represents by far the preponderant element of cost of production. The cost of producing chemicals in Europe could be only marginally dependent on exports to the United States. Their lower costs arose from other sources, such as the lower wages prevailing in their plants and in the supporting industries.

It might also be said as is so often asserted in similar instances that the American tariff makes it possible for the American manufacturers to charge higher prices to the customers than they could if there were no tariff. Undoubtedly this is true. The alternative would be lower prices, in order to remain in production, and therefore lower profits or possibly a loss. Lower profits would indeed produce the effects asserted of free trade. Either the manufacturers would leave the field to imports and turn to other products or would accept the lower profits or the loss, as the case might be. They might, of course, strive to reduce their own costs in order to become competitive. This alternative again is one of the benefits attributed to free trade. However, if they had success in this endeavor imports would be squeezed no less than by a tariff. Our market would offer no better prospect to foreign exporters than it would if a cost-equalizing tariff were in effect. The effect on imports would be no less restrictive.

If we examine these alternatives we may come upon the implications of free trade for American industry.

First, let us examine the equity in the premises. If American costs are higher the legitimate question is why they are higher. It is because of relative inefficiency of domestic producers, which is to ask whether they produce less per man-hour or man-year than their foreign competitors? In the chemical industry (the benzenoids) just now reviewed, there is no sure measure. In other industries comparative measures of productivity are on clearer ground.

THE STEEL INDUSTRY AS AN EXAMPLE

In the steel industry output per man per year is measurable in tonnage. In 1964 the output per man in the United States was 248 tons per production worker, compared to 181 tons in West Germany, 151 tons in France, 174 tons in Italy, and 156 tons in Japan (up from 112 tons in 1960). (European Coal and Steel Community, General Report, March 1964; Basic Statistics of the Community, 1965, Table 10, p. 28.)

Despite this lead in productivity the American steel industry is often accused of inefficiency because imports have risen rapidly since 1958 while exports have dropped sharply. If we examine the relative levels of employee compensation, it is readily understood why the foreign countries enjoy a competitive advantage—one of sufficient

magnitude to overcome the cost of ocean transportation and other export expenses.

Steel wages in our industry were at a level of \$3.36 per hour in 1963 or at an annual rate of about \$6,600. This compares with average annual net earnings of steelworkers also in 1963 (without free accommodations) with a family of two, of \$1,970 in West Germany, \$2,264 in France, \$2,516 in Belgium, \$2,146 in Holland, \$1,834 in Italy and \$1,380 (with bonus) in Japan (U.S. Wages: Current Survey of Business, U.S. Department of Commerce, April 1966; European: Statistical Office of the European Communities, Basic Statistics of the Community, 1965, Table 92, p. 138; Japanese wages: Monthly Report of Iron and Steel Statistics, Iron and Steel Federation, Japan).

Once more it is clear that our competitive disadvantage, which is the same as the foreign advantage, in our market did not arise from our comparative inefficiency. Our productivity was merely not sufficiently ahead of that of our competitors to offset the lower wages they paid. Moreover, in many industries our lead is narrowing because of foreign technological advancement.

If our steel industry is to increase its productivity sufficiently to overcome the cost differential, drastic reductions in employment must be made. There is no other source of cost reduction remotely comparable to employee compensation. Since wages cannot be reduced, worker displacement by technology represents the only recourse for achieving substantially lower costs. This follows from the fact that employee compensation represents very close to 80% of corporate production costs in the United States. (Statistical Abstract of the United States, 1968, Table 463, p. 317, National Income by Sector). This is a very important fact.

COLLAPSE OF THE INDICTMENT OF INEFFICIENCY

Should the free-trade economists trouble themselves to investigate relative productivity between domestic producers and their foreign competitors they would lose their most effective and persuasive contention, which is that American industry needs protection because of its relative inefficiency. The indictment does not stand and cannot be substantiated simply because facts do not support it. Nevertheless these beleaguered economists will not accept relatively low employee compensation in other countries as a source of their competitive advantage. To do so would upset their free-trade teachings.

Whereas the export industries, the importers and the financial and service industries that have a heavy stake in foreign trade, have selfish interests as a source of motivation for continuing to sing the false notes, the economists are principally motivated by vested intellectual interests. Having become intellectually anchored to a particular philosophy their defense of position is often more sublimely stubborn than that of their more pragmatic commercial counterparts.

These defenders of the faith, moreover, have not yet explained the difference in effects between a trade restriction in the form of a tariff or an import quota in terms of their reducing trade, on the one hand, and increased efficiency of our industries as a means of warding off imports, on the other. In either event foreign exports are held off.

No doubt they would feel better if our greater efficiency accomplished the limitation of imports. Our consumers would then presumably reap the benefits in the form of lower prices.

However, before giving way to unrestrained glee over the prospect, it may be sobering to turn to yet another piece of irrefutable evidence supported by official statistics.

THE EXPERIENCE OF THE COAL INDUSTRY AND THE MINE WORKERS

Before we worship too ardently at the altar of industrial efficiency we would do well to look about us. We have good cause to question productive efficiency as the supreme social good, no less than the forces that press

¹ T. C. Publication 181, July 1966. See pp. 6-16.

relentlessly in that direction, including low-cost imports.

The coal industry in the early 'fifties found itself beset by lethal competition from several sources, especially diesel oil, residual fuel oil and natural gas. The industry was faced with a peremptory competitive demand to reduce costs substantially or see itself evicted from the fuels field. The "short and simple annals of the poor" have seldom recorded a more tragic economic cataclysm or one about which less was made in the form of heart-rending news accounts than the inhabitants of the area known as Appalachia from 1950-65.

The coal industry achieved competitiveness both at home and abroad and has recovered most of its lost ground in terms of coal tonnage produced annually. *In so doing the industry, however, demonstrated what is involved in terms of employment in the process of reducing costs of production.*

The output of coal per man-year was 1,159 tons in 1950. In 1965 an output more than three times as great was reached, or 3,697 tons per year per miner. Employment of miners slid at a dizzying pace, dropping from 483,000 in 1950 to 142,000 in 1965. This was a drop of 341,000 jobs, or two jobs of every three!

True, only a part of the cause was the imports of residual fuel oil; but the principle is the same. The cost of productive efficiency was revealed in its drastic exaction. The cost of rehabilitating Appalachia at many hundreds of millions of dollars has not yet accomplished the readjustment, while human misery continues on a scale that demonstrates the intractable nature of industrial disruption induced by a peremptory program of greater efficiency.

THE EXAMPLE OF AGRICULTURE

While the experience of the coal industry was dramatic, American agriculture has contributed a lion's share to the casualties of efficiency. From 1950 to 1965 (the same period as that of the coal example) the index of output per farm worker per hour increased from 61 to 155 or an increase of more than 2½ times, a phenomenal burst, even if somewhat short of the coal achievement. (Stat. Abs. of the U.S., 1968, Table 927, p. 614.)

During the same period farm employment dropped from 9.9 million to 5.6 million, for a decline of over 4 million, large numbers of whom migrated to the urban centers where they added their distress to the ghettos and greatly aggravated our urban problems and the civil rights disturbances. Since 1965 the efficiency index of farm labor has risen further, from 155 to 167 and the number of workers has declined another million. (Stat. Abs. of the U.S., 1968, Tables 927 and 340.)

THE TOLL OF PRODUCTIVE EFFICIENCY

These recitations throw a revealing light on the cost of rising productive efficiency. We have worshipped so long at this shrine that a counsel of moderation risks falling on deaf ears. The cost, however, has not been confined to labor displacement. In our hurry we did not dispose properly of wastes and thus have poisoned our streams and the air and stripped much of our land.

Today we begin to demand costly steps to avoid further contamination and poisoning, and these call for expensive undertakings that will raise costs even beyond their present levels. These costs will be proportionately higher in this country than abroad, thus adding a further margin of competitive disadvantage on our side of the account.

That relatively higher productive efficiency does not lift us out of the reach of imports has been demonstrated frequently in recent years. The long-time chorus of the free-trade economists, chanting the theme that our most efficient industries, while paying the highest wages, were also our leading exporters, has nevertheless not been silenced.

The obsolete litany continues even though the automotive industry, the steel industry, the electronic industry, the manufacturers of typewriters and footwear, sewing machines and other mass producers are now on the import-vulnerable list. Yet some of them are among the highest wage payers in this country and among the most efficient.

Yet we find that in Chapter V, p. 41, of the Report to the President, the statement that "the United States must offset the lower standards of others by higher productivity and by other cost advantages—by innovation, style and design, and better distribution and marketing." In other words, we must be sharper merchandisers. Yet, style and design are unstable and ephemeral bases for competitive leadership. To equate them with employee compensation which represents approximately 80% of production costs does little credit to the Report.

After recognizing that "differences in labor standards that affect unit labor costs will play a greater role in determining the flow of trade," the Report nonetheless says that "the United States should neither use its fair labor standards as a protective device nor require that others match ours in absolute terms." Evidently industry and labor are to pay the price of our free-trade inebriation.

The Report completely ignores the many other legislative measures of the past generation that have also reduced our international competitive flexibility.

Because of the disrepute in which protectionism was held, because we needed a scapegoat to explain the 1929 debacle, the numerous measures designed to create full employment, high consumer income and welfare, were given little thought as boosters of costs. Our mass-production economy, unlike other world economies until recently, did indeed require a high consumer income to absorb the vast output of our farms and industry; and high wages supplied the high consumer income; but in raising costs of production we overlooked our competitive position. *As voters we laid heavy handicaps on our producers and then as consumers we looked eagerly abroad for bargain prices!* We found them in rising volume as other countries, with wage-costs lagging as productivity advanced, found our market an easy mark. Meantime we continue to cut our tariff and to preach free trade's virtue.

We properly helped the other countries to rebuild their economies and extended much technological assistance. Now, with growing evidence that we have over-exposed ourselves, the other countries threaten retaliation if we try to make some corrections and adjustments!

We have culpably even hidden the truth from the public by disseminating false official measures of our position in world trade. We have padded our exports by including all the Foreign Aid, Food-for-Peace and similar shipments as exports, thus showing comfortable surpluses of exports over imports, when in fact we have experienced deficits for several years in terms of commercial competitive exports.

The Report to the President did nothing to expose the deceptive practice; and that fact of itself is sufficient to condemn it.

The free-trade goal accepted by the Report is incompatible with the internal interferences we pursue, and would work at cross purposes with their objectives. Regulation of imports is not only consistent with our internal economic practices but indeed becomes necessary if we insist on adhering to the interferences.

Altogether the Report was an assemblage of data and superficial judgments that were ordained to a foregone conclusion. The public is not justified in accepting it as a serious examination of the factors, forces and trends that should shape our national trade policy.

THE MANNED SUBMERSIBLE SAFETY ACT

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

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I am today introducing legislation to promote safety in the operation of manned submersible vessels.

This legislation would be known as the Manned Submersible Safety Act and would permit the Secretary of the department in which the U.S. Coast Guard is operating to prescribe regulations and procedures for the safety in design and operation of these manned submersible vessels.

As a member of the Subcommittees on Oceanography and the Coast Guard of the House Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries, I have for many years taken an active interest in the research and development of our ocean resources, and I have also been particularly interested in the activities of the Coast Guard and have worked to increase the effectiveness of the Coast Guard in promoting marine safety.

This legislation is not intended to inhibit or impede the active research and development of submersible vessels that is now, and will be, undertaken. Indeed, there is specific language which would permit the Secretary to exempt a submersible vessel from the requirements of this act if he determines that the submersible vessel is being constructed or operated for developmental, experimental, or research work.

Research and experimentation with new designs and materials must be encouraged, not hindered, if we are to take full advantage of the treasures beneath the sea.

The language in this bill looks to the future as well as the present; research will bring new knowledge into the field of manned submersible activity, and the Secretary is permitted to change any regulations accordingly.

Since 1961, at least 30 submersibles have been built and are now operating; by 1975, more than 100 such vessels of varying shapes, sizes, and construction will be in operation.

Over 2,000 deep dives have been made to date by all American submersibles.

Submersibles are being built which will be sufficiently inexpensive to become available to the weekend mariner. We are only a few short years away from the day when any individual will be able to rent a manned submersible vehicle on a daily or hourly basis for recreation and relaxation beneath the water.

Due to the high quality of workmanship and competence of the manufacturers and pilots there have been, fortunately, no serious accidents to date. However, as new companies and individuals enter this field, the present record may not stand.

I urge prompt action on this legislation in order to insure realistic safety measures in this rapidly growing industry.

CAMPUS UNREST

(Mrs. GREEN of Oregon asked and was given permission to extend her remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. Mr. Speaker, the specter of campus unrest which has so relentlessly pursued our society in recent months has left the American public bewildered and disturbed. With references to our democratic society and a generation gap, many of our more radical youth have attempted to eradicate what they consider the gross flaws in our society in an attempt to establish their own utopian ideal.

In the prevailing confusion, one is reminded of the words of folksinger Bob Dylan:

There's something going on here but you don't know what it is, do you, Mr. Jones.

But "Mr. Jones" is wising up. After the initial disturbances and destruction he determined that naivete was no answer and an understanding smile did not prove to be much of an umbrella when protest hit the campus. The very real and pressing dangers to our educational system are apparent to all observers. While opinion must be respected and legitimate interests accommodated, we do not respect violence and we will not accommodate anarchy.

The "wising up" process has been a slow and painful one, but it is coming to fruition. It is impossible to understand why some individuals in our society are so willing to throw away what seems to us to be the hard won gains in a civilization that is our 4,000-year-old heritage. We know our civilization is not perfect, that changes are necessary. We not only know this: We have accomplished change and continue to seek it. However, none of us is willing to throw aside what we now have because it is less than perfect. We indict those in our society who exhibit only intolerance and a willingness to destroy what we have when they have no replacement to offer.

Much time has been given to analyzing and explaining the causes of the phenomenon of unrest on our campuses. In a real sense the whole country has been participating in a learning seminar on the subject. The Special Subcommittee on Education has been particularly privileged in that in the course of holding hearings on the problems on campus unrest, many excellent statements have been presented to us by articulate and informed witnesses. So that others may also benefit from these remarks, I am submitting for the RECORD today some of the statements presented to our subcommittee, along with several outstanding articles which have appeared in the news media relative to this matter:

[From the New York Times, Mar. 12, 1969]

WHO DEFENDS THE UNIVERSITY?

The warning by a hundred members of the Columbia faculty that it is the university's own obligation to defend itself against student disruption comes at a critical moment in the history of the American campus.

The crisis is nationwide. It stems from the adoption of terroristic methods as a substitute for rationality in the pursuit of greater student power. At Rutgers University vandals sprayed academic buildings with noxious liquids, forcing the abandonment of most instruction. At Pomona College in Cali-

fornia a staff member was severely injured by a bomb placed in a mail depository.

Cornell's president, James Perkins, was physically pulled off a platform during a campus discussion. At San Francisco State College, a student who apparently was in the process of placing a home-made explosive device was blinded and otherwise horribly maimed. On scores of other campuses the avoidance of serious injury has been a matter of luck rather than restraint by the dissidents.

The inevitable reaction to the escalating violence is an intensifying threat by Federal and state authorities to move in on the disciplinary authority that should be—but rarely is—exercised by the academic community itself. The imminence of such intervention is reflected in Justice Department notice that professional agitators are touring the campuses to incite discord and must be stopped by Federal prosecution.

These charges parallel Mayor Lindsay's complaint that outside forces are responsible for much of the upset in city schools, but there is one significant difference. The maintenance of order in the elementary and high schools is clearly a local police function when teachers cannot maintain control. But it would be a confession of intellectual bankruptcy for the nation's colleges and universities to have to acknowledge the necessity for surrendering their independence to police patrols or "law and order" vigilante groups.

The Columbia faculty group recognizes what an academic tragedy such as acknowledgment would be, just as did the Rev. Theodore M. Hesburgh, president of the University of Notre Dame, in his earlier warning that public revulsion against the inability of universities to police themselves might bring "a rebirth of Fascism."

Among the proudest elements in the academic traditions is its devotion to nonviolence, to the substitution of reasoned argument for blind passion. The abandonment of that tradition by a small but imperious segment of academia and the tendency of a far larger segment to condone or explain away the attendant excesses as a temporary therapeutic phase menace the survival of academic freedom and the capacity for internal reform.

The Columbia group rightly warns that it is up to the academic community to "demonstrate the will to act." The extent of that demonstration on campuses everywhere will provide an important measure of the universities' ability to insure their survival in freedom.

[From the Washington (D.C.) Sunday Star, May 4, 1969]

CAMPUS RIOTS: A REAL AND PRESENT DANGER

Five years ago a band of student radicals at Berkeley, demanding a change in university regulations, staged a sit-in that succeeded in its primary aim of disrupting campus life. Columnists, commentators, editorialists and other spokesmen for the reasonable side of the generation gap reacted with predictable outrage. Just how far, we demanded to know, was this permissive nonsense going to be carried?

Today, that question has answered itself. The peevish display of bad manners that shook the campus at Berkeley and shocked the nation now seems a nostalgic relic of the good old days. In the space of those five short years, student demands and student violence have escalated from the sit-in to the seizure of administrative offices, from the angry protest to the armed confrontation. The spark from the Berkeley campus has spread like an unchecked prairie fire across the continent, until most of America's 2,500 university and college campuses have felt its searing heat.

Today, the most permissive educator, the most liberal and detached viewer of the national scene, faces one unavoidable fact: Higher education in the United States is in serious danger. Destruction of the system is no longer a nightmare possibility or the dis-

tant goal of a handful of nihilistic idealists. It is a very real and immediate threat.

The result of this escalating violence is an inevitable wave of reaction. In Congress, plans are being made for investigations by Senate and House committees. Senators and congressmen, including some who up to the present have argued that the academic community should be free from federal interference, now thunder denunciations of the university surrender to radical students and demand federal laws to deal with the violence. The President of the United States issues a sharp public warning against disruptive protests. The attorney general announces "an end to patience." Liberal members of the university fraternity recoil in horror at the excesses of the student protest, as evidenced in the article by Dr. Dwight L. Dumond on page 3 of this section today. This reaction to the violence, perhaps as much as the violence itself, threatens universities and colleges. Currently, according to a survey by "The Chronicle of Higher Education," some 70 universities are shopping frantically for chief executives—a leadership gap that can, in large measure, be traced directly to the agony on campus. And the colleges are threatened as well at their most vulnerable point: Their finances.

There is no shortage of students. But tuition charges do not pay the cost of operating a university or college. The tab is finally handed to the affluent graduates, to the state legislatures or to Congress. All the evidence points to a growing disinclination on their part to pick it up.

Quite obviously something must be done to curb the violence and to restore to the disrupted campuses an atmosphere in which the pursuit of learning can be carried on. That something should not be federal intervention or the indiscriminate use of local police power. The restoration of order should come instead from within the academic community itself. It should result from a determination on the part of university and college administrations to enforce their own rules of student behavior. Those who break those rules—whatever the claimed justification may be—should be disciplined. Those who persist in their determination to destroy the system should be expelled.

Such a formula is admittedly not an easy one to follow. Extreme criminal behavior, involving danger to the well-being or to the lives of others, would make police intervention mandatory. And even if this final step can be avoided, a crackdown by university authorities will itself almost certainly result in an initial increase in the disruption of campus life by transforming some onlookers into active sympathizers in the protest.

For all that, there must be a crackdown. Nearly 7 million students are now enrolled in institutions of higher learning. Their rights to an education cannot be denied by the few radical activists—estimated at 2 percent of the student body—who have taken it upon themselves to identify every wrong in today's academic system and who have assigned to themselves the task of correcting these ills overnight. And the very real gains in recent years in the enrollment of Negroes in the leading colleges and universities must not be sacrificed in a convulsive rage over the actions of a handful of disoriented militants.

To date, the response of academic administrations to campus violence has fallen into two broad categories. The first, as in the case of Columbia last spring, has been a quick call for the police—over whose performance the university has no control. The result has been a rapid spread of the violence. The second route, which was undertaken by Cornell this spring, has been an attempt to buy peace by acceding to the demands of the militants without any serious regard for the consequences. The result has been seemingly limitless escalation of the demands, a growing resentment in the rest of the campus

community and a threat of mass resignations from the faculty.

Between these extremes lies the largely untrodden way of firm, impartial and strict application of the institution's own code of conduct. Suspension of the rules is, in reality, a great disservice to the activist students. College life is, after all, supposed to provide some preparation for real life. And although some academic communities have demonstrated a tolerance that threatens the destruction of the institution, society will not greet the graduate with any such permissive attitude.

Perhaps the major tragedy of the present agony on America's campuses is that the violence has drawn attention away from the fact that grievances do exist. There is a danger that the entire focus of concentration will be on the ugly and dangerous symptoms while the causes are neglected. If that happens, then regardless of how effectively the violence is curbed today, tomorrow will bring a repetition.

The university and the college should properly be a place where a full and frank interchange of opinions between the generations can take place. The students, who have reached their physical and in many cases their mental maturity, should be active participants in the total life of the community.

And yet, in too many cases, the young men and women are treated as children. The size of the big universities has too often reduced the student to a punch card for the institution's computer system. The questions of this most inquisitive and doubting of generations go unanswered. The sense of alienation grows.

Today the academic world is ablaze. The first order of business must be to bring that conflagration under control before the system is destroyed. But putting out the fire should not entail quenching sparks of honest dissent. There is room for improvement in our institutions of higher learning, and students have a proper and constructive part to play in bringing about the needed changes.

[From the Washington (D.C.) Sunday Star
May 4, 1963]

AN ANGRY SCHOLAR SPEAKS OUT ON CAMPUS RIOTING

(By Dwight L. Dumond)

NOTE.—The author of this article is a distinguished professor emeritus of history at the University of Michigan. He specialized in the history of the American South and taught that subject at Michigan for 35 years.

As a student of Southern slavery and its aftermath, Dr. Dumond was a liberal pioneer in the fight for freedom of the black man in America. He has written several definitive works on the abolitionist movement and the anti-slavery origins of the Civil War.

He is now professor of American Institutions at Colgate University.

The article first appeared in the Detroit News Sunday "Passing Show" section.

Rioting on college campuses in the United States has now become such a disgrace that we may well be caught in the tentacles of worldwide revolution.

We are dealing with a unique institution: It is the most precious establishment in a democratic society, so fragile as to be an alluring temptation to every would-be dictator and propagandist spawned in a free society.

It consists of two essential elements: professors and students. But if present disruptions continue, we may have to turn more and more to research institutes, unburdened and unencumbered by hordes of students.

There is a deep cleavage between administrators and professors. It worries the administrators, annoys the professors, confuses the students and destroys morale.

The arrogance and power of administrative officers depends largely upon their control of finances. There is enormous competition be-

tween deans for larger budgetary allowances for their colleges, between chairmen of departments in division of college funds, and between professors for ever higher salaries. Great inequities exist in all areas.

Herein lies the deadly virus that has done more to weaken and destroy independent teaching and research than all other things combined.

There never has been a revolt without the encouragement and assistance of a portion of the faculty. It is precisely in those areas which have been neglected and suffer the inequities that trouble starts.

Today, students, who know nothing at all about anything much, also are demanding and are getting membership on all policy-making boards and committees.

UNWIELDY MASS

Disaster first struck when we were compelled to educate, or try to educate, a great unwieldy mass of young men and women who had no definite objective in a system designed, organized, operated with reasonable success for an intellectually elite or at least culturally oriented and carefully selected minority.

Barriers dropped or requirements lessened perceptibly. Students came without language equipment, without any ability to write intelligent English, without adequate preparation in subject matter, and worst of all without manners.

Almost before anyone knew what was happening, a group generally considered riffraff showed up. Disreputable characters who dressed like tramps, smoked incessantly, used drugs, seldom bathed. They had no apparent respect for themselves, for anything, or for anybody.

They had nothing in fact, did nothing useful, but wanted every experience in life in a day and a night and took what they wanted. They thought no one before them ever had any problems or any experience, ever did very much, or ever did anything right.

What we soon had to deal with was an oligarchy of ignorance, conceit and plain immorality.

The second area of conflict embraced personal conduct. The age of drug addiction, sexual promiscuity, and nudity was upon us. The demand was for all restraints by faculty or administrative officials pertaining to student behavior to be abandoned.

If they wanted to have sexual relations in lounges or university buildings or in the rooms of men's dormitories; if they wanted to use drugs to release all inhibitions; if they wanted to hurl obscenities at professors; if they wanted to come to class half naked; or if they wanted to put on plays while nude or show publicly films formerly found only in bawdy houses or stag parties—if these or other acts ordinarily considered immoral and degrading pleased them, then no one should interfere.

They said that God was dead and religious tenets were no longer respectable.

WAR PROTEST

The third area of conflict was that of foreign and domestic policy as related to the Vietnam war. This was a legitimate, perhaps compelling subject for investigation and discussion in the halls of learning at the proper time and place.

We started out with proper seminar discussions, but degenerated to desecration of the flag, insults to and about men who had died in the service of their country, demands for the end of ROTC training, cancellation of all recruitment and research, obstruction of the shipment of war supplies, invasion of official conferences with government authorities, and sit-downs in court rooms and legislative halls.

All of this, vulgar as it was, pales into insignificance beside the source and purpose of the initial agitation.

Not all, but a substantial part of the en-

tire business bore a direct relation to civil rights. Two premises will haunt professors of history from now until eternity if they do not recognize and deal with them:

1. The bitter crusade of denunciation and vilification of President Lyndon B. Johnson and his Vietnam policy was begun by men who had never lifted their voices in support of civil rights, who were suspected of strong racist tendencies, and who aimed at confusing and confounding the entire civil rights movement.

2. They were aided and abetted by pseudo-liberals, who were frightened by progress of the crusade for equality of Negroes and whites, dared not openly oppose it, and sought to retard it by attacking the President who had done more in six years for the Negro and the poor and the underprivileged than all the other Presidents combined since the founding of the Republic.

We might have tried with as much success to brush back the tides with whisk brooms as to bring order out of the chaotic situation at that point, and the worst was yet to come. We were entering the fourth area of conflict. The black militants were on the march.

Negro students began with a demand for full integration, passed to a demand for courses in Negro history, and ended with a demand for autonomy and separation. Along the way they made many demands conforming to the various stages of the power struggle going on among the Negro population.

Black power is the battle cry: Black colleges in the cultural complex of a university; black professors; courses designed for and by black students; admission without requirements, as if blackness removed all handicaps to the understanding of higher mathematics, political theory, or genetics.

They had no program but shifted from one demand to another day by day. They had no proposed curriculum of studies and wanted none.

They wanted to invade and participate in faculty meetings. They wanted college and university funds to spend running around from one campus to another, to import speakers, many of whom have deliberately violated the law and thumbed their noses at the courts, and to publish and distribute propaganda.

They wanted separation but white money. They wanted autonomy but the benefits of university degrees. They were supported in all of these demands by a small but violent minority of white students and intruders on the campus.

MISLED AND DECEIVED

Who are these youngsters that demand the very segregation and alienation that generations of their forebears fought to overcome? Most of them know little or nothing about the work of Walter White, or Roy Wilkins, or Thurgood Marshall. They know of Martin Luther King because in their impetuous ignorance they destroyed him and abandoned his philosophy of nonviolence.

They know nothing about how black and white men working together in mutual respect and understanding overcame lynchings, secured abandonment of segregation by law in education, in housing, in public accommodation, or about the painful struggle for support of Negro colleges in the South.

They have been misled and deceived. They demanded black colleges, black teachers, and black studies—other names for subordination, ghettos and apartheid.

Black power is not a thing of virtue. The true basis of power is economic, political, intellectual, moral. The highways to achievement run along these lines. There are no other roads. Division of the country or any part of it, or any of its institutions on the basis of color, is no more possible than division of freedom.

There is no such thing as black freedom, or white freedom. Everyone is going to have

it or no one is. No person ever was accepted, or evaluated, or elevated to power for long because he belonged to a group—only on the basis of ability, knowledge, and individual achievement.

I am not an amateur in the writing or teaching of history, or on the lecture platform, and few men have done more in the area of human relations or for the cause of racial equality, but a leader of the militants at Howard University dared to say to me in the classroom, "I don't want to hear any more about your constitutional democracy"; and, after a public lecture at Colgate University, one white student called me a "damned radical" and a black student called me "another one of those — liberals."

This is what we have come to in our universities: a composite of intolerance and ignorance.

Rejecting integration, young Negroes talk of black history, art, economics, political action, leadership, nationalism and capitalism. They say they will go it alone. Black racism and white racism are equally bad and both are beyond the pale of respectability.

The young Negroes in the universities are being misled by power-hungry men who exploit their gullibility for personal reasons of money and power.

The demands of black militants are supported by many white students through ignorance, a desire for segregation, an impulse to help a minority group regardless of merit, or their own gain. It may have elements of exaggerated self-pride, of inferiority complex, of narcissism, of budding masculinity.

They talk about doing their "thing", thus revealing an intellectual poverty and subservience to ignorant leadership.

They want power without knowledge. Those who come from wealthy homes, and many do, say over and over again that they never have to work if they don't want to, and intend to create such widespread fear by rioting and destruction that people will get down to the serious business of creating the kind of society they, themselves, want. They are adventurers and revolutionaries, and happily so.

University administrators, totally unprepared and uninformed, were paralyzed into inactivity when the rioting began. Students who seize university officials and buildings, disrupt faculty meetings and conferences, resort to arson and bombings, and make it impossible for law-abiding students to go about the business of getting an education for which they paid, are guilty of crimes sufficient to send them to prison for life.

Every one of them who attacked police, security officers, and National Guardsmen with weapons could have been killed in the melee and it would have been due process of law.

I am not saying that severe repression is wise, or advocating resort to it, but facts are facts; and when law enforcement officials are called upon to perform their primary function of protecting persons and property someone is certain to get hurt.

RULE OF LAW

In many respects the situation is more serious than crime on the streets. In every case, militant students have demanded complete immunity from law enforcement: No one should be arrested, offenders should be released from jail, excused from trials, and reinstated in school without being disciplined. This is anarchy, and when mobs attack public officials it approaches planned insurrection or treason.

Universities alone cannot handle this problem of law enforcement, but they can expel those students who are involved and dismiss participating faculty members. Law enforcement agencies have their responsibilities as do parents.

Students do not lose their rights as individuals when they enter a university, but neither do they shed their obligation to obey

the law. In fact one of our most precious rights is to live under the rule of law.

To make martyrs out of men who violate the law is to invite anarchy. The legal principle must be sustained on the college campus as elsewhere. Why, then, has there been so much delay in correcting this serious and disgraceful business?

Agitators are not interested in discussion or reform, but in destruction and domination. They have no intention of making the educational process a continuing and ever-changing one.

The idea is to create havoc, confusion, destruction. Whether the basic motives can be classified as communist, fascist, or plain anarchy, the actual program is plainly identifiable as destruction of educational institutions rather than reform of educational processes.

The militants follow a practice of staying away from classes and public lectures; and of mutilating books, magazines, and manuscripts which do not conform to their momentary mood.

They check out thousands of books to disrupt the learning process, but never bring a precious tome to class; instead, they bring coffee and doughnuts, hamburger sandwiches and soft drinks. Some of them come to classes in pajamas, and with everything from garlic to cigarettes on their breath.

They cannot speak without obscenities. They cut great holes in desks, write erotic notes on desks at which decent people have to sit after them, and burn holes in the carpets and cork floors. They have revolted against everything that is decent and respectable. Their study habits are irregular or nonexistent.

Faculty members have become so accustomed to these things and so intimidated by colleagues who go along with the students' behavior that they cease to be concerned if someone throws a brick through the window.

Professors have a long tradition of concern for the dignity and security of the students and educational process. They know that some of the students' complaints are legitimate. In fact, they know more about that than anyone is willing to admit.

Too many administrators and faculty members, also, have been more interested in their own security and advancement than in the students.

Just as some of the problems of the cities lie in the poverty and illiteracy of the rural South whence the immigrants came, so do the problems of the universities lie in the homes, the public schools, and the churches. Youngsters coming to college have never been disciplined. This is a permissive society. Our cultural level is in steady decline.

Children have never been failed in public schools, since there are no standards for promotion from year to year. They have never been taught respect for persons and property. Universities cannot in a few months make up the deficiencies of parents, schools, churches, and public officials over a period of 16 to 18 years; and they have more sense than to try to do it by repression.

Governors, legislators, even congressmen and the President shun the problem and find justification for their inaction in the peculiar nature of educational institutions, or in the structure of the federal system which lodges police power in state and local government.

This is not a local matter. There is revolution involved, and the campus disorders are calculated, whether by design or not, to contaminate the vast reservoir of moral and intellectual power which is the great strength and security of a democracy.

The right to dissent does not mean the dissenters' views must prevail. Militant students say it does, that their demands are not negotiable. It does not include a right to destroy property, to prevent by obstruction, noise, physical violence, the vast ma-

jority of the students from going about their business of getting an education.

Militant students who call themselves Afro-Americans are devotees of black power. To many it means unity in everything: to act as a black person though elected as a delegate to a political convention, appointed to a teaching position, given public office, and so forth.

It means no longer to be a responsible person but a member of a group in politics in business, in education, in religion. Their professed objective is a worthy one, of giving to black people a sense of dignity, of belonging, the need of which may well be over-emphasized, but the value of which cannot be denied.

What then has been the result of these campus disorders? What has it all gained? What are the losses?

Those things which militants among the students want are not within the province of anyone to give. The structure of a university cannot be changed overnight, in all probability should not be changed at all.

Teaching methods, the content of admission requirements, the intellectual attainments which justify conferring degrees—all of these elements in the educational process are constantly under scrutiny and revision by college faculties. There is always intellectual ferment, though not always change because change does not always denote progress.

EXTREME REACTIONARIES

The militants are not progressives, not liberals. They are reactionaries of the most extreme sort. They seek to destroy, not to build, and they are achieving little except chaos and retardation. When the revolution has consumed its leaders, as always happens, and the wreckage is cleared away, we will be about where we were before the trouble started.

Those responsible have:

Destroyed academic freedom.

Betrayed the educational process by seeking objectives through ultimatums, threats of force, and destruction of property.

Infringed upon the rights of others to improve their talents and skills.

Greatly retarded understanding and peace between people of different colors by demanding separation instead of integration.

Fostered in their own minds and others a false idea of achievement, inculcating the idea that the road to progress is obstruction, destruction, threats of fear.

Allowed themselves to resort to mob action, planned and well coordinated, until no one knows whether the upheaval, with its overtones of racism, portends social revolution or war; or whether the disorders are evidence of smoldering emotions or first steps in a specific program of world-wide revolution.

Insured a level of mediocrity in the education of blacks and whites alike by demands for adoption of pass-fail, abolition of requirements for admission and graduating, and appointment of professors on other bases than quality.

Strangled financial support for higher education from private donations and taxes.

Turned distinguished scholars and administrators away in utter disgust.

It takes 100 years to build a university faculty of distinguished scholars, even longer to establish for it a reputation which merits the full support and affection of the people.

Schools like Harvard and Michigan and California belong to the world. They are the most precious institutions of a people's culture, reaching far into the distant past and on into an endless future. They can be destroyed in a day, and I wonder how close it is, for Robinson Jeffers must have been thinking about what I am thinking now, when he wrote:

"The day will come when the earth will scratch itself and rub off humanity, and then the world will blossom with passionate stars, sunset rocks and uncontaminated grass, the

pure and impersonal 'beauty of things which is the face of God,' although there will be none to recognize it."

[From the Washington (D.C.) Evening Star, May 2, 1969]

RUSTIN RAPS "SOFT" COLLEGES
(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 the 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. But in this country, to try to separate the black experience from the American experience, is ridiculous.

A. 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 administrations 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.

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 get to classes, they have the right to carry on any form of non-violent protest.

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

A. I think there has 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 stu-

dents 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. That 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, and 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. . . .

"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. 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 the 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."

[From the U.S. News & World Report, May 19, 1969]

THE REAL CRISIS ON THE CAMPUS: A NOTED EDUCATOR SOUNDS A WARNING—EXCLUSIVE INTERVIEW

(NOTE.—Sidney Hook, professor of philosophy and formerly department head at New York University, is regarded—at home and abroad—as one of the leading American philosophers of his time. Now 86, Dr. Hook has championed civil liberties and left-wing causes, in writings and speeches, since the late 1920s.)

Q. Dr. Hook, have campus disorders brought universities to a turning point in their history?

A. Yes. Recent events on American campuses have precipitated a genuine crisis in higher education. Because of events at Harvard, Cornell and other institutions, it is no exaggeration to say that American higher education is confronted with the most fundamental challenge to its basic principles in history. And by its basic principles, here, I mean the principles of academic freedom.

After all, the demand on the part of students to determine not only the nature of the curriculum but who is to teach them, and who is to be hired and fired, implies an abandonment of the traditions of academic freedom.

Q. Just how do you define academic freedom?

A. It is the freedom of professionally qualified individuals to inquire, to discover, to publish and teach the truth as they see it, independently of any controls except the standards by which conclusions or truths are established in their discipline.

Therefore, the principles of academic freedom require that, once a teacher is certified by his peers as professionally competent, there should be no interference with his right to reach and teach any conclusions in the field in which he is an expert. This principle obviously no longer applies with respect to black studies, because it is quite clear that, if black students disagree with the position of the teacher, they have the right to veto him. They have already moved in that direction in several institutions.

A year ago at Cornell, black students invaded the office of the chairman of the department of economics and demanded an apology, and later dismissal, of a lecturer because he expressed conclusions about Africa of which they disapproved. At UCLA [University of California at Los Angeles], a course in race was canceled at their demand.

Now, if this right to determine the nature of a black-studies curriculum and to select its teachers is given to black students, the natural thing will be to give white students the same right. Otherwise, it's an expression of racism. Otherwise, the implication would be: "Well, black studies are so unimportant, one can let black students determine what they want to be taught. But where white students are concerned, one must recognize traditional standards." This would be not only absurd but invidious.

If the practice is legitimate with respect to black students, why not for white students?

This demand is already part of the program of the Students for a Democratic Society. A few years ago it issued literature

demanding that students have equal rights with the faculty in determining what should be taught and who is to teach it. Later on, in some places, it contended that students should have preponderant power.

Now that Harvard has recognized the principle that students can determine the content and personnel of instruction, the demand is sure to be made by white students in various fields. Only a few days ago, at the University of Colorado, an assembly of students passed a resolution condemning a professor of anthropology for having published an article on the American Indian which they regarded as racist. They rebuked him. Some demanded his dismissal.

It is quite clear that the epoch-making decision Harvard took will bring in its wake a demand by white students to control their curriculum and teachers.

However, this is only the beginning. What happens next will parallel what has happened with respect to black studies. The control of black studies today in most institutions is in the hands of black nationalists who are committed to separatism. They denounce people like Roy Wilkins, A. Philip Randolph and Bayard Rustin. In controlling what should be studied, they explicitly say that the curriculum must be organized in such a way as to reinforce the truth of black nationalism.

In other words, black studies have been politicized. Partly by threats and partly by actual coercion, in various places where black studies are being taught and controlled by black students we find only one point of view expressed.

This was already prefigured at a meeting at Yale University in May, 1968, when Ron Karenga and Nathan Hare [black militants] indicated that "genuine" black studies must be organized and taught by blacks—and only by blacks committed to the ideals of black nationalism. This is equivalent to saying that if there are Jewish studies on campus, they must be taught only by Zionists and not by any other Jews or by gentiles.

Now, when white students take over and demand the same rights, the SDS or the Peace and Freedom Party will demonstrate—as they already have in some places—against some teacher of economics or history or anthropology or even some scientist on the ground that his conclusions, in their exalted wisdom, are "imperialist" or "class-biased." They will then demand he be dismissed.

This will definitely spell the end of academic freedom. If the faculties of this country do not organize themselves now to resist this mass assault against the principles of academic freedom, the end result will be the politicization of the American university in the style of the universities of Asia and South America, many of which have been politicized to a point where little study actually takes place.

It's not accidental that when South American and Asian students want a thorough education in any particular field they go to other countries. What they can get at their own institutions is a political education—and a partisan one at that.

Maybe something can be said for the politicization of universities in authoritarian countries where there is little opportunity for political opposition. But in our own country, where opportunities abound for the expression of differing political points of view, to make the university a political instrument is educational genocide.

What I am saying is that the tendency legitimized by Harvard and by Cornell may result in a continuous purge of universities by students who have become politicized. Even the high schools are becoming affected.

At the moment we hear a great deal from "revolutionary" or "left" students. But before long there will be a reaction to these students, and we will hear demands for politicization from the "right." This backlash

may be even more severe than the threat from the so-called "left."

Q. Does this point to civil strife—even gun battles—ahead on the campus between competing factions?

A. I am not convinced that there will be civil war on the campuses. The failure of the educational authorities to implement their own rules will probably lead the civil authorities to step in. If universities refuse to govern themselves, the government will have to take over. It cannot permit assault, arson, possible loss of life merely because administrators—and the faculties—are cowardly.

The betrayal by the faculties, particularly at Cornell, of the principles of liberalism is what is so significant. It goes to the very heart of our agony, of our tragedy. The faculty at Cornell originally repudiated the capitulation of its dean and president in the face of armed threat, and upheld the earlier decision made by a regularly constituted committee of faculty and students to censure certain students for violent acts.

They then reversed themselves. In what did this betrayal consist? In the fact that these faculty members subordinated the processes of deliberation and justice to an opportunistic decision designed to get them off the hook.

Now, the essence of liberal civilization is the belief in due process. It is belief in the importance of rational consideration and evaluation of evidence in the hope of reaching a just conclusion. We have always taught that the process by which we reach conclusions is much more important than any specific conclusion—just as in science, the method is more reliable than any particular conclusion, because the method of science is self-corrective. We have always held that although man may be wrong in his belief, so long as the rational process is not tampered with, so long as the evidence is not "cooked," so long as there is honest inquiry, in time he will reach truth.

Similarly, for the administration of justice: We have believed that once we follow due process, we can correct any inequity that develops. The alternatives are mob rule and lynch law.

But the Cornell faculty abandoned the process by which its own committee reached a conclusion. On a Monday, it sustained its committee; on a Wednesday it reversed—on the very same evidence.

Secondly, what is unforgivable in the action of the Cornell faculty is the reason it reversed itself—and yielded to force. It acted in panic, out of sheer fear of the consequence of adhering to its own principles.

Finally, what kind of example did this yielding to the threat of terror set their students? These men are supposed to represent the rational life and its integrities. Instead they sacrificed principle for safety. What kind of example was this to set their fellow citizens who subsidize education, pay them their salaries because they look to the university as the center of courageous objectivity—only to witness the faculty panic in cowardly folly?

This bodes ill for the future of higher education. It will contribute to a growing discontent on the part of citizens with universities and faculty members. It will intensify anti-intellectualism in the country. Already too many bills to curb campus disruption have been introduced in State legislatures.

Q. Does academic freedom extend to students?

A. When we talk about "academic freedom for students," the problem is to give it some acceptable meaning. It could mean the right to go to school or not to go to school, which they have; the right to go to one college or another college, depending upon their interests; or the right to choose one course of study rather than another within any particular college. By and large, students have this right.

Academic freedom could also mean the

right to question, to dissent, to develop points of view of their own. And, by and large, I should say that students in this country are freer with respect to the right to dissent than they ever have been in the history of the country. They're freer here than they are in most other countries.

Recall the students who wrote and produced "MacBird." That was a play in which the President of the United States was accused of complicity in a conspiracy to assassinate his predecessor. Now, there isn't a single country in the world where students would have been permitted to publish or produce a play of this sort. And yet, on American campuses they have complete freedom to do so.

However, "academic freedom for students" might be defined as freedom to acquire an education. To this freedom there may be great obstacles: prejudice, poverty, absence of educational facilities. Their removal is the task of all citizens of a democratic community.

Traditionally, we have looked to the university as the source of nonpartisan authority—as an institution that studies and illumines problems and proposed solutions, but does not enlist itself in behalf of any partisan outcome. If it becomes a partisan political institution, it cannot escape political retaliation when it backs political proposals rejected by the community.

Q. Is "nonviolence" an excuse for such actions?

A. The forcible occupation of a building is a lawless action, and is always accompanied by the threat of violence. It really is immaterial whether the violence is actual or whether the violence is threatened. At Harvard, the spectacle of deans being carried out on the shoulders of students as though they were so many sacks of potatoes was grim evidence of violence. At other places, like San Francisco State, much worse has occurred—arson, bombing, maiming for life.

Q. Have faculties in many places aided disorders?

A. The truth is that the faculty has the power to curb and to prevent student violence and the attendant outrages against academic freedom.

The faculties have more power over educational curriculum and, ultimately, over discipline than any other group on the campus. But the faculties of this country, by and large, have been loath to exercise it. Notice how few the expulsions have been for actions far worse than actions in the past that brought expulsions for offending students.

At the University of California at Berkeley, the faculty voted down motions that condemned the forcible occupation of Sproul Hall. Therefore, students elsewhere were encouraged to emulate this lawlessness.

At Columbia, the faculties have, in effect, amnestied the students for actions that were criminal in character.

Now it is obvious—especially after what has happened at Cornell—that the faculties, by and large, have been trying to buy peace by capitulating to threats of violence and to the forces of unreason. They will discover that the logic of appeasement is the same in education as it is in politics: It only whets the appetite of the students to make more and more unreasonable demands.

If Harvard is the "Munich" of American education, Cornell is its "Pearl Harbor."

Of course, what I'm saying is not true for all members of the faculty. I must confess, however, to intense disappointment with my colleagues, since I believe in the principle of faculty control. I had hoped that faculties would have more gumption and guts than they have displayed in many institutions, and especially at Harvard and Cornell.

At the turn of the century, there was an English lecturer who, having visited the American universities, returned to England with the observation that there were three

sexes in America: men, women and college professors. He obviously meant to call attention to the absence of simple moral courage on the part of the faculties.

I had assumed that this falling—if it ever existed—had been overcome. Alas, there is heart-sickening evidence that many faculties are more interested in buying peace at any price than in defending academic freedom.

The great irony is that American faculties often condemned German faculties that refused to stand up to those who trampled on academic freedom when resistance might have meant the loss of their lives and those of their families. But, in the United States—confronted with a threat that doesn't begin to compare in seriousness with the threat of totalitarians—faculty members have yielded in the hope that, if they gave the students what they demanded, the students would be "reasonable." They only get kicked harder.

THE WORST EXCESSES

Q. Is the present structure of the university as an institution outmoded—especially the large, so-called "multiversities"?

A. What has happened has happened not only at large universities but at small. Look what occurred at Swarthmore, a small college where the president died of a heart attack in the midst of student turmoil. Look what happened at Oberlin, where students got out of hand and violated the procedures established by faculty-student committees.

No. It is interesting to observe that the worst excesses have occurred at the most liberal universities, large or small. This is overlooked by some people in positions of political authority whose academic qualifications are rather dubious.

For example, here is Robert Finch, our Secretary of Health, Education and Welfare, who maintained that many universities have brought troubles on themselves because of rigid administrative procedures and outmoded attitudes and because they pay too little attention to students.

This is true of some institutions, but is it the cause of student disorders? If Secretary Finch were right, the worst disorders and excesses would have occurred at the most authoritarian universities. But this is not the case. Secretary Finch is talking through his hat.

The truth is that at Harvard, Cornell, San Francisco State the administrations were very much concerned with students. There existed committees on which faculty and students were represented. Yet it was there that the students were guilty of some of the worst excesses. At Columbia the situation worsened after vast reforms. At Cornell, it was a faculty-student committee that decided, horror of horrors, that three Negro students were to be censured—*censured!* Some punishment! Yet the result was a resort to arms.

Secretary Finch's remarks imply that because none is free from fault, all are equally guilty—that student violence can be equated with administrative ineptitude.

Now that the season for political silliness is over, we are in for its educational variant.

In New York City, Mayor John V. Lindsay has denounced student violence in the high schools and has vowed that he would prevent it. Hurray for him! But it is the same Mayor Lindsay who in a speech at Princeton University two years ago hailed the "Berkeley rebels," at the University of California, as providing a pattern for the rest of the students in the country to emulate. They have.

Whoever wrote that speech for Mayor Lindsay was actually putting words in his mouth to encourage students to do precisely the things that they're doing today—in high schools, too—which he is deploring. What makes Mayor Lindsay an authority on the colleges?

Scientists often rush in to talk about these matters as if they wish to illustrate that there is no transference of training from one field to another. A famous biologist and Nobel Prize winner at Harvard claims that, if

adults would be aroused about social and political affairs, then youth would not be aroused. This is demonstrably false. After all, adults today are more aroused about social and political affairs than they ever have been in the past, but students are not less violent but more.

Secondly, he fails to explain why, in the past, when adults were not aroused, youth was apathetic. Aging scientists, their creative work behind them, like aging business tycoons become "elder statesmen"—and with the same qualifications.

The trouble with such "statesmen" is that they don't bring to the consideration of social and political affairs the same conscientiousness, the background of knowledge, and sense of logical form and evidence that is second nature to them when they are in the laboratory.

But not only scientists wander afield. Take a theologian like Robert McAfee Brown of Stanford, who maintains that, in the name of human freedom, academic freedom should be sacrificed. He seems unaware of the fact that academic freedom is a human freedom, too. Robespierre might have spoken in the vein that Dr. Brown did when the French Revolutionary terrorist decreed the guillotining of Condorcet [progressive philosopher], for Robespierre identified human freedom with "the health of the Revolution."

One would have expected a theologian with insight to have recognized that academic freedom is so fundamental because the real problem is the conflict of freedoms. The reason we've stressed academic freedom is that we believe that the knowledge, the detachment, the objectivity which flows from academic freedom helps us expand other human freedoms as well as resolve the conflicts among them more readily.

HOW AMERICA HAS CHANGED

Or take those who in discussing student violence always refer to the violence of the American Revolution to prove how authentically American violence is. Someone should tell them we've already won the American Revolution—that we already had our Boston Tea Party. And we had them because at the time there did not exist the political institutions by which we could settle grievances peacefully.

Today we have them. We can settle our political differences through the ballot rather than through riots. And what nonsense to hear otherwise intelligent men cite approvingly Rap Brown's discovery that "violence is as American as cherry pie"—as if that made violence or everything American as good as cherry pie. Lynching is American, too. But does that make it good?

Examine remarks like those made by John D. Rockefeller III who, in a recent speech, called down blessings upon the young because of their concern with social and political affairs. I don't know where John D. Rockefeller III gets his information about what's happening on American campuses. Whoever supplies it to him obviously can't distinguish between intellectual dissent and the exercise of violence.

The Nazi students in the '30s were also "concerned" with social and political matters when they trampled on the rights of Jewish and socialist professors. But anybody who merely or mainly praised them for their "concern" at that time would either have been considered a Nazi sympathizer or a political cretin. And to find somebody today who praises violent disrupters because they're "concerned" with social and political issues, who doesn't understand that their violent methods are far more important than any "concern" they are showing, seems to me to be irresponsible—to put it very mildly—because it encourages violence by the "concerned."

Q. What about the claim of the "New Left" philosopher Herbert Marcuse that authority in today's society is so diffuse and

so powerful that peaceful methods won't work?

A. No, Marcuse is simply muddle-headed. What he is saying is this: Democracy has failed because people choose things of which Marcuse disapproves. He is a Prussian type who believes that we should force people to be free, force them to love each other. Marcuse has publicly declared that he would rather that Negroes didn't have the right to vote than choose wrongly by voting like white workers for the values of a consumer society. Credit where credit is due! He certainly has the courage of his confusions.

For Marcuse, error has no rights. This goes back to Augustine's dictum. Those who believe they have the absolute truth, you see, don't accept the experimental methods of democracy, which is skeptical of absolute truth. The "right to be wrong" is not only necessary in order to be a person; it sometimes is necessary in order to reach the truth. In science, we make progress by eliminating errors. Very often the hypothesis which is refuted furthers our knowledge.

DEMONSTRABLE NONSENSE

Q. What about statements that we should listen to the students—that they are trying to tell us something?

A. Of course, we should listen to students—and the truth is that we have been listening to students. But the best way to communicate what one wants is through words, arguments, programs—forms of demonstration that are reasoned and reasonable.

A blow never communicates when we reach for understanding. Power may come out of a gun barrel—not insight or truth. Those who say students are merely "trying to communicate" are unaware of the fact that they have communicated quite well. But some students' conception of whether they're listened to is simply whether faculties will yield to any demands they make.

When students say that they want to determine the nature of the curriculum and have the right to hire and fire professors, we understand very well what they are saying. What they are saying is demonstrable nonsense, because to make such a demand is to equate experience and inexperience, maturity and immaturity, knowledge and ignorance.

If a student wants to learn medicine to be a doctor, the fact that he wants to learn indicates that he hasn't got the authority to determine what he should study in order to become a good doctor. There is an authoritative, as distinct from an authoritarian, aspect to the teaching relationship which flows from the superior knowledge, the tested methods, the objective evidence which the teacher relies on. This is true even if you consider the student as an apprentice teacher—or assume even that every student some day will be a professor, which is a very large assumption. After all, in what field does the apprentice have the same authority as his teacher to determine what he should learn in order to become a master journeyman?

What the students are trying to communicate when they make these demands is something which is absurd on its face, and even more absurd upon analysis. But, having communicated this and having failed to convince any reasonable person that this is desirable, they then resort to occupation of buildings, to assault, to the language and violence of the gutter. If their argument wasn't persuasive before they used violence, what makes it more persuasive—the violence? Is might going to determine not only what is right, but what is true? This goes beyond the Orwellian world of 1984.

The issue is not the ideals mouthed in the easy rhetoric of the students, but the means they use to achieve these ideals.

As John Dewey [educator and philosopher] pointed out, "Anybody can proclaim high and mighty ideals, but the world that comes into existence is a consequence only of the means used to achieve these ideals." When black

students and SDS radicals use the same methods Nazi students employed to destroy the Weimar Republic and trample into the dust traditional ideals of academic freedom, then no matter how different their rhetoric may be, fundamentally both are enemies of the rational process and of those values of civilization which have developed over the centuries against the forces of obscurantism and barbarism.

WHY STUDENTS ARE DELUDED

Q. Are students especially honest and moral people rebelling against dishonest and immoral elders?

A. This view that the students are suffering from an excess of virtue, whereas their elders are intellectually dishonest, is a lot of horsefeathers. The truth is that the students are completely unhistorical. They have no perspective upon events. They do not compare the situation today with what it was like in the past. They expect overnight transformations which in the nature of the case can't take place if one understands history and the elements of human psychology.

In my own lifetime, I have seen changes in the position of the Negro and in the position of the worker which I would have regarded as almost fantastic in the 1920s. Because there are still abuses, discrimination, problems created in virtue of past progress, doesn't mean that the progress made in 30 or 40 years is minimal or immaterial. After all, our judgment of a situation should rest on whether it is growing better or growing worse—not whether it is absolutely good or absolutely bad.

These students who claim that they are opposed to hypocrisy because they demand all injustices to be abolished overnight probably would denounce those who wrote the Declaration of Independence as hypocrites. Why? Because slavery existed at the time.

Now, would you call those who wrote the Declaration of Independence hypocrites when they proclaimed all men were born free and equal at a time when some had slaves? No. The significant thing is that this principle was enunciated—at a time when all other countries of the world accepted the practices of elite rule and leadership. The new principle had a powerful role in the ultimate abolition of slavery.

Those who think like unhypocritical students would have rejected not only the Declaration of Independence but the Magna Charta, which is regarded as the charter of English liberties.

If one reads the Magna Charta, he finds explicit discrimination against Jews and against women. The students would say this makes it a hypocritical document. But anybody with a knowledge of history and context, and with common sense, would say that the Magna Charta recognized principles that were new at their time—that became the basis for expanding liberties in England, even though they were wrung from King John by barons for their own interest.

You see, the student radicals pass judgment on social and political affairs as if they were born yesterday. In effect, they are saying that they can understand social and political affairs because they are "sincere." But it is not sincerity, it's foolishness to overlook the fact that you cannot escape history. And the history of the United States has been a history of slavery, of the Civil War, of Reconstruction. It has also been a history of fanaticism—for example, of people who, thinking like these students, prevented the adoption of Lincoln's proposal for the liberation of slaves by purchase as an alternative to the Civil War and its more horrible and continuing costs.

Politics is usually the choice of the lesser evil. Those who glorify the students because they are not hypocrites are actually saying it is hypocritical to choose the lesser evil. But why? Lesser evil, in a sense, may be the great-

er good. There is no sane political alternative to the policy of the lesser evil.

Q. Are many Americans tending to look on student rebels as being somehow pure and innocent? Is a kind of youth worship causing some to condone student violence?

A. There is a large measure of truth in this. There are people who seem to believe that youth can do no wrong—perhaps because they hope thereby to recapture their own youth. Foolish parents coddle their darling young rebels in a vain hope to keep them from flying the nest.

In my experience, there is nothing intrinsically wise about age. There is nothing intrinsically virtuous about the young. What is more important than youth or age is intelligence—intelligence tested by experience.

After all, it was the young Nazis who burned books, marched into battle, constituted the elite of the SA and SS [Brown Shirts and Black Shirts].

Lewis Feuer's masterly book on "The Conflict of Generations" proves that most youth movements have aided reaction. And the Fascist hymn, "Giovinezza"—or "Youth"—is a very good illustration of the fact that the glorification of youth can blossom into a glorification of cruelty and arrogance.

This, I think, is profoundly true today, especially in the United States. Those who uncritically identify with the young overlook its callowness, its insensitiveness. They tend to become apologists for brutality and terror.

BATTLE IS NOT YET LOST

Q. Is there a possibility that many professors, rather than continuing to teach in situations like those at Cornell or Harvard, will become discouraged and leave the teaching field and go to other fields, such as foundations?

A. There is no doubt that many people will leave the academy rather than teach under existing conditions.

But I think that they would do better to stay and fight. The battle is going against us, but it is not yet lost. I still have faith that, if we keep on fighting, our colleagues will rally to us. That is why we have organized University Centers for Rational Alternatives and are soliciting support from all who wish to defend the free university.

If our good faith is a vain hope, then we have to go down fighting. For freedom and self-respect are nonnegotiable.

CIVIL DISORDER IN ACADEMIC COMMUNITIES

(By Assistant Director William C. Sullivan, Federal Bureau of Investigation, at the fifth national conference, Associated Student Governments of the United States of America, Washington, D.C., Nov. 27, 1968)

J. Edgar Hoover: "Dissent is one of this Nation's priceless values. It must be protected at all times and in all areas of thought and action, be it in time of peace or in time of war. But this dissent, of its very nature, requires law for both its expression and its preservation."

At the center of my remarks tonight lies a concern for the growing incidence of civil disorder in the American educational community. Civil disorder, as it applies to the academic community, may be defined as the actions of certain college-oriented elements—young as well as old—which are deliberately committed and aimed at disrupting not only the functions of educational institutions but also the functions of our social system.

At this point, I would also like to refer to the observation that the current shock of our age is the discovery that concepts and patterns of action of a more secure past no longer fit present reality.

Why is this true as I believe it is? It is true because of what might be called the three "C's"—Change, Challenge, and Con-

¹ Civil disorder at the high school level will not be included in the scope of this lecture.

flict. There is no status quo in human relations and institutions *per se*.

AGE OF FLUX

Who will deny that we live in an era marked by profound changes in diverse areas of human living? Changes in the world scene, for example, have brought about the establishment of 65 new nations since the end of World War II, for a total of 136 nations in the world today. This political and geographical flux in itself has given more than a billion people the possibilities of deciding their own destinies. Within the underdeveloped countries of the world the people are increasingly aware that the other half of the world's population enjoys the benefits of scientific, political, economic, and educational progress. They rightfully wish to share in the progress, and a social upheaval known as the revolution of rising expectations is expressing that desire.

Another vast change is called the knowledge explosion. It has been estimated that, starting with the time of Christ, the first doubling of knowledge occurred in 1750; the second in 1900; the third, 50 years later, in 1950; and the fourth only ten years after the third, in 1960. This knowledge explosion has had its impact on our daily lives, in our schooling, in our occupations and professions, on the streets, and even in the privacy of our homes. Much more is yet to come. Scientists advise they will learn as much in the next 15 years as in all preceding centuries, so that scientific developments will rapidly influence living in the future.

We have with us also as a change-producing force, the population explosion. It has been estimated that by the year 2000 the world's population will have jumped from its 3 billion mark to 7 billion. As a result of this dramatic increase, there will be need of expansion in our resources relating to food, education, medicine, science, housing, employment, and religious and social institutions.

Changes, of their very nature, produce challenges, and today on the international level we see a foremost challenge from the Soviet and Mao versions of communism. On the national level we are also facing challenges to our freedoms, traditional principles, accepted values and historic goals. These challenges come from various groups beyond the pale of the vital center of moderation in our land. The strident strivings of the extremist left, black nationalist, and white hate groups present a threat that our society may be polarized into a confusion of bitter, hatred-ridden, and barbaric segments. The confrontation and conflict between ideas and people—that we in this country have been suffering for some years—have as we all know brought varying degrees of civil disorder in academic communities in the United States.²

MAJOR ISSUES

The major issues underlying civil disorder fall into three categories, each of which has several related questions.

The first category is university reform. This relates in the main to the right of students to share in all administrative functions of the university, including the drawing up of school budgets and the planning for future expansion. The right to sponsor campus speakers; to distribute any type of literature on campus; to publish any paper or other literature free of censorship; and to have a voice in the hiring and firing of teachers and the admissions policies for students are also points at issue, as are demands that university student files be closed to all agencies, unless student permission is provided for their review; that students' rooms not be searched; that dormitories be open to both male and female students; and that local

² Civil disorders outside of academic communities are of even graver concern. However, they are also beyond the scope of this lecture.

police departments not be allowed on the campus. There is strong opposition to lectures, to the grading and examination systems and to the view that teachers are arbiters of the truth.

Students also complain that their needs are not being given equal consideration with the needs of faculty members; that there is too much research and too little good teaching; that there are too many narrow specialists among faculty members and too few model professors to emulate; and that educational institutions and their faculties are "self-serving, self-justifying, and self-enclosed." They further charge that the current educational system places them in a position of "debilitating dependence" and that the system is more concerned with preparing them to earn a living than it is with making their "lives."

The second category is opposition to the war in Vietnam. This has served as a catalyst in drawing together student protestors who have demanded that the U.S. withdraw from the war in Vietnam; that the universities and colleges end defense-related research; that the universities refuse to cooperate with the Selective Service System; that universities publicly disclose details of all contracts with the United States Government; that military and other Government recruiters not be allowed on the campus; that the Reserve Officers' Training Corps be abolished; and that firms engaged in defense-related research or manufacturing be barred from the campus.

The third category deals with social problems such as university construction in ghetto areas and the demands of minority student groups on campuses. These minority demands have been concerned with the establishment of separate facilities, the teaching of courses of special interest; admission of minority group members as students, regardless of qualifications; and the hiring of large numbers of instructors from these minority groups. In addition, at some predominantly black schools, there have been demands for the creation of black campuses by the exclusion of all white students and faculty members, thereby creating another form of segregation.

Many of the demands made in the above categories have been advocated in terms of legitimate and orderly dissent. However, much of that dissent has changed drastically through the irrationality of many students and sympathizers in recent years. Now, much of the protest movement involving students—the so-called new left—have been transformed into emotional and at times fanatical, resistance-type elements that openly espouse disruption, nihilism, and violence as shown in their statements and actions.

STATEMENTS ON CAMPUS ISSUES

The record reveals numerous statements by new left spokesmen relating to reforms in the academic community, the war in Vietnam, and social issues of today. A representative sampling will indicate that they advocate disruption and even violence to achieve their ends.

The Students for a Democratic Society (SDS), a nationwide group that shows a propensity for disruption, violence, and semi-anarchy, has urged for several years that universities must be reconstructed because they are part of the "corporate liberal society." Student power has been advocated in terms of the abolition of the grading system, disruption of student government meetings, and the creation of student unions which would set rules for campus conduct.

In a speech at the University of Illinois in 1967, an SDS spokesman, Carl Davidson, stated that students could not free their universities without freeing all of society and that anything destroying the "United States system" would be beneficial. He told the student listeners that one weapon was to shut down "this place."

Mark Rudd, an SDS leader in the riots at

Columbia University in April, 1968, stated in a letter dated April 12, 1968, to the President of Columbia University "You are quite right in fearing that the situation is potentially dangerous. If we win, we will take control of your world, your corporation, your university and attempt to mold a world in which we and other people can live as human beings. We will have to destroy at times, even violently, in order to end your power and your system—but that is a far cry from nihilism." It is noted this letter was written before the actual riots took place at Columbia University.

Thomas Hayden, a founder of SDS, in an interview on May 21, 1968, stated among other things, that if college administrators do not make themselves subordinate to students "We will close them (the colleges) all down." Hayden stated that rather than ending the war in Vietnam or furthering civil rights, the true aim of the campus disruption is student control of universities.

Michael Klonsky, an SDS official speaking at Western Michigan University on October 21, 1968, stated that students should tear down the power structure and replace it with "people power." In addition, he proposed that students would then control the universities and workers would operate the factories. To destroy the old system, Klonsky stated, it would be necessary to develop a worldwide movement.

In 1967, at a rally sponsored by the anti-war Vietnam Day Committee at the University of California at Berkeley, Bettina Aptheker Kurzweil, a Communist Party, USA, national committee member, condemned cooperation between the university, the FBI, and CIA. She called on professors to join the campaign to "drive them off the campuses." An SDS spokesman later in 1967 discussed the SDS nationwide effort to prevent recruiters from the military services, CIA, and the Dow Chemical Corporation from entering campuses. In addition, he stated that SDS also sought an end to research on campuses for Government-sponsored projects on war-related subjects.

At a rally sponsored by the Student Mobilization Committee in New York City on April 15, 1967, Nick Egleson asked the audience to refuse to go to war and "join us in acts of disobedience if the war continues."

Shortly prior to the October 21-22, 1967, demonstration at the Pentagon at Washington, D.C., Jerry Rubin, former cochairman of the Vietnam Day Committee and coordinator of the demonstration stated "the peace movement is no longer one of mere protest and demonstration. We are now in the business of wholesale and widespread resistance and dislocation of American society. We, the American people, are going to have to close down the Pentagon, the universities, the banks—all the institutions that use and destroy human beings and values."

Michael Klonsky, of SDS, in his October, 1968, speech at Western Michigan University, stated that there must be an armed struggle for personal liberation and that the heart of American fascism is the military establishment. Instead of avoiding military service, radicals should go into the military and "split" taking with them any servicemen who could be persuaded to desert.

Greg Calvert, an SDS spokesman who has traveled in the Midwest to speak before various SDS chapters, was quoted as describing SDS motives and goals in society today in the following statement: "We are trying to build a guerrilla force in an urban environment; we are actively organizing sedition."

It is of interest to note that several leaders of the new left movement have made trips to Czechoslovakia, Sweden, North Vietnam, and Cuba, where they have engaged in various conferences and discussions.

VIOLENT CAMPUS PROTEST

Civil disorders on the Nation's campuses in recent months have taken many forms. Some have been marked with violence against

persons or property. Many have been initiated or sponsored by the Students for a Democratic Society. Probably the most widely publicized campus disorder in 1968 was the student take-over at Columbia University in April. Led by Mark Rudd, head of the SDS chapter at Columbia, "activists"—both student and nonstudent—seized five campus buildings and held them for eight days. The demonstrators demanded that Columbia stop construction of a new gymnasium in a nearby ghetto area; end its ties with the Institute for Defense Analysis; grant amnesty to all demonstrators; revoke the prohibition against demonstrations; and hold public hearings on disciplinary actions.

University officials were forced to utilize the New York City Police Department to clear the seized campus buildings. The demonstrators resisted this action, with the result that 109 demonstrators and seventeen police officers were injured. During the Columbia disorders, 696 persons were arrested and the demonstrators caused an estimated \$250,000 damage to university property.

With regard to the part played by Mark Rudd in the Columbia disturbances, it is interesting to note that in October, 1967, he prepared a position paper on disruptive activity at Columbia which called for a sit-in and a general university strike.

Civil disorders on campuses have occurred from one end of the country to the other. At Brooklyn College in New York, for example, fifty persons who were identified as members of the Student-Faculty Coalition Against Racism staged a sit-in in the Registrar's Office in May, 1968. This group of demonstrators, which included members of the SDS and the W.E.B. DuBois Clubs of America, a communist youth group, demanded admission of Negro and Puerto Rican students to the College by the Fall of 1968 and the hiring of minority group faculty members. Forty-two of the demonstrators were arrested and expelled from the College when they refused to leave the Registrar's Office. Also, the University of Hawaii chapter of the SDS in May, 1968, staged a sit-in to demand that a University professor who had been active in protest activity be granted tenure.

A sit-in was held at American University here in Washington, D.C., under the sponsorship of the SDS in May, 1968. The demonstrators, who consisted of a very small minority on the campus, demanded personal privacy for students, the abolishment of curfew regulations and mandatory University housing, and a student voice in all policies concerning academic action and faculty assignment and dismissal. And at California State College, Long Beach, California, on June 3, 1968, the SDS sponsored a demonstration to protest the refusal of California authorities to allow an exhibit of obscene sculptures. One hundred fifty persons entered the administration building of that college and demonstrated for approximately one hour.

Kent State University, Kent, Ohio, was the scene of a sit-in demonstration on November 13, which was called by the SDS and a group known as the Black United Students. The purpose of this demonstration was to protest campus recruiting by two police officers from the Oakland, California, Police Department. The demonstrators prevented the officers from leaving the University placement office for several hours.

Student protests against the war in Vietnam have been widespread, and have led, in some instances, to confrontations with prominent governmental figures. For example, in November, 1966, then Secretary of Defense Robert McNamara was blocked in his car at Harvard University by student protestors who refused to allow him to leave the area until he debated with them. In the same month, General Earle G. Wheeler, Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, spoke at Pembroke College, Providence, Rhode Island. After the speech, a group of students charged the platform in an apparent at-

tempt to reach General Wheeler. Police blocked the students from the platform while officers quickly ushered Wheeler out a side door. And at Howard University, Washington, D.C., in March, 1967, Lt. General Lewis B. Hershey, Director of the Selective Service System, was forced to cut short a speech appearance due to threatened student violence.

On November 14, 1968, fifteen persons, including members of the SDS, were arrested at Colorado State University, Fort Collins, Colorado, because they had engaged in a sit-in to protest campus recruiting by the Dow Chemical Company. And at the University of Pennsylvania in Philadelphia, student protestors forced the University to end its defense-related research.

Black student protests have occurred at a number of schools. On November 21, 1968, about 100 students including ten whites, were arrested at Wisconsin State University, Oshkosh, Wisconsin, when they broke windows and damaged furnishings in the administrative offices of that school. This disturbance occurred after the president of the University refused to sign a list of demands presented by a group of students who sought funding for black students, the hiring of black instructors, removal of a professor and institution of black cultural courses.

In protest over the suspension of George Mason Murray, an instructor at San Francisco State College, approximately 250 students at that school disrupted classes on November 7, 1968. Murray, Minister of Education for the Black Panther Party, was suspended after he urged militant action by black students to force officials of San Francisco State College to meet their demands. Disturbances have occurred on that campus almost daily since November 7, and classes have been suspended. On November 22, 1968, a number of black students gathered on the campus armed with bricks, baseball bats, and other objects. Seven plain-clothes police officers on duty in the campus area were recognized by members of this group and were harassed and chased from the area.

BOMBING AND ARSON INCIDENTS

During the past nine months, a number of bombing and arson incidents have occurred throughout the country on or near college campuses. They include the following:

In February, 1968, a Naval ROTC building at Stanford University was damaged by arson to the extent of \$2600. In May, 1968, the building was burned to the ground. One SDS member boasted "they" did it. In July, 1968, a fire at the office of the president of Stanford resulted in about \$300,000 damage.

In September, 1968, arson caused over \$7900 damage to ROTC equipment at the University of Delaware.

In September, 1968, the Naval ROTC facility at the University of Washington was damaged by arson with \$90,000 damage. The facility had previously been mentioned as a target by a local SDS group.

In September, 1968, the Navy and Marine Reserve Center, at Eugene, Oregon, was bombed in an incident believed related to a November, 1968, bombing of Cherney Hall on the University of Oregon campus.

While Jerry Rubin, Youth International Party leader, spoke at The George Washington University in protest of hearings on the new left by the House Committee on Un-American Activities, a fire was apparently set in an underground hallway between two buildings on the campus.

On November 7, 1968, a Nigerian student was arrested for possession of explosives at San Francisco State College after numerous fires had been set in apparent support of demonstrating Black Student Union members and white supporters.

In addition, various offices and records of the Selective Service System have been damaged or destroyed by various protest groups including student elements of the new left. In the Baltimore area several Roman Cath-

olic priests were among draft resisters who poured blood on draft records on one occasion and set fire to draft records after another invasion of a Selective Service office. In Milwaukee other antiwar activists destroyed thousands of files from five Milwaukee and suburban draft boards by a public burning.

In an incident involving a CIA office, the SDS at the University of Michigan and other new left elements have claimed credit for the bombing of the CIA office in Ann Arbor.

THE PARALLEL

There is a parallel to be drawn between the attitudes³ of some student "activists" alluded to and the well-known attitudes of fascists and communists. They all believe the end justifies the means. All are militant and intolerant toward those who do not believe entirely as they do. Their rationale for disorder is both national and international. They have little or no faith in the democratic process. Their views on legitimate authority and just laws are uniformly negative. Arrogance, insolence, and conceit are common among them. Almost without exception, all fall to recognize and understand human limitations—including their own. All look for ideas, encouragement and support from professors—and receive them from a small but sometimes significant percentage.

THE PROBLEM

The problem of serious civil disorder in academic communities today is not to be attributed to the need for change and improvement, for all social institutions (not educational ones alone) are daily in need of this. The problem is not that students want more of a share in the processes which shape their personal future and that of colleges and universities. They should have this, commensurate with their experience, knowledge, ability, and accomplishments. The problem is not the "divine dissatisfaction" of students, for without this no substantial progress can be made. The problem is not that of serious student concern with the defects of our social order—for which they should be praised (and it is hoped they are equally concerned about their own individual defects).

The problem is irrational thinking and behavior. It is this which is at the root of civil disorder in our academic communities. While we have always rightly opposed the tyranny of the majority, we now are faced with the tyranny of a small irrational minority. Of the typical member of this minority, it may be said: "To him who looks upon the world irrationally, the world in turn presents an irrational aspect. The relation is mutual."

THE PERMANENT SOLUTION

What is the permanent solution to this problem of civil disorder in our academic communities? First of all, I hasten to say that I do not know for certain what the solution is. For your consideration, for your acceptance or rejection, however, may I suggest two things? First, where the permanent solution will not be found, and second, where, perhaps, it may be found.

I suggest that the permanent solution to the problem of civil disorder in academic communities will not be found on television or radio programs or in books, or in the kind of speech that you are listening to this evening because what we are day in and day out is infinitely more decisive in determining the future than what we see, listen to or read. Nor will the permanent solution to such civil disorders be found in legislation *per se*, or law enforcement alone, for these are emergency measures, not designed to effect a permanent solution to a thoroughly complex academic social problem. If then the permanent solution is not to be found in these important areas, where is it to be found?

³ This is not to be confused with ideology, which is not being discussed in this lecture.

May I suggest that the clue to the solution might be found in the thinking expressed in the lines of Matthew Arnold years ago. He wrote "... man hath all which nature hath—but more, And in that more lie all his hopes of good."

Of what does this "more" consist? It is suggested that this "more" consists of six indispensable human capacities. These six human capacities are:

First, there is the capacity of every individual student to think—to reflect, weigh, evaluate, interpret, and analyze. It is his capacity to perceive, to sit down before a set of facts, study them and draw from them correct conclusions. As Blaise Pascal said: man is weak, he is a reed—but a thinking reed and this makes all the difference. Civil disorder will not be prevented or even reduced unless all students express their capacity to think much better than has been done in recent years. Those who create disorder and some of those who oppose it are not immune to the negative emotional content of conflicting slogans and cliches. But decisions based on such are not the product of thought. No thinking person can fail to recognize and apprehend the relationship between violence and illegality and shallow irrational thinking. It is the responsibility of the great majority of students to provide the rational thought and leadership which will put an end to civil disorders on campus!

Second, is the capacity of every student for freedom. But freedom is not the result of an anarchical conscience. Rather, freedom is the result of an inner restraint and an outward implementation of democratically formulated laws. It can be a freedom only under law—freedom of thought, conscience, expression, worship, assembly, inquiry, dissent, and experimentation and freedom of education. Those persons in our Nation, young and old, black and white, educated and uneducated, who deliberately break our laws and create civil disorder on campuses to achieve an objective are not seeking freedom. What they seek is to impose their tyrannical wills over the student majority. Civil disorder, therefore, is directly related to the suppression of freedom. This is as true of the seizure of buildings at Columbia University and at other educational institutions as it is of efforts to shatter the Democratic Convention in Chicago. We would do well to ponder James Anthony Froude's conclusion: "Just laws are no restraint upon the freedom of the good, for the good man desires nothing which a just law will interfere with."

Third, is the student's capacity for self-discipline. The evidence pointing to a deterioration of self-discipline in this country is too impressive to be taken lightly. Our homes, schools, colleges, churches, and mass media are not without blame here. A permissive psychology has eaten deep into our national life. Without self-discipline there can be no peace, no justice, no order either on or off campus. We can recall with benefit Edmund Burke's observation that unless people learn to discipline themselves from within they will be ruled by dictators from without.

Fourth, is the student's capacity to be self-governing in certain areas of academic life. However, not being an isolated capacity it depends for success on the capacities alluded to previously. Members of the new left who today attack all authority, who see in every institution a pillar of "The Establishment"—which they openly declare must be utterly destroyed through civil disorder leading to revolution—do not believe in the capacity of the ordinary student to be self-governing. They have no faith in the democratic process. Their faith is in their own disordered egos which impel them to dogmatize that they alone have "the truth" and that they alone have the only correct answers to all profound questions. Should such people come to power in a university any self-governing process would be impossible, for we can rightly raise the relevant question asked years ago by

Oliver Goldsmith: "Who can direct when all pretend to know?" To be self-governing is to recognize, among other things, our own limitations. It is to recognize the rights of others, so necessary to civil order.

Fifth, is the student's capacity to be educated—not only intellectually, but morally and spiritually. It is suggested that only a *balanced* education can make any substantial contribution to preventing civil disorder on campus. In fact, it can be maintained that certain inadequacies in various educational institutions have created mentalities and conditions facilitating the development of civil disorder. I am reminded of a contemporary American philosopher who has opined that for many years in the field of education we have staked everything on the intellect only to learn painfully now that it is integrity, character and rational conduct which win in the end, and without which no nation can endure.

Sixth, is the student's capacity for ceaseless, dynamic individual development. There will be no solution to the problem of civil disorder in our academic communities without the realization that ultimately all depends on individual development and growth in keeping with the values of a law-oriented but free and open society. No person expressed this truth more succinctly than did Justice Louis D. Brandeis: "What are the American ideals? They are the development of the individual for his own and the common good; the development of the individual through liberty and the attainment of the common good through democracy and social justice." The importance of these American ideals to the solution of the problem of civil disorder has been most perceptibly summed up in the lines of Edwin Markham:

"We are all blind until we see
That in the human plan
Nothing is worth the making
If it does not make the man.

"Why build these cities glorious
If man unbuilt goes?
In vain we build the world
Unless the builders also grow."

Will the student builders grow? This is the question. Are students destined to dream great enterprises and see these dreams shattered because of lack of growth in themselves? Will the rise and decline of their accomplishments be always attributed to the failure of the individual student to deepen, to broaden, to grow in integrity and vision? "For where there is no vision, the people perish."

Of course, only the future contains the final answer to this question. I have mentioned the word "future." Do you not agree that it is an intriguing word? Why? I suggest that it is intriguing because the word future calls to the mind of every student the fascination of uncertainty, the quest of the unknown, the lure of distant horizons, the challenge of high peaks as yet unscathed—intellectual, moral and spiritual—and the dangers inherent in the ascent.

In the word "future" is packed all the drama and excitement of youth, of student existence.

You know what the past has been. You know what the present is, but you do not know what the future is going to be from one hour to another. Yet, you cannot ignore or flee from your future. You must face it every moment and make an individual decision as to how to embrace it and mold it and give to it the direction you believe in the depth of your being it should have.

Because civil disorder in our academic communities is a serious and wasteful problem today, because it stands astride of your academic road to the future, it is incumbent upon the great majority of students to make rationality prevail over irrationality, legality over illegality, peace over violence, order over disorder, freedom over oppression, tolerance over intolerance, good will over hatred, and

to make the reasoned thought and conduct of the majority of students prevail decisively over the fanaticism of a tyrannical academic minority.

If this is achieved—and it can be—students, professors, and administrators will then be able to say to each other: "Come now, and let us reason together . . ." This is the fundamental requisite for all progress, justice, tranquility, and mutual understanding.

OUTLINE OF STATEMENT ON UNIVERSITIES, BY JACQUES BARZUN, THE UNIVERSITY PROFESSOR, COLUMBIA UNIVERSITY, MAY 9, 1969, BEFORE THE SPECIAL SUBCOMMITTEE ON EDUCATION

I

Among the causes of unrest today, it is impossible to overlook the general disaffection with society which exists in the western world. It is based on a sense of futility and stagnation in the face of social difficulties, urban, racial, international. The contrast between the immense power that man can wield—theoretically—and his apparent powerlessness to cope with urgent needs stirs up and feeds blind resentments.

On this account, many adults who are not consciously radical or destructive, are unconsciously favorable to the student rebels, and enjoy seeing something being smashed. In other words, the frustrations arising out of industrial-democratic life, when the individual is surrounded by "big impersonal bureaucracies" are relieved by seeing an institution defied and destroyed. It is thereupon assumed that it too was big and impersonal and a bureaucracy, that it was full of abuses and needed reform. What are the facts?

II

The American University was perhaps the freest institution ever conceived, and its history for the past 75 years is a record to be proud of. To maintain the proper conditions for science and scholarship, all legitimate freedoms were protected. Faculty tenure protected scholars from trustees and administration and from one another. Students had freedom too: they enjoyed easy and informal access to faculties, had a wide choice of programs, were saved from wasted time and energy by the transferability of credits, and had the right to publish, criticize, and hear outside opinions ad lib. The administration served and did not command; it was the buffer between trustees and faculties, interpreting each to the other, and both to the alumni. It worked largely with faculty advice and consultation. We should note the great cases of presidents defending threatened teachers, from Lowell of Harvard in 1916 to Brewster of Yale in 1968. University administrators came from faculty ranks for the most part and were responsive to faculty needs. In conflicts, the American Association of University Professors could be counted on to intervene and protect academic freedom.

The American University, in short, was governed by influence, not power. Its acts did not spring from arbitrary decision-making but from *deference* to the common interest. Its principles were rationality and civility. All this was shattered when the first bullhorn was heard on the campus.

III

How did the deterioration take place? In the first instance, by the university's own mistaken desire to enlarge its role in the public service. Inevitable in time of war, this enlargement continued after 1945. It turned the university into a catch-all institution, ready to do what government, industry, foundations, and private donors wanted. With the best intentions, faculty members became globe-trotters and project-directors. The end-results were unexpected: on the one hand, the university's true service to society was obscured and damaged by these new and multiplying services; teaching was neglected;

buzzing activity replaced quiet thought. And on the other hand, the new activities subjected the university to the normal criticism that the public has a right to level at its service centers. The university became a common target, an object of complaint, pressure, and demand. By its nature, it could not fight back. It was vulnerable and it fell.

IV

What, then, is the true idea of the university? How does it best serve society? By sticking to its double role: to learn and to teach. Students learn; teachers teach and learn more. The idea of the university is *study*. There is no limit to what can be studied at a university, provided the subject is capable of being reduced to principles, which can then form the basis of training. The university produces trained minds, and they of course can go and apply concretely and usefully to all sorts of problems what they have learned from the broadest and deepest possible survey of reality. If, for example, there are rational solutions to urban and minority problems, they will arise from study of this kind.

They are not likely to come by asking universities to improvise action centers made up of scholars and scientist, no matter how much foundation money is behind them. The desire to do something, at once, without forethought, is the very opposite of the idea of a university. Yielding to this impatient desire for the last 25 years has weakened the fabric of the universities and laid the ground for their present destruction. Note in passing that asking universities to serve immediate purposes is the exact parallel to students demanding Relevance.

V

What about these student demands—justified, unjustified? The demands they do not make or make only in passing are the justified ones: better teaching, a stronger grip on their minds and emotions by the tasks set before them.

The demand for student power or even participation—whatever that may mean—seems to me rooted in a tangle of misconceptions and impracticalities. To suggest only one: if a student is in fact capable of framing curricula, he should be given a diploma, not a voice.

Besides, this and other demands they make are vitiated by the way they make them. For example, anything having to do with curriculum or faculty appointments cannot be dealt with by physical obstruction and destruction, nor can they be worked out or agreed upon overnight. The method of the ultimatum and the sit-in yield nothing but disaster. The very term "nonnegotiable" defines the protesters as what they are in fact: people who hope to gain their ends by intimidation and blackmail. Anyone who thinks this can lead to a better life for students and a better university does not know what a university is.

As for demands for changing the world *via* the university, they are equally unreal. The university has no such power except through study, discovery, the slow work of mind upon difficulty, which requires peace and quiet and which is stopped by guerrilla warfare. Youthful idealism is no excuse for the lack of imagination which fails to take what the conditions of solid work are, have been, and always will be.

There are those, finally, who plan revolution and think they are beginning the overthrow by toppling colleges and universities. These rebels too are going about it in an irrelevant way in an irrelevant place. They can bring about the shutdown of every university in the land; but they will still face the showdown with troops on the streets and the hillsides. The terrorization of the University of Tokyo led to nothing but the elimination of a seat of learning.

VI

Are there remedies to the American situation that may avert comparable results

here? They are not as clear as the diagnosis, and those that suggest themselves are not pleasant to take. But first one thing must be clear. Talking of remedies implies that this country wants to save its colleges and universities. If it does not, the simplest thing to do is to let events go on as they have. When people make no move to save what they care for, they must not complain when it is torn to pieces in front of their eyes.

If a rescue operation is to be undertaken, it must aim at restoring on the campus its characteristic way of life—the way of discussion, civility, and decent behavior. It is not true that campus disruption is a lawful parallel to labor disputes, even though many people, including a former Solicitor General of the United States, believe the analogy correct. The relationships are utterly different. It is not true that the tyrannical misdeeds of universities justify any amount of vandalism by students. What are these misdeeds and tyrannies? Where has a list of them appeared? The promiscuous name-calling and the imputation that universities abet the world's evils do not fulfill the specification of a list of grievances.

Rather, the grievances are on the side of the universities and colleges—work disrupted, property defaced, libraries damaged, scholars manhandled, their research papers burned, the thought and speech of *everyone* contaminated and debased; these are offenses that cannot be condoned as a lark or accepted as a legal form of free expression. The American universities will not recover from these blows for decades, but if they are to last that long, it will have to make use of strong means, even if—as the Declaration of Independence says, it entails “organizing its powers in such form as to them shall seem most likely to effect their safety and happiness.” Under the new student despotism, “it is their right, it is their duty, to throw off such governance and to provide new guards for their future security.” I quote the Declaration of Independence, because I believe in independent universities.

STATEMENT OF DR. BRUNO BETTELHEIM, BEFORE THE HOUSE SPECIAL SUBCOMMITTEE ON EDUCATION, MARCH 20, 1969

The problems to society which originate in the students' rebellions are so manifold and have such far reaching implications that in a short presentation only a very small selection of them can be alluded to. I shall, therefore, concentrate (1) on the parallels to the German situation before Hitler; (2) on a few of the factors which contribute to the widespread unrest among relatively large numbers of students, black and white; (3) on the small group of leaders who, by making skillful use of the general unrest, succeeded in doing damage way beyond the importance of this group because of their tactics of intimidation and coercion and due to the publicity they receive; (4) the particular difficulties of some black students which are exploited by the SDS; (5) the fascination with extreme positions, and (6) what all this does to the universities and higher education.

1. While history does not repeat itself, and while the present U.S. situation is radically different from that of pre-Hitler Germany, given these vast differences, some of the similarities between the present student rebellion and what happened in the German universities which spearheaded Hitler's rise to power are striking. Of course, the German student rebels embraced politically the extreme right, while here they are of the extreme left, but what is parallel is the determination to bring down the establishment. In Germany the philosophy which gained them a mass following was racist and directed against a discriminated minority (the Jews), while here the radical students intend to help a discriminated minority. While this is an important difference, it does not

change the parallel that universities then and now were forced to make decisions in respect to the race of students, rather than on the basis of disregard of racial origin. To use only one example, German universities began to cave in when students coerced faculties to appoint professorships in *Rassenwissenschaft*, that is, professorships devoted to teaching the special aspects, merits, achievements, of one race versus others, rather than concentrating in their teaching on contributions to knowledge, whatever the origin of the person who made the contribution.

Professor Laqueur (2) says, “National Socialism came to power as the party of youth.” Its cult of youth was as pronounced as that of Italian fascism whose very hymn was called “Youth” (*Giovinetza*). Hitler insisted all along that his movement was a revolt “of the coming generation against all that was senile and rotten with decay in German democratic society.” Professor Gay (1) stresses the prevalence in pre-Hitler days of an ideology that pitted the sons against the fathers, an insistence that the generations cannot understand each other, are deadly enemies; in short, in this respect they said exactly the same as do our rebellious students who insist that nobody over thirty is trustworthy.

Thus, then as now, these rebellious students were pictured as the new generation, disgusted with the complacency of their parents, fighting courageously for a better world. And what were then the mass media often depicted them as idealists, as young people concerned with the real issues of society. In short, they were in their time the wave of the future. And leftist student activists in 1968 burned books they did not like in the same manner and at the same place, Berlin, as did Hitler's equally youthful followers in 1933.

After having stressed these parallels, and some others which I shall mention at the end, one must recognize the vast differences between the present student rebelliousness, and that of pre-Hitler Germany. It is these differences which should permit us to work towards an entirely different outcome.

If I read the signs of the time correctly, I do not think that the rebellious students in and by themselves are a serious danger to the country, though they are a real danger to the universities.

The danger I fear is rather an opposite one: that the disgusting behavior of a very small group of students—the overwhelming majority of our students are sound, and wish nothing more than to take advantage of the opportunities higher education offers them—will arouse a severe counter-reaction, so much so that their left radicalism may lead to a fascist type of backlash. This I believe is the greatest danger inherent in their efforts to create chaos. In desperation—and they try to test and exhaust the patience of what they call the establishment and thus do succeed in creating desperation—and to prevent such chaos, repressive measures might be embraced which would be dangerous to our democratic institutions. It is because of this danger that I believe the student rebellions must be dealt with in the best interest of all of society, including that of the rebelling students themselves. But they can be dealt with intelligently and constructively only if the measures taken are designed to do away with the cause of the widespread discontent of college students.

2. In order to understand this discontent one has to realize that so many more go to college than ever before, and hence many more are much less well prepared for this experience. Taking advantage of college, and being satisfied with this experience rather than being defeated by it, requires a considerable amount of self-discipline, and a high degree of satisfaction with what can be derived from developing one's intellect. Present day education both in home and school

teaches very little self-discipline compared to even very recent times. The expectation is that education can hand over knowledge and skills, and this nearly instantly. There is widespread feeling that if students do not do well in school, this is the failing of the educational system, not due to their lack of application. With each year in school, this feeling becomes stronger in those who do not do well academically. And with it, the system becomes the enemy which deliberately withholds from them which they believe could so easily be given to them by it, hence the hatred of the system.

To understand why pressures erupt in adolescence on a growing scale nowadays, and why controls seem to grow weaker, we must recognize that adolescent revolt is not a stage of development that follows automatically from our natural makeup. What makes for adolescent revolt is the fact that a society keeps the next generation too long dependent in terms of mature responsibility and a striving for independence.

Years ago, when schooling ended for the vast majority at fourteen or fifteen, and thereafter one became self-supporting, got married and had children, there was no need for adolescent revolt. Because while puberty is a biological given, adolescence as we know it with its identity crises, is not. All children grow up and become pubertal. By no means do they all become adolescents. To be adolescent means that one has reached and even passed the age of puberty, is at the very height of one's physical development—healthier, stronger, even handsomer than one has been, or will be, for the rest of one's life—but must nevertheless postpone full adulthood till long beyond what any other period in history has considered reasonable. And their educational experiences in the home and school prepare only a small minority well for such a prolonged waiting, for being able to control their angry impatience while engaged in such waiting.

And it is this waiting for things—for the real life to come—which creates a climate in which a sizable segment of students can, at least temporarily, be seduced into following the lead of the small group of militants. It seems to give them a chance to prove themselves as real men. Thus it is an empty waiting for real life to come, which makes for student rebellions. This can be seen from the fact that most rebellious students, here and abroad, are either undergraduates, or those studying the social sciences and humanities. There are no militants among students of medicine, engineering, the natural sciences. They are busy with doing things that are important to them, they are working in the laboratory and at their studies. It is those students who do not quite know what they are preparing themselves for, and why, the students who sit around waiting for examinations rather than doing active work, which form the cadres of the student rebellion.

One example may stand for many: In a class I am presently teaching, a student was close to the activists. He gave me a very hard time in class at first. Two months later he was one of the most interested, cooperating students. I asked him what happened. He answered: “A few weeks ago I got a job which interests me, and I also began to be interested in my classes; that did it.”

In my opinion there are, today, far too many students in the colleges who essentially have no business to be there. Some are there to evade the draft, many others out of a vague idea that it will help them to find better paying jobs, though they do not know what jobs they want. And again many go to college because they do not know what better to do and because it is expected of them. Their deep dissatisfaction with themselves and their inner confusion is projected against the institution of the university first, and against all institutions of society secondarily, which are blamed for their own inner weakness.

To make matters worse, our institutions or higher learning have expanded much too fast, have under public pressure for more education for everybody increased enrollment beyond reason. The result is far too large classes. Many classes in our large universities are taught by teaching assistants some of whom, out of their own inner dissatisfaction and insecurity, tend to side with the rebellion. All this led to the anonymity, the impersonal nature of student faculty contacts about which many students rightly complain. And since many of them are essentially not interested in the intellectual adventure, the knowledge which the faculty can convey to them is not what they want. They want essentially group therapeutic experiences which will help them to become mature, secure, to find themselves. But colleges are not mass therapeutic institutions, and hence disappoint the students where the greatest need lies.

In addition because of such vast expansion in numbers, the old methods to give coherence to the college experience, and to offer students a life geared to the needs of the late adolescent age group have disintegrated. This the fraternities and sororities used to do, which group homes easing the transition from home to society at large. They no longer can contain the vast number of students. And here the demands of some black students for separate black housing, etc. has to be understood as the consequence of their feeling lost in the anonymous mass of students. Only most of the white students are similarly lost until such time as they find themselves in their work and study experience.

Also, the old rituals which enhanced student life and bound them to each other, and to their college, such as football rallies, homecomings etc., all have lost most of their meaning and have not been replaced by anything but the excitement the sit-ins and rebellions provide. The spirit of intimate comradeship that used to prevail in a fraternity house is now found by all too many students in their sit-ins, where they feel closely bound together, important as at no other time, doing things together which they deep down know they do also for the emotional satisfactions they derive from such being together, whatever high sounding issues they think are motivating their actions.

In this context, the symbolic meaning should not be overlooked of students' invading the dean's or president's office, violently, or by means of sit-ins, big in age and size, who inwardly feel like little boys, and hence need to play big by sitting in papa's big chair. They want to have a say in how things are run, want to sit in the driver's seat, not because they feel competent to do so, but because they cannot bear to feel incompetent.

I think it is unnatural to keep a young person for some 20 years in dependency, and attending school. This might be a way of life for that small elite which always in the past went to universities. They were those who could go to school for 20 years. But they were never more than a small percentage of the population. In the past, the vast majority of young people were actively meeting life, proving themselves as men or women. And in this way they found themselves as real, strong human beings. Now the tremendous push that everybody should go to college has brought an incredibly large number into the university who do not find their self-realization through study, or through the intellectual adventure. But they still need to find their early manhood. They try to change the university to something where they can find it through engaging in an active, sometimes even violent battle against the existing order or all of society. Only that would change the university so that it would be no longer an institution dedicated to the intellectual virtues, to the frontiers of knowledge, but one dedicated to a belligerent reshaping of society. And this is exactly what the mili-

itants want—not to engage in study and research, but in political battles.

The reason we didn't have student revolts before is partly because only those went to college who wanted to be educated, and partly because those students who had to put themselves through school, by the very fact that they could do that, of their own strengths, could prove their early manhood—at least to some degree.

I think many of the rebellious students are essentially guilt-ridden individuals. They feel terribly guilty about all the advantages they had. And there's also the guilt of their exemption from the draft, which is a serious guilt. Only again, they cannot bear to live with their guilt. They try to destroy society or certain institutions rather than deal with their own inner guilt, because they have it so good.

I think, from these remarks, it should be obvious which, I believe, may be some of the remedies. Firstly, all too many who now go to college have little interest, ability, and use for what constitutes a college education. They would be better off with a high level vocational education which is closely linked to a work program which gives scope to their needs for physical activity and visible, tangible achievement. The complaint of many of these students is that nobody needs them. They feel parasites of society, and hence come to hate a society which they think makes them feel this way. Here we should not be beyond learning from the communist countries where studies are combined with work in factories and in the fields. I believe this to be a much better arrangement for all those who do not feel a deep commitment to the intellectual enterprise, that is to study and research, and these will always be only a relatively small segment of this age group.

As a matter of fact, I would suggest a youth service program (civilian peace corps, or such) of a couple of years' duration where young people work on socially significant projects while earning pay for it, and receiving at the same time, higher vocational training. After this period only those would go to universities who really wish to do so, while the rest would feel a much greater stake in a society that they helped rebuild. At the least, because of the training they received, they would be well prepared for permanent jobs.

While a need for an army draft exists, such program should be an alternative to it: only those young men who wish to do so should serve in the armed forces, which then would be a voluntary army. And I am convinced if every able-bodied person would have to serve two years in some such program, there would be no scarcity of those who wish to spend these two years in the armed forces instead, particularly if they would, for example, receive some advantages in pay, or other special advantages such as at the end of armed service. This would also do away with the exemption of college students which, in connection with the war in Vietnam, is behind so much of the student unrest. For example, if I am exempt from service when others are not, I can live in peace with myself only if I am convinced this is a vile war.

3. I feel I can be shorter about the very small group of leaders of the student rebellion because were it not for the widespread student discontent which I discussed above, they would find scant following, and if they should break the law, without such followers, they could be readily dealt with. It is the mass following they can arouse because of the widespread discontent which alone makes them dangerous. I therefore think we should concentrate in our thinking and planning not on these very few, but on what needs to be done so that they won't find ready followers.

There were always a small percentage of persons bent on destroying society, and on fomenting a revolution. In previous generations they were the Wobblies, later there were the campus communists. The reason why the

present brand of campus revolutionaries, who are of anarchist and nihilist persuasion, are so much more dangerous is that they can point to success after success of their disrupting tactics. Here, too, nothing succeeds like success. As early as 200 years ago Immanuel Kant warned that we shall never be able to control violence if it is rewarded. "It is far more convenient," he wrote, "to commit an act of violence, and afterwards excuse it, then laboriously to consider convincing arguments and lose time in listening to objections. This very boldness itself indicates a sort of conviction of the legitimacy of the action, and the God of success is afterwards the best advocate." The greatest danger, then, is presently the readiness with which violence is afterward excused, and the seemingly convincing arguments which are brought forth to justify it before and after the act. Worst and most dangerous of all, there seems to be a tendency in our society to legitimize the results of violence so that, as Kant put it, the God of success afterwards serves as advocate for the violent action that preceded it and suggests its future use. On our campuses those committed to violence, (to quote Kant again) "lose no time on considering arguments, or on listening to objections." They simply refuse to be rational about their grievances and through using violent means insist on having their way, no matter what. And if they get their way, as Kant already knew, their success then legitimizes their disruptive actions.

And they gain their success by arousing a sizeable number of students through the tactics of confrontations, and by universities' fear of such confrontations. Confrontations have one important aim—to use the reaction of those they provoke to generate a feeling of new unity among the demonstrators. This has been used in its most direct form by militants, who stand in front of policemen and denounce them as pigs and wait until the man in uniform hits out. The art of demonstrating then lies in seeing that the blows are directed against the less committed demonstrators and, if possible, against completely uninvolved persons. This then provides the mass following they need for their success. A whole system of provocations has been worked out for this purpose.

Speaking of the small group of leaders of the radical left, it has been observed that most of them come from well educated, very liberal families. From my own observations I would like to add that those whom I got to know might be characterized by having had their intellectual abilities developed very highly at much too early an age, but at the expense of their emotional development. Very bright as they often are, emotionally some of them remained fixated at the age of the temper tantrum. It is this discrepancy between great intellectual maturity and utter emotional immaturity which is so baffling, often even to the universities, where some members of the faculty fail to see behind the obvious intelligence the inability to act rationally, and most of all, the inability to act responsibly. It is one of the weaknesses of university faculties that, as persons committed to value most highly intellectual abilities, they are captivated by the intelligence of these students to the degree as to be ready to excuse, or make little, of their disruptive and intellectual arrogance.

As for these students themselves, psychologically I always found them hating themselves as intensely as they hate the establishment, a self-hatred they try to escape by fighting any establishment. Obviously they need help in overcoming their emotional difficulties, and punishing them is hardly the way to do it. If we bring them to the universities, we should provide facilities for helping them. I believe it is their emotional immaturity that explains both their call for immediate action, and the retreat of the dropout and the hippy into utter non-action, because each one masks an inability of these very intelligent young people to take time to

think things out first. Essentially these militants must want to destroy the universities because they do not want to be students. Because to be a student means to prepare oneself to do something more worthwhile in the future. The militant student's cry is for action now, not preparation for action later. In this real sense he is no longer a student at all, since he clearly rejects knowledge as a precondition of any meaningful activity. Truth, moreover, is no longer sought, but "revealed"; the contempt for free speech and free thought is demonstrated as much in his actions as in his words. Were he ever to capture the university, it would cease to be a university at all.

In their inability to think things out because they cannot delay action for thought, both right and left extremists, the militants of all colors, are brothers under the skin. This is among the reasons why in history it happened that the young followers of the extreme right can very easily become those of the extreme left, or the other way round. Because the mainspring of their action is their wish to prove themselves strong, and less any particular political conviction, which is super-imposed on their self-doubt and a hatred of a society that they feel left them out in the cold. There were reasons why, in Germany, the National Socialists and the Communists voted together, worked together to bring down the democratic Weimar government. There is a reason why former Nazis could easily become active in the Communist government of Eastern Germany.

But there is also reason why mainly the children of leftist parents become hippies, or student revolutionaries in our society, as in other places or times the children of conservative parents, when the similar emotional conditions prevailed in their families, spear-headed rightwing radicalism. It was the children of conservative German parents, for example, who first embraced the Emperor's War and enthusiastically went to their death, because they felt a need to lay "their bodies on the line," as it were, for ideas their parents had only lukewarmly held. This way they could prove themselves strong, while at the same time proving their parents weak, wishy washy, not worthy of true respect. They felt, too, this was a rebirth, a way to revitalize an ossified society, to create a new society, one of true authenticity and confrontation. All these were the main tenets of academic Hitler youth, as they are now those of our student left.

Thus, while the emotional constellations which make for very different student revolts are strangely familiar, the specific political content of a student revolt depends to a very large degree on the beliefs of their parents. Because in many ways, it is a desperate wish to do better than the parent, exactly where he seemed weak in his belief. In this sense it is also a desperate desire for parental approval. But even more it is a desperate wish that the parent should have been strong in his convictions that motivate many of their actions. This is the reason why so many of our radicals embrace Maoism, why they chant in their demonstrations "Ho Ho Chi Minh" exactly as another generation of students chanted at their football rallies. These are strong fathers, with strong convictions, who powerfully coerce their children to follow their commands. While consciously they demand freedom and participation, unconsciously their commitment to Mao and other dictatorships suggests their desperate need for controls from the outside, since without it they are unable to bring order into their inner chaos.

Thus while these militant students need controls, such controls must not be imposed punitively, nor for the benefit of others. They must be controls that clearly and definitely benefit the person himself, so that he will eventually make them become his own inner controls.

It is this, their inability to wait and work hard for long range goals, which marks these

militants as emotionally disturbed, as does their hatred for their parents who failed to give them direction, set them against the world, by exposing their immature minds to criticism of all that could have given meaning to their lives.

It is their hatred of society that makes it so easy for the small group of militant leaders to make common cause with another small group that provides temporary leadership for some of the rebellions: outright paranoid individuals. I do not believe the number of paranoids among students is greater than their number would be in any comparable group of the population. They become dangerous again because of their high intelligence, which permits them to hide more successfully the degree of their disturbance from the nonexperts. Having worked professionally with some of them for years, I know that student revolt permits them to act out their paranoia to a degree that no other position in society would permit them. How understandable, then, that all paranoids who can, do flock into the ranks of these militants. Unfortunately, most nonexperts do not know how persuasive paranoids can be, at least for a time, until they are recognized as such. The persuasiveness of a Hitler or Stalin is now recognized as the consequence of their own paranoia, and their unconscious appeal to the vague paranoid tendencies that can be found among the immature and disgruntled. I have no doubt that the ranks of the militants contain some would-be Hitlers and Stalins, hence again their dangerousness.

(4) Paranoids always make a persuasive appeal to any group of the population who rightly or wrongly feel persecuted, and they seek out such groups because they are most likely to view their paranoia as true understanding of this group's particular predicament. Which brings me to the particular problems of some of the black students who, fortunately, seem to recognize ever more than the SDS is using them, rather than helping them. They are not quite as successfully to see through the motives of some of the paranoid student leaders. Their feeling persecuted because of their emotional disturbance "feels" more congenial because of the black students' experience with discrimination.

Still, the overwhelming majority of the black students desire exactly the same for themselves as does the overwhelming majority of the white students: a rightful place in this society. And only a very small minority of them wishes to destroy it, as do the few rebellious white students. Thus if they could be convinced that there is a good place for them in society, their attitude would change and they all would part ways with the SDS, as many of them have already done. But here the difficulty is that many of the black students, just because of the nature of the commitment of the university, do not feel that being a student is necessarily the best way for them to find their rightful place in society. Here our wish, and theirs, that they should become part of the elite, runs afoul of what for many of them is their reality. Many of the black students who are brought into our colleges are often ill-prepared academically, and lacking in the skills required for making a go in college. At the same time they have been imbued with the notion that it is the fault of the establishment that they are disadvantaged. While this is true to some degree, being aware of such truth is an easy way out if one does not succeed.

All students find the transition from home to college difficult. In past times this was blamed by the student on himself, and most of them therefore tried to do something about themselves and sooner or later succeeded. Today both white and black students tend to blame the faculty for the difficulties they encounter in adjusting to a different way of life and study.

The demand for black study programs orig-

inated not only in the justified feeling that one must be familiar, and proud of one's own background, but to a large degree in the feeling that such studies would be easier, that such faculty would have greater understanding for this difficulty.

The fact is that some black students are induced to go to college whose preparation for it is inferior to that of the majority of the college population. While the faculty is ready to make allowances for this, it runs counter to the self-respect of the black student, who rightly does not wish to be made to feel like a second class citizen. But if he cannot compete successfully with those students who had had so many advantages educationally and socially, he is in a terrible conflict. He was brought to college to do as well as the others, but if he fails to do so, his background does not permit him to accept that this is because of his lack of preparation, because this would make him feel second class, while he is in college to get out of such a position. So when because of lack of background and preparation—though intellectually able to make the grade—he has difficulty in adjusting, he feels that the very place that promised to make him equal fails to do so. Disappointed, he rages against the institution that makes him once more feel inferior. And efforts to help him by means of special programs only makes this inferiority even more obvious. The many black students who are well able to hold their own with the best of the rest feel they must not desert their fellow black comrades and hence feel obliged to make their burden their very own.

I believe the answer to this problem does not rest with the colleges and universities. If we want to bring a large number of black students into our universities, as we should, I am convinced we have to start much earlier. I believe from high school age on, it would be necessary to educate a larger number of them, together with white youngsters from culturally deprived background, in true prep schools, so that they will enter college in every respect as well prepared academically and socially as the rest of the college population.

(5) There is a fascination in society at large with sex and violence, with drugs and insanity which both influences the student militants and provides them with a noteworthy which they exploit to the full. If students protest because of an idea or position and do so in orderly and rational form, they do not receive much public attention. But if they shed all their clothes and walk around naked, this makes news all over the nation, whatever the case they may, or may not have had. It is part of a dangerous fascination with youth and its extreme positions. What passes for modern literature which these youngsters read already in junior high school intoxicates their minds with the appeal of drug induced madness, with sexual acting out and with violence.

The universities, because of their intellectual prestige, give the student activists a prestige for their revolutionary claims which they otherwise could never achieve. For example, for days not more than some 20 to 30 students occupied the administration building of the University of Chicago. They got headlines everyday, and were prominently featured on radio and TV. If some 30 people would have demonstrated in any other place, they would have found no attention whatsoever. This the SDS knows, that is why it concentrates on the universities. The contrast between an institution devoted to the highest achievements of reason, and the obscenity and violence perpetrated there, makes it all the more fascinating. It is this fascination on which they try to build their revolutionary success. An idea in itself may be next to nothing, but it becomes news by interfering with something else which is considered, for one reason or another, to be of public importance. In themselves a couple of hundred demonstrators, somewhere in

New York or Chicago would mean very little, but if some fifty students march into a large lecture hall, take control of the podium, and broadcast their ideas to people who came to hear something quite different, then they have made news.

Here, too, is where the function of political phraseology becomes operative. If someone advocates urinating on graves as the Fugs did, or if a few girls dress up as witches and put curses on professors, as they did in Chicago, if they would do so without reference to politics, people would rightly wonder about their sanity; but if they do so as a condemnation of the Viet Nam war, or take clothes off while claiming to be demonstrating for some good progressive cause, they have the support of many of the older liberals and enlightened radicals, who will inevitably consider it all to be very socially significant. If you are a teenager wrestling with the police and you say you are doing it because of the moral superiority of a future social order, you cannot fail to get the sympathetic attention of the editors of radio and TV stations rather than psychiatrists. The ritualistic invocation of ideology is thus both an alibi and a defense.

(6) Perhaps it all has made too many headlines, perhaps it has been talked about too much for people to accept the fact: but the truth of the matter is that these rebellions can and do paralyze the universities.

And they do this not only because classes are interrupted and buildings occupied, not only because faculty must devote all their energies to calming things down, but much more so because all the time and energy which should be devoted to more lasting achievements has to be concentrated on preparing for and on forestalling new confrontations. Here a last comparison with pre-Hitler days: Then in Germany, as Professor Mosse (3) puts it "professors tended to be either scholars who withdrew into their own speciality, taking scant notice of the world around them, or men who attempted to play the role of prophets. The first kind of academic wanted only to be left in peace . . . The professor as prophet, with very few exceptions indeed, was to be found on the side of the revolting students." Of the students he says, "They had found a basis for action that opposed existing authority yet remained independent of any political movement directed by their elders." And of the faculties that they "failed to provide any opposition, failed to use administrative powers, and failed to organize effective alternative groups of students. At best they displaced a detached passivity . . . at worst they joined in the harassment."

Like in pre-Hitler faculties, so in our universities today we can see efforts of faculty members to remain aloof from it all, while others try to anticipate even the most radical student demands, so as to avoid confrontations. Worse, there are no efforts made to organize effective alternative groups of students. And most of all, many are so intimidated that they cave in even before the students exercise any pressures. It is the continuous worry about what the militant students may do next, the anxious efforts to give them no offense, which saps the universities of their strength so that they become paralyzed. This anxious avoidance of taking a firm stand gives not only these militants, but also many non-committed students the feeling that they have the faculty on the run, because these adults are not sure about their values.

If the colleges and universities would feel sure about themselves, take a determined stand against any coercion and intimidation—though always not only open to, but inviting, reasonable, non-coercive discussion about how things could be improved (and much improvement is needed, as I suggested all along)—then I believe student rebellions could be so reduced as to no longer threaten the universities and, because of the consequences, possibly even all of society.

Thus I believe efforts should be concentrated on strengthening the will of the colleges and universities to resist disruption and coercion. If we succeed in doing so, I believe we shall have little need to take recourse to punitive measures; beyond setting into practice that those who do not wish to have any part of our universities should have their will: they should not be permitted to be, live and work at a place they hate, not as a punishment, but because to remain at a place they hate and despise serves no good purpose, and is detrimental to their emotional well being.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

1. Gay, Peter. *Weimar Culture; the Outsider as Insider*. New York and Evanston: Harper and Row, 1968.
2. Laqueur, Walter Z. *Young Germany*. New York: Basic Books, 1962.
3. Mosse, George L. *The Crisis of German Ideology*. New York: Grosset and Dunlap, 1964.

STATEMENT BY NATHAN M. PUSEY, PRESIDENT OF HARVARD UNIVERSITY, BEFORE THE SPECIAL SUBCOMMITTEE ON EDUCATION, MAY 8, 1969

In my judgment there is little likelihood that the current disturbances and ills which plague college and university campuses can be helped by new legislation at the local, state or federal levels. I have believed strongly—and nothing that has happened at Harvard in recent weeks has caused me to change my opinion—that a correction for our manifold present difficulties can only come from within the academic communities themselves. Let me hasten to agree, however, with what I take to be the view of many concerned people outside the universities, that a correction is clearly overdue.

Very serious injury is being done to the academic enterprise in this country as in many other countries, by the disruptions now being experienced in university communities. In the very period of the world's greatest need for education, the number of institutions of higher learning being shut down, or in which scholarly work is made virtually impossible, for varying periods of time here and abroad, is a scandal. The hours and days and terms wasted in turmoil and emotional distress by students and faculty are beyond calculation. On many campuses for long periods of time learning has almost ceased; and research if it has moved at all, has only limped along. Serious intellectual work cannot be accomplished in a violent revolutionary atmosphere. We need serious intellectual work. And we need those serious people—happily there are still many—who have not lost their faith and interest in this kind of activity and want to get on with the job. In the offing too are the new generations of young people waiting and needing to learn. In the light of these considerations the one unblinkable conclusion, which I take it I share with you, is that the turmoil and violence on our campuses must stop.

My firm conviction is that the campus communities themselves are the only instruments by which the desired end can properly be effected. If the desired result is to be achieved, students, faculties, administrative officers, governing boards and alumni all together must now say, "Enough is enough," and beyond this, they must mean it and show by their actions that they mean it. And—though some of you will find it hard to believe—it is my opinion that academic communities are going to measure up to this task. Signs are multiplying of a growing readiness on the part of faculty and students to assume this strange, unexpected and unwanted responsibility.

What has been happening on our campuses is both difficult and not difficult to understand—difficult in its deeper causes, not reasonably clear as revealed in the surface events which engender disruption. There are small groups of active revolutionaries on most

campuses who have given up on American society and its institutions. Many of these are unimaginative, and not untypically rather fanatical young people whose professed aim is to bring down the "Establishment" as a preliminary to ushering in—they believe—a new and better order of individual freedom and gratification. These groups and their atrocious activities constitute the source of our immediate problem. Though their numbers are not great, they have managed to bring about an incredible amount of disturbance. Yet is not they, so much as the response they have won from other young people who should refuse to follow their lead, which constitutes the most serious problem.

This latter problem—which is, I think, basic—can be dealt with only quietly in reasonable analysis and discourse, over a long period of time. The immediate task, therefore, is to make clear within academic communities that revolutionaries insofar as they insist on using tactics of violence, disruption and coercion in pursuit of their goals have no rightful place, and will not be tolerated. If academic communities are to survive—or at any rate are to survive healthy and free—they must insist on this primary requirement of their existence.

Militant radicals have been winning varying degrees of sympathy from a much wider group of concerned and troubled young people. The amount of support the latter give changes with the issues—goes up and down almost from day to day. The revolutionaries search continuously for issues to win support from their nonmilitant colleagues in order to increase their own following and to achieve their basic purpose, which they acknowledge quite frankly is simply to extend "the movement." By this they mean to foster a revolution which they assume they are leading. They have been fairly successful in recent years in finding issues and so have gained not only tolerance but a great deal of active sympathy for themselves.

But if we are to understand this latter lamentable phenomenon we must recognize and keep in mind that young people do have legitimate cause for worry and dissatisfaction. They have suddenly become acutely aware of many blemishes in American life, within universities and even more in the world outside. They cannot understand why adults in our society—their parents, you and I—do not appear to be equally concerned, nor why we have not already made substantial advances toward correcting the many abuses of which they have become conscious—such abuses as the war, poverty, blighted cities, distorted values for living, and overconcern with getting and gaining, an absence of loving and caring—these and others.

It is easy to say these young people with their lack of experience as to the true world situation and of the conditions of adult life, have an inadequate understanding of how difficult it is to effect constructive change, of how slowly substantial improvements are won when they are won, how much effort, concern, dedication and patience are required, how much knowledge and trained skill are needed, and how many conscientious efforts have been and are even now being made. It is also easy to fault the revolutionaries among them for such things as their manifest egotism and self-righteousness, their unwillingness to listen, the impatient orthodoxy of their so-called radicalism, their superior moral attitude, the tendency of the quickest among them to equate brightness with wisdom and articulateness with understanding, their failure to see that the business of living is essentially a compromise with imperfection, their arrogance and shameless vulgarity, and their belief that action is more important than competence, and feeling (they call it "caring") more important than understanding.

But the present militant young will not listen to explanations or accept excuses from

us. They want results; and they want them now. The mood is widespread. And were it not for its impatience, and the lack of charity it engenders because of its imperfect understanding, who can deny that it is a good thing? The statement painted by youthful revolutionaries on a building at the London School of Economics, "We want the world, and we want it now" is only an expression of a deep-rooted concern and an insistence on change which springs from valid sources of strength in contemporary society.

There are real troubles in society and in the human heart which foster disturbances on campuses, and we have a gigantic task to face up to them, if we are to move toward the eradication or amelioration of the manifold blemishes of our society in such a way as to recall the distressed and angry, young and old, to work patiently and seriously together, charitably, and reasonably, and on a basis of knowledge, in a fresh effort to build a satisfying society that will stir and elicit loyalty.

I cannot say how this is quickly to be done. This long-range aim is what education is all about. Members of faculties, able and devoted teachers will have to do the job. I can only ask that the public outside the universities recognize that the present problem is deep and difficult, and entreat their legislators not to seek to effect correction by hasty enactments which cannot reach to the root of the difficulty and will in all probability only spread the discontent.

I would like to assure the Congress and the public from my own experience that we within the universities are not unaware of the serious implications of the disturbances with which we are now confronted—how venomous and threatening they are. I would like the Committee to believe that we are seeking to understand them and to find ways to contain those relatively few individuals who are most immediately responsible. Toward this end we must enlist the cooperation of the many other young who truly want to build a better society. It is for this reason that I urge you to refrain from precipitate legislation at this time, though recognizing your desire to be helpful. Clarification is on the way. Wills and resolve are stiffening. Those who understand learning and care for it are coming together. Academic communities move slowly to defend themselves. They are almost endlessly tolerant. But the new barbarism will be repulsed. Our institutions will not be surrendered. In a sense universities live for dissent. In less anxious times they encourage and welcome it. But they are not so complacent or other-worldly that they do not know when their lives are threatened, and I am confident as they come to recognize the evil which has recently been permitted through indulgence to grow in their midst they will respond, and again assert the university's true character.

My plea is that in the interest of our national well-being you retain faith in the vast majority of our young people and permit the institutions which exist to foster their education to get on with their very difficult task in ways which will seem to them appropriate, and which alone, I believe, can be counted on to be productive.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to Mr. KEE (at the request of Mr. SLACK), for May 13 through May 16, on account of official business in his congressional district.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legis-

lative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. RUPPE) and to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous matter:)

Mr. STEIGER of Wisconsin, for 30 minutes, on May 13.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD, for 5 minutes, on May 13.

Mr. DANIELS of New Jersey (at the request of Mr. CAFFERY), for 10 minutes, today, and to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to revise and extend remarks was granted to:

Mr. BELCHER and to include extraneous material.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. RUPPE) and to include extraneous matter:)

- Mr. McDADE.
- Mr. SCHADEBERG.
- Mr. BROWN of Ohio in two instances.
- Mr. QUIE.
- Mr. WYATT.
- Mr. WINN.
- Mr. SEBELIUS.
- Mr. ROBISON in three instances.
- Mr. DERWINSKI in three instances.
- Mr. DUNCAN in two instances.
- Mr. UTT.
- Mr. PETTIS.
- Mr. BELL of California.
- Mr. ZWACH.
- Mr. HALPERN in two instances.
- Mr. HOSMER.
- Mr. TAFT.
- Mr. DENNEY.
- Mr. COWGER.
- Mr. CUNNINGHAM.
- Mr. COUGHLIN.
- Mr. ASHBROOK.
- Mr. SCHNEEBELL.
- Mr. COLLINS.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. CAFFREY) and to include extraneous matter:)

- Mr. BIAGGI in two instances.
- Mr. O'HARA in two instances.
- Mr. ADDABBO in two instances.
- Mr. BOLAND in two instances.
- Mr. FLOWERS in three instances.
- Mr. KASTENMEIER.
- Mr. DINGELL in two instances.
- Mr. CHARLES H. WILSON in two instances.
- Mr. GIAIMO.
- Mr. VANIK in two instances.
- Mr. PODELL in three instances.
- Mr. WILLIAM D. FORD.
- Mr. EILBERG.
- Mr. EDWARDS of California in two instances.
- Mr. McFALL.
- Mr. CONYERS in three instances.
- Mr. RARICK in three instances.
- Mr. GONZALEZ in three instances.
- Mr. GIBBONS in three instances.
- Mr. SHIPLEY.
- Mr. DE LA GARZA in three instances.
- Mr. MATSUNAGA.
- Mr. FEIGHAN.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. CAFFERY. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 1 o'clock and 15 minutes p.m.), the House adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, May 14, 1969, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

758. A letter from the Attorney General, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to establish, in the House of Representatives, the office of Delegate from the District of Columbia, to amend the District of Columbia Election Act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

759. A letter from the Director, Bureau of the Budget, Executive Office of the President, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to establish a Commission on Government for the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

760. A letter from the Under Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to authorize the appropriation of funds for Padre Island National Seashore in the State of Texas, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

761. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a request for the withdrawal of the application by the Cameron County Water Improvement District No. 2 of San Benito, Tex., for a loan under section 4(c) of the Small Reclamation Projects Act, pursuant to the provisions of that act; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

762. A letter from the Secretary of Transportation, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to provide for the alteration, maintenance, and repair of Government buildings and property under lease or concession contracts entered into pursuant to the operation and maintenance of Government-owned airports under the jurisdiction of the Secretary of Transportation, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

763. A letter from the Secretary of Transportation, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend the act of September 7, 1950 (relating to the construction of a public airport in or near the District of Columbia), to authorize arrests for offenses committed on Federal lands acquired to provide access to the airport, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

764. A letter from the Secretary of Transportation, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend the act of October 9, 1940 (54 Stat. 1030), in order to increase the periods for which agreements for the operation of certain concessions may be granted at the Washington National Airport, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

765. A letter from the Director, Office of Science and Technology, Executive Office of the President, transmitting a report on the national atmospheric sciences program; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

766. A letter from the Executive Director, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting a report on the backlog of pending applications and hearing cases in the Federal Communications Commission as of March 31, 1969, pursuant to the provisions of section 5(e) of the Communications Act, as amended; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

767. A letter from the Administrator, National Aeronautics and Space Administration, transmitting a report listing certain information on contracts negotiated under 10 U.S.C. 2304(a) (11) and (16) during the

period July 1 through December 31, 1968, pursuant to the provisions of 10 U.S.C. 2304 (e); to the Committee on Science and Astronautics.

768. A letter from the Director, Bureau of the Budget, Executive Office of the President, transmitting a report on the operation of section 201(g) of the Revenue and Expenditure Control Act of 1968 on the number of civilian officers and employees in the executive branch of the Government for the quarter ended March 31, 1969, and for the period of the law's operation to that date, pursuant to the provisions of that act; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. CAHILL: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 3666. A bill to amend section 336(c) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (Rept. No. 91-215). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. RODINO: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 3667. A bill to amend section 312 of the Immigration and Nationality Act; with amendment (Rept. No. 91-216). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. COLMER: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 406. Resolution for consideration of S. 1011, an act to authorize appropriations for the saline water conversion program for fiscal year 1970, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 91-237). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. O'NEILL of Massachusetts: Committee on Rules. Resolution 407. Resolution for consideration of H.R. 4152, a bill to authorize appropriations for certain maritime programs of the Department of Commerce (Rept. No. 91-238). Referred to the House Calendar.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. DENNIS: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 1462. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Vita Cusumano (Rept. No. 91-217). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. CAHILL: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 1707. A bill for the relief of Miss Jailleh Farah Salameh El Ahwal; with amendment (Rept. No. 91-218). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. DOWDY: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 1948. A bill to confer U.S. citizenship posthumously upon Pfc. Joseph Anthony Snitko (Rept. No. 91-219). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. MESKILL: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 2208. A bill for the relief of James Hideaki Buck; with amendment (Rept. No. 91-220). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. DOWDY: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 2224. A bill for the relief of Franklin Jacinto Antonio; with amendment (Rept. No. 91-221). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. EILBERG: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 2536. A bill for the relief of Francesca Adriana Fatta (Millonzi); with amendment (Rept. No. 91-222). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. FEIGHAN: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 2890. A bill for the relief of Reuben Rosen (Rept. No. 91-223). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. RODINO: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 3165. A bill for the relief of Martin H. Loeffler (Rept. No. 91-224). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. EILBERG: Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 3166. A bill for the relief of Aleksandar Zambelli (Rept. No. 91-225). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. EILBERG: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 3167. A bill for the relief of Ryszard Stanislaw Obacz (Rept. No. 91-226). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. MESKILL: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 3172. A bill for the relief of Yolanda Fulgencia Hunter; with amendment (Rept. No. 91-227). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. DENNIS: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 3188. A bill for the relief of Cho Johnny; with amendment (Rept. No. 91-228). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. RODINO: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 3376. A bill for the relief of Maria da Conceicao Evaristo (Rept. No. 91-229). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. RODINO: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 3560. A bill for the relief of Harry Bush; with amendment (Rept. No. 91-230). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. DENNIS: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 5107. A bill for the relief of Miss Maria Mosko; with amendment (Rept. No. 91-231). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. RODINO: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 6389. A bill for the relief of Visitacion Enriquez Maypa; with amendment (Rept. No. 91-232). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. DOWDY: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 9979. A bill for the relief of Choi Sung Joo; with amendment (Rept. No. 91-233). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. FEIGHAN: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 256. An act to confer U.S. citizenship posthumously upon Lance Cpl. Theodore Daniel Van Staveren (Rept. No. 91-234). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. FEIGHAN: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 537. An act for the relief of Noriko Susan Duke (Nakano) (Rept. No. 91-235). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. FEIGHAN: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 648. An act for the relief of Ernesto Alunday (Rept. No. 91-236). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ADAMS (for himself, Mr. DIGGS, Mr. FRASER, Mr. HUNGATE, Mr. JACOBS, and Mr. KYROS):

H.R. 11170. A bill to establish a Commission on Government for the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. ANNUNZIO:

H.R. 11171. A bill to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BELL of California:

H.R. 11172. A bill to authorize the appropriation of additional funds necessary for acquisition of land at the Point Reyes National Seashore in California; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. BIAGGI:

H.R. 11173. A bill providing for the issuance of a special postage stamp in honor of, and as a tribute to, the courageous men who served on the U.S.S. *Pueblo*; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H.R. 11174. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to make extensive reforms in the income tax law, with emphasis on reforms which will be of particular benefit to middle- and low-income individuals

and families; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 11175. A bill to permit the States and District of Columbia to deny welfare assistance to persons who have not resided within the State or District from which they seek assistance for at least 1 year preceding their application for assistance; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 11176. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to provide payment for optometrists' services under the program of supplementary medical insurance benefits for the aged; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 11177. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to provide payment for chiropractors' services under the program of supplementary medical insurance benefits for the aged; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BINGHAM:

H.R. 11178. A bill to amend chapter 89 of title 5, United States Code, relating to enrollment charges for Federal employees' health benefits; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H.R. 11179. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide a basic \$5,000 exemption from income tax for amounts received as annuities, pensions, or other retirement benefits; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 11180. A bill to permit officers and employees of the Federal Government to elect coverage under the old-age, survivors, and disability insurance system; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BRASCO:

H.R. 11181. A bill to establish the Federal Medical Evaluations Board to carry out the functions, powers, and duties of the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare relating to the regulation of biological products, medical devices, and drugs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. BURKE of Massachusetts:

H.R. 11182. A bill to promote health and safety in the building trades and construction industry in all Federal and federally financed or federally assisted construction projects; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. CELLER:

H.R. 11183. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act so as to liberalize the conditions governing eligibility of blind persons to receive disability insurance benefits thereunder; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. COLLIER:

H.R. 11184. A bill to adjust the postal revenues and to afford protection to the public from offensive intrusion into their homes through the postal service of sexually oriented mail matter, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H.R. 11185. A bill to allow a deduction for income tax purposes of certain expenses incurred by the taxpayer for the education of a dependent; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CORMAN:

H.R. 11186. A bill to authorize appropriations for the Civil Rights Commission; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 11187. A bill to reclassify certain positions in the postal field service, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. DELANEY:

H.R. 11188. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act so as to liberalize the conditions governing eligibility of blind persons to receive disability insurance benefits thereunder; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. EDWARDS of California:

H.R. 11189. A bill to increase the availability of guaranteed home loan financing for

veterans and to increase the income of the national service life insurance fund; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. ESCH:

H.R. 11190. A bill to establish a National Economic Conversion Commission, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. FALLON:

H.R. 11191. A bill to provide for the more efficient development and improved management of national forest commercial timberlands, to establish a high-timber-yield fund, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. FOLEY:

H.R. 11192. A bill to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to make indemnity payments to certain beekeepers; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. FUQUA (for himself, Mr. NELSEN, Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia, Mr. HAGAN, Mr. FRASER, Mr. HORTON, Mr. ADAMS, Mr. CABELL, Mr. GUDE, and Mr. HOGAN):

H.R. 11193. A bill to authorize a Federal contribution for the effectuation of a transit development program for the National Capital region, and to further the objectives of the National Capital Transportation Act of 1965 (79 Stat. 663) and Public Law 89-774 (80 Stat. 1324); to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. GIBBONS:

H.R. 11194. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to provide under the retirement test a substantial increase in the amount of outside income permitted without loss of benefits, but with a requirement that income of all types and from all sources be included in determining the amount of an individual's income for purposes of such test; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GONZALEZ:

H.R. 11195. A bill to enable citizens of the United States who change their residence to vote in presidential elections, and for other purposes; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. HALPERN:

H.R. 11196. A bill to promote health and safety in the building trades and construction industry in all Federal and federally financed or federally assisted construction projects; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H.R. 11197. A bill to amend the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act to include a definition of food supplements, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. HAMMERSCHMIDT:

H.R. 11198. A bill to amend chapter 73 of title 38, United States Code, to make a career in the Department of Medicine and Surgery more attractive, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. JACOBS:

H.R. 11199. A bill to amend the Federal Aviation Act of 1958 in order to establish certain requirements with respect to air traffic controllers; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mrs. MINK:

H.R. 11200. A bill to amend the Agricultural Marketing Agreement Act of 1937 to authorize marketing agreements providing for the advertising of Hawaiian papayas; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. MIZE:

H.R. 11201. A bill to amend title 5, United States Code, to authorize consolidation of Federal assistance programs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. MOLLOHAN:

H.R. 11202. A bill to amend the Federal Meat Inspection Act to require that imported meat and meat food products made in whole or in part of imported meat be labeled "Im-

ported" at all stages of distribution until delivery to the ultimate consumer; to the Committee on Agriculture.

H.R. 11203. A bill to provide for improved employee-management relations in the postal service, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H.R. 11204. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide the same tax exemption for servicemen in and around Korea as is presently provided for those in Vietnam; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 11205. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act so as to liberalize the conditions governing eligibility of blind persons to receive disability insurance benefits thereunder; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MORGAN:

H.R. 11206. A bill to increase the increase limitations governing payment of pensions under the Veterans' Pension Act of 1959; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. MORSE:

H.R. 11207. A bill to authorize the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development to make loans for the provision of urgently needed nursing homes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H.R. 11208. A bill to amend title I of the Housing Act of 1949 to authorize loans to assist older persons who have been displaced from their homes by urban renewal projects to purchase comparable homes, free of additional debt; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H.R. 11209. A bill to prohibit arbitrary discrimination in employment on account of age, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. MOSS:

H.R. 11210. A bill to amend titles 10 and 37, United States Code, to provide equality of treatment for married female members of the uniformed services; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H.R. 11211. A bill to amend the Civil Rights Act of 1957 to extend the duties of the Civil Rights Commission; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 11212. A bill to provide equality of treatment for married women employees of the Federal Government, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H.R. 11213. A bill to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act to provide equality of treatment with respect to widows and widowers of certain employees who die in service; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H.R. 11214. A bill to amend title 38 of the United States Code to provide equality of treatment for married female veterans; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. NELSEN (for himself, Mr. GERALD R. FORD, Mr. SPRINGER, Mr. O'KONSKI, Mr. HARSHA, Mr. HORTON, Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia, Mr. WINN, Mr. GUDE, Mr. STEIGER of Arizona, Mrs. MAY, and Mr. HOGAN):

H.R. 11215. A bill to establish a Commission on Government for the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. NELSEN (for himself, Mr. GERALD R. FORD, Mr. SPRINGER, Mr. O'KONSKI, Mr. HARSHA, Mr. HORTON, Mr. WINN, Mr. GUDE, Mr. STEIGER of Arizona, Mrs. MAY, Mr. HOGAN, and Mr. QUJE):

H.R. 11216. A bill to establish, in the House of Representatives, the office of Delegate from the District of Columbia, to amend the District of Columbia Election Act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. PATTEN:

H.R. 11217. A bill to amend title II of the

Social Security Act to provide disability insurance benefits thereunder for any individual who is blind and has at least six quarters of coverage, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. REUSS:

H.R. 11218. A bill to amend part B of title XVIII of the Social Security Act to include drugs requiring a doctor's prescription among the medical expenses with respect to which payment may be made under the program of supplementary medical insurance benefits for the aged; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. RHODES:

H.R. 11219. A bill to change the definition of ammunition for purposes of chapter 44 of title 18 of the United States Code; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 11220. A bill to afford protection to the public from offensive intrusion into their homes through the postal service of sexually oriented mail matter, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. ROTH:

H.R. 11221. A bill to deny tax-exempt status to private foundations and organizations engaging in improper transactions with certain Government officials and former Government officials, and impose an income tax of 100 percent on income received by such officials and former officials from such foundations and organizations; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SCHWENGEL:

H.R. 11222. A bill to authorize the Secretary of Commerce to conduct research and development programs to increase knowledge of tornadoes, squall lines, and other severe local storms, for prediction and advance warning, and to provide for the establishment of a National Severe Storms Service; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. STAGGERS:

H.R. 11223. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to extend for 3 years the programs of assistance for medical libraries; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. STEIGER of Arizona:

H.R. 11224. A bill to amend title 13, United States Code, to increase the penalties for wrongful disclosure of information by employees of the Bureau of the Census; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. TAFT:

H.R. 11225. A bill to provide Federal financial assistance to opportunities industrialization centers; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. UTT:

H.R. 11226. A bill to prohibit mineral leasing and geologic or geophysical surveys of certain submerged lands on the Outer Continental Shelf off the coast of California; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. UTT (for himself and Mr. BOB WILSON):

H.R. 11227. A bill providing an exemption to the Revenue and Expenditure Control Act of 1968; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. WALDIE:

H.R. 11228. A bill to provide for improved employee-management relations in the postal service, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. WINN:

H.R. 11229. A bill to authorize the Secretary of Commerce to conduct research and development programs to increase knowledge of tornadoes, squall lines, and other severe local storms, to develop methods for detecting storms for prediction and advance warning, and to provide for the establishment of a National Severe Storms Service; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. WYATT:

H.R. 11230. A bill to amend the Communications Act of 1934 to establish orderly procedures for the consideration of applications for renewal of broadcast licenses; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. ANNUNZIO:

H.J. Res. 715. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to equal rights for men and women; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FOLEY:

H.J. Res. 716. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to equal rights for men and women; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JACOBS:

H.J. Res. 717. Joint Resolution authorizing the President to proclaim the week of September 28, 1969, through October 4, 1969, as "National Adult-Youth Communications Week"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. VANIK:

H.J. Res. 718. Joint resolution to authorize the President to proclaim the first week of August of each year as "American Youth Week"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DONOHUE:

H. Con. Res. 250. Concurrent resolution relative to the orderly withdrawal of troops from South Vietnam; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. PATMAN:

H. Con. Res. 251. Concurrent resolution to require France to pay its World War I debt; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. PATTEN:

H. Con. Res. 252. Concurrent resolution, support of gerontology centers; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. WILLIAMS:

H. Con. Res. 253. Concurrent resolution, support of gerontology centers; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. PERKINS (for himself, Mr.

THOMPSON of New Jersey, Mr. DENT, Mr. PUCINSKI, Mr. DANIELS of New Jersey, Mr. BRADEMANS, Mr. O'HARA, Mr. CAREY, Mr. HAWKINS, Mr. WILLIAM D. FORD, Mr. HATHAWAY, Mrs. MINK, Mr. SCHEUER, Mr. MEEDS, Mr. BURTON of California, Mr. GAYDOS, Mr. STOKES, Mr. CLAY, and Mr. POWELL):

H. Res. 405. Resolution to express the sense of the House regarding the shutdown of Job Corps installations before congressional authorization and appropriation actions; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

163. By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of Washington, relative to restoration of funds to implement construction of a pilot plant to determine the engineering and financial feasibility of building two commercial plants to process bituminous coal from the State of Washington; to the Committee on Appropriations.

164. Also, memorial of the Senate of the State of Washington, relative to the closing of the Crispus Job Corps Center, Randle, Wash.; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

165. Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Hawaii, relative to automatic increases in annuities for retired civil service employees; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of the rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. COWGER:

H.R. 11231. A bill for the relief of Surjeet Singh Dhanjal; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GUBSER:

H.R. 11232. A bill for the relief of Michael R. Marino; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HALL:

H.R. 11233. A bill for the relief of Dr. Eligio C. Cruz; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. O'NEILL of Massachusetts:

H.R. 11234. A bill for the relief of Lino Veramessa; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

106. By Mr. MIZELL: Petition of the Board of Aldermen, city of Winston-Salem, N.C., opposing any Federal legislation which would deny or limit tax exemption of municipal bonds; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

107. By the SPEAKER: Petition of County Council, county of Hawaii, State of Hawaii, relative to the antiballistic-missile system; to the Committee on Armed Services.

108. Also, petition of Antonio Escalera, Santurce, P.R., relative to redress of grievances; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

109. Also, petition of Edward Vieira, Jacksonville, Fla., relative to a memorial of the Legislature of the State of Florida; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

ACCELERATED PROGRAM FOR REBUILDING RIOT DAMAGED AREAS

HON. HOWARD H. BAKER, JR.

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, May 13, 1969

Mr. BAKER. Mr. President, it has come to my attention that a spokesman for the Nation's timber and forest products industry has spoken out in strong support of President Nixon's accelerated program for rebuilding areas of our major cities damaged by riots in recent years.

During the past few years we have all become increasingly aware that the major domestic problems confronting this Nation cannot be solved by Government action alone. The vigorous support of all elements of the private sector are essential to an effective attack on those problems. I am delighted to see this evidence of vigorous involvement on the part of timber-related industries.

I ask unanimous consent that an April 9 release reporting the remarks of Mr. R. R. Edgar be printed in the Extensions of Remarks.

There being no objection, the remarks were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

REMARKS OF R. R. EDGAR

WASHINGTON, D.C., April 9.—A spokesman for the Nation's timber and forest products industry today gave strong support to Pres-

ident Nixon's order for Federal assistance in rebuilding riot-damaged areas of 20 major American cities.

Speaking for the Forest Industries Council—FIC—R. R. Edgar said—

"The Forest Industries Council strongly supports the statement by the President of the United States in which he placed a new emphasis on rebuilding the scarred neighborhoods of our major cities. President Nixon has forcefully reminded the Nation of its responsibilities to provide all citizens with decent shelter and environment. The Forest Industries Council, composed of the four major national timber and forest products associations, believes in allocating our energies and resources so that our fellow Americans who are in most need gain our first attention. The council will do whatever is appropriate in this great effort. We are alerting all our member companies at the local and regional levels to heed President Nixon's call of concern."

The FIC is a coordinating committee representing four major national associations—the National Forest Products Association, the American Paper Institute, the American Pulpwood Association, and the American Forest Institute.

In recent weeks Mr. Edgar and other industry representatives in testimony before House and Senate committees urged an increase in the availability of federally-owned timber and long range programs that would assure adequate continued support for Federal and State forest services.

Mr. Edgar, president of the American Pulpwood Association and vice president of Bowaters U.S. Corp., Calhoun, Tenn., said the FIC is vitally concerned with all proposals that aid the country in meeting its housing goals.

GRAND MASTER WILLIAM F. BOOTH

HON. ROBERT N. GIAIMO

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 13, 1969

Mr. GIAIMO. Mr. Speaker, I am proud to report that William F. Booth, a native son of New Haven, Conn., has been installed as Grand Master of the Grand Lodge of Masons in the State of Connecticut.

Affectionately known as "Billy," Mr. Booth is the brother of legendary Yale football star Albie Booth, but this fact has not dimmed the luster of his own accomplishments. As a fitting tribute to the dedication and sacrifice this man has shown in his 40 years as a Mason, I should like to include his biography, as printed in the May 1969 issue of Connecticut Square and Compasses, in the RECORD at this point.

The article is as follows:

HOW PROUDLY WE HAIL

Every community has a handful of people it treasures—people who have done more than make their own way. There are people who have been unafraid to cut through to the core of a problem and then do something about it. There are people who have cherished their Masonic heritage and have borne it to others as a gift.

It is not necessary to write a book to introduce Most Worshipful Grand Master, William F. Booth, to the people of Connecti-