

## HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES—Wednesday, January 21, 1970

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

*I will lift up mine eyes unto the hills from whence cometh my help.—Psalm 121: 1.*

O Lord, our God, take our impatient spirits into Thy patient hands and breathe into them the power and the peace of Thy presence. Lift us above the clamor which is about us and the confusion which is around us and lead us to the high hills from whence cometh our help for the present and our hope for the future. O spirit of the living God make Thyself real to us as we pray.

Unto Thy loving care we commit our Nation. Make us worthy of the sacrifices which established on these shores a free people. Save us from the folly of our own foolishness and by sterling character, strong integrity, and steadfast faith may our Nation become a real blessing to the nations of the world.

In the spirit of Christ we pray. Amen.

### THE JOURNAL

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

### ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER

The SPEAKER. The Chair would like to make an announcement.

On January 3, 1969, the House adopted an amendment to rule XV, clause 1, that eliminated the necessity for Members to "qualify" on a yea-and-nay vote. Since that time several Members have asked the Chair if it would be possible to make a signal system distinction between a yea-and-nay vote—either a constitutional vote or a vote under clause 4, rule XV—and a call of the House.

The Chair has given careful consideration and study to the matter and has reached the conclusion that the change would be of benefit to the Members. Accordingly, starting today, the Chair has directed that on all recorded votes the bells will be rung twice. On quorum calls, either in the House or in Committee of the Whole, the bells will be rung three times.

For the convenience of Members the Chair will insert in the RECORD at this point a revised schedule of the signal system:

#### HOUSE LEGISLATIVE ELECTRIC BELL AND LIGHT SIGNALS

Tellers: 1 ring and light on left.

Yeas and Nays (either when ordered by one-fifth of those present or under Rule XV, cl 4): 2 rings and lights on left.

Call of House; No quorum in Committee of the Whole: 3 rings and lights on left.

Adjournment: 4 rings and lights on left.

Recess: 5 rings and lights on left.

Civil Defense Warning: 6 rings and lights on left.

(The light on the far right—7—indicates that the House is in session.)

### THE PUBLIC'S RIGHT TO BE HEARD ON AIR POLLUTION

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

Mr. KOCH. Mr. Speaker, I am introducing a bill today to provide for public hearings in the formulation of implementation plans for air pollution abatement. Currently, States throughout the country are devising such regulations for the control of sulfur and particulate matter; but, they are doing so without the benefit of public hearings.

In the near future the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare will issue criteria and control methods for carbon monoxide, hydrocarbons, and photochemical oxidant and the States will start a 460-day process of devising air quality standards and then implementation plans.

Under the Air Quality Act of 1967 public hearings are required before a State can submit its schedule of air quality standards to the Federal Government; and yet, no hearings are required during the second stage when implementation plans are devised.

I believe it is essential that there be some "public input" in this planning stage and so I propose to make a very simple change in the Clean Air Act of 1967 which would require that the public have an opportunity to be heard through public hearings before a State adopts a plan for the implementation, maintenance, and enforcement of air quality standards.

Indeed the implementation of regulations is the most important aspect of a pollution control program; it is the enforcement of the standards which will determine whether or not the standards are merely illusory, and whether or not we have clean air.

Too often States seem to be more sensitive to industrial and commercial interests than to protecting the public. Consequently air quality is compromised and the public continues to pay for pollution with their health and tax dollars. The cost of air pollution for Metropolitan New York in terms of maintenance and cleanup is an estimated \$1 billion a year, or \$70 per person, and, of course, it is incalculable in terms of injuries to the health of the very young and very old.

In addition to introducing my bill, I am writing to Gov. Nelson Rockefeller of New York today urging that he direct New York to take the lead and voluntarily go ahead with public hearings now before submitting its implementation plan for the control of sulfur and particulate matter to the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare on May 7. I hope that other States will do likewise.

### A TRIP TO CANADA

(Mr. KOCH asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute, and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. KOCH. Mr. Speaker, having been told by parents in my district of the growing exodus of draft-age Americans to Canada, I went to Canada on December 29 to see for myself and talk with some of the estimated 50,000 young Americans who have emigrated to that country primarily to avoid the draft and military service. Upon my return I issued a statement setting forth my observations and conclusions and I will append that statement with the thought it will be of interest to my colleagues.

As a result of that statement, I have received an enormous amount of mail, much of it critical, and it comes from all parts of the country. Those critical letters which attempt to enter into a rational dialog with me, as opposed to the obscenities that all of us at some time or other receive on controversial issues, make it clear that they find it repugnant to deal with the problem presented by these exiles in Canada while our young men are still drafted and are sent to Vietnam to fight and sometimes to die. I understand that feeling and so in responding to those writers, I state that our primary goal at this time must be to stem the flow of young men leaving the country. That can be done if we immediately terminate the draft. Pending its termination, we should provide that no draftee will be sent to Vietnam without his consent and add to the existing draft regulations the status of selective conscientious objector. One receiving such a classification would be required to perform noncombatant service in the Armed Forces or an acceptable form of alternative civilian service as that now performed by traditional conscientious objectors.

I also tell them that obviously there will not be an amnesty offered to those now in exile as long as the war in Vietnam continues. However, it is important to open up the discussion of that matter so that we can now begin to think of the options which should be made available to those young men.

To my colleagues I would like to say this is a most difficult problem but one which we must face and my major goal here in Congress with respect to it is to begin a dialog which does not resort to the harsh rhetoric that makes it often impossible for good Americans to rationally discuss the consequences of the war still growing like a cancer in the American body politic. If some do not think we owe such concern to the young men of this country, can they not at least agree that such concern is owed to the parents of these young men.

Nothing takes the place of firsthand observation. And I therefore hope that other Members of Congress will go to Canada to observe the situation and re-

port back to this House their conclusions.

In addition to my original statement, I am also setting forth copies of some of the letters that I have received and a recent newspaper article by Mary McGrory. For the sake of their privacy, the names of the letterwriters have been omitted.

The material follows:

STATEMENT BY CONGRESSMAN EDWARD I. KOCH AT PRESS CONFERENCE JANUARY 1, REPORTING ON HIS TRIP TO TORONTO, OTTAWA, AND MONTREAL TO MEET WITH AMERICAN DRAFT-AGE MEN WHO HAVE EMIGRATED TO CANADA

Like it or not, it is time this country wakes up to the fact that there are at least 45,000 young Americans and as many as 60,000 who since 1965 have already emigrated to Canada and that thousands more are likely to follow.

With the cooperation of Clergy and Laymen Concerned About Vietnam, I traveled to Canada this week to meet with some of these young Americans and their Canadian hosts. They told me that I was the first U.S. Congressman to make a trip for this purpose. I visited Toronto, Ottawa, and Montreal to find out who these young people are, why they have emigrated, and how they are adjusting to the new life they have chosen.

We cannot lightly dismiss these Americans because they are draft resisters and deserters. For the most part they are sensitive and mature young people who emigrated from every section of the United States. They have been outraged by our prosecution of the Vietnam War; they have been victimized by the brutality of military training; and they have been alienated by what they see as intolerance and hypocrisy in American society.

I met with five members of the Canadian Parliament who are delighted that talented and educated young Americans have chosen to pursue their careers and raise their families in Canada. These same members were instrumental in getting the Canadian Government to liberalize its immigration policies last May, thereby opening the door to sincere, qualified Americans seeking landed immigrant status.

I talked with other Canadians who are eager to counsel, house and befriend these young people. It is apparent that their hospitality is of immense help during the initial period of adjustment. It quickly dispels the fears of persecution or hostility which the American emigres have been wrongly told awaits them.

Many of the young people I saw are deeply saddened by parents who have practically disowned them, while others are greatly strengthened by parents who have stood by them. In either case, they regret they can no longer visit their families in the U.S.

America has always welcomed immigrants from abroad who have fled religious and political persecution and paradoxically given sanctuary to Germans and Russians fleeing from service in the armies of the Kaiser and the Czar. Now ironically America drives out its own young men and women of conscience—it is a shame and a disgrace.

Those Americans who shout "America—love it or leave it," miss the point. The young Americans in Canada that I met nourish no hatred for their country. Neither are they cowards—some of them indeed have fought in Vietnam. What they do feel is that America has deserted them by forsaking its own heritage and ideals.

Strangely, they are not as concerned with eventual amnesty as I am. It is possible that many given the option will never come back. Yet amnesty surely should be considered and discussed by Americans—for our sakes as well as theirs—for what the Vietnam War has done to these young men and what it has forced them to do. In our own civil

war where men in the South took up arms against their own country, amnesty was offered even before that struggle was concluded. We should do no less for these young men today who in their own minds at least, have fought in their own way for this country by refusing to take up arms and kill in a war which they feel is not in the defense of our country and which sullies our country's good name.

We must now undertake to do what we can to provide the options to these young men to return to this country. They should be welcomed back neither as heroes nor as criminals, but as young men who are doing their best to uphold the finest traditions of this country.

We must redouble our efforts to end the Vietnam War, to abolish the draft, and to insure the civil liberties of men in uniform. Most important, we must never abandon the goal of a free and just society.

I hope that other Congressmen and concerned citizens will make the trip I made and meet the young Americans I met. It is an education and far better than cursing or trying to ignore this historic and tragic exodus.

[From the New York Post, Jan. 16, 1970]

DRAFT'S FOES ON THE ATTACK  
(By Mary McGrory)

WASHINGTON.—Almost two years ago, at the height of the New Hampshire primary, Sen. McCarthy suggested draft reforms to provide for selective conscientious objection to the Vietnam war.

Sen. McIntyre (D-N.H.), a leader of the pro-Johnson forces, promptly accused him of "wanting to honor draft dodgers and deserters."

Since then, the cause of selective conscientious objection has made little progress. The government has prosecuted draft resisters at the rate of 300 a month, and sentences upon conviction have averaged 41 months. Thousands of draft-age Americans have fled to Canada, Sweden and France.

Some appeals courts decisions have made exceptions. In Boston a judge ruled that "ethical" objections have religious force, and recently in San Francisco a judge decided in favor of a Roman Catholic objector who claimed that his religious beliefs excused him from fighting in what he regarded as an "unjust war."

The Administration has shown no signs of relenting in punishing draft resisters, and Vice President Spiro T. Agnew excoriated them in a November speech.

"Amnesty" is still a fighting word as applied to self-exiled draft evaders, as Rep. Koch (D-Man.), discovered when returning from a year-end study trip to Canada he defended the fugitives as "not drop-outs, cop-outs or hippies, but first-rate young men."

He received a flood of abusive mail from his own and other states. A typical letter said: "Instead of trying to get the traitors and the cowards who fled to Canada to return, why don't you go and join them."

Koch visited draft-resistance centers in three Canadian cities—Toronto, Ottawa and Montreal—and talked with fugitives who, he said, "were for the most part sensitive and mature young people, who have been outraged by our prosecution of the Vietnam war . . . victimized by the brutality of military . . . and alienated by what they see as intolerance and hypocrisy in American society."

Koch was told there are approximately 50,000 young Americans who have either settled permanently in Canada or are waiting for the end of the war. He was told by Canadian Members of Parliament that the Canadian government, which welcomes them, expects another 150,000 draft-age emigrants

to seek shelter there until the end of the war or the draft.

He is going to try to persuade Congressmen from both parties to join him in other trips across the border, so that they can judge for themselves the quality of the refugees, some of whom deserted their service after fighting in Vietnam.

He hopes also to open a "rational dialogue" on the subject of amnesty, which he would offer in the form of "options." He has discovered that the most vehement objectors to amnesty are receptive to the idea of requiring the returnees do some alternative national service—for instance work in the ghettos.

Koch has a bill in Congress, providing for selective conscientious objection for past and present draft-eligibles. Rep. Ryan, another New York Democrat, has a bill providing that no draftee be sent to Vietnam without his consent. Either change could be made by executive order.

The Americans for Democratic Action, of which such things are expected, urged in its 1970 legislative proposals released yesterday that Congress grant amnesty "to those who conscientiously object to the Vietnam war."

The most prominent selective conscientious objector on the East Coast, David Hawk, a leader of the Vietnam Moratorium this week received word that government prosecutors have asked for an indefinite delay in the trial he was scheduled to undergo Jan. 26 in Scranton, Pa.

Reason cited was a U.S. 3d Circuit Court of Appeals decision in Pennsylvania striking down the "punitive reclassification of draftees who burned or turned in their draft cards."

Hawk's prominence as an antiwar leader, his exceptional looks and his record—he was an All-American diver at Cornell and a student at the Union Theological Seminary—would have made him a particularly sticky defendant and could conceivably touch off new agitations among the young, who have become morose in the wake of President Nixon's success in rallying the "silent majority" against peace demonstrations.

PLAINVIEW, N.Y.,  
January 1, 1970.

Representative EDWARD KOCH,  
House of Representatives,  
Washington, D.C.

SIR: For the good of our country you should re-examine your conscience.

When you ask for amnesty for draft dodgers who, in my opinion are cowards, you encourage people to thumb noses at the law. When you were sworn in, you promised to uphold the Constitution of the United States. How in hell can you reconcile your present bleeding-heart position with the oath you took?

You are aware, of course, that more than 40,000 young Americans gave their lives because our country called them to arms. I am sure all these young men wanted to live long useful lives—and they might have had they chosen to turn tail and head for Canada. But, that is anarchy when you flout the law. These men put love of country and duty above love of themselves, knowing full well what the risk would be.

Those who fled to Canada know there are penalties for disobeying a law—that is why they have scurried away over the border. They are afraid to face the consequences either in uniform or in the courts.

Can you imagine how the families of our dead servicemen must feel when they hear a man in your position pat draft dodgers on the head with a plea to return home "because we need them."

Like hell we do.

I am so happy you do not represent my district.

Plainview, L.I., N.Y.

TORONTO, ONTARIO, CANADA,  
January 3, 1970.

Representative EDWARD KOCH,  
House of Representatives,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: I read the article in The Toronto "Globe and Mail" about your views on amnesty and the war.

We are Americans living in Canada for business reasons. We would like to see the American boys here permitted to return to their families and country, as free as the Canadian boys who can live, go to school, marry and raise their families in peace.

Keep working on your fine convictions. We need more people to feel as you do.

U.S. ARMY TRAINING CENTER,  
Fort Dix, N.J., January 1, 1970.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN: I have just viewed the evening television news and am elated to have seen an interview in which you put forth your views on the young men who have fled to Canada to avoid fighting in a truly immoral war. At long last someone of the legislative elite has seen fit to firsthand study this problem of conscience and moral conflict and further to intelligently propose a just (and, in fact, the only) solution. It is apparent that these emigrants had no alternative other than to follow the sagely advice of Albert Einstein who once said, "Never do anything against conscience, even if the state demands it."

As an American citizen, a member on active duty in the armed forces, and as an individual who heavily weighed all the alternatives to conscription, I wholeheartedly agree with your proposal and will, in turn, write to my own Congressman in an effort to solicit his support.

If I can in any way aid you in your fight for political amnesty, please feel free to contact me.

Thanking you for your concern, I remain, very truly yours.

CARLSTADT, N.J.,  
January 5, 1970.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE KOCH: I just cannot believe it. It just seems too ridiculous to be true, that you, a representative of the people could even think of giving amnesty to the draft dodgers and deserters who have turned their back on America and fled to Canada. They say that they do not believe in the whole American system. They are against the draft and the Viet Nam War. In fact, it is hard to determine if they are in favor of anything.

I would like to remind you of something. There are a lot of boys who would rather not be in the service, but they went when called. There are a lot of boys who do not want to die in Viet Nam, but they are dying there just the same, and many are coming back crippled for life. Now when you talk of the cream of our youth, or the boys who hold up to the finest traditions of patriotism, how the hell can you think about cowards and scum, the yellow bellies who went so far as to flee the country to Canada? Bear in mind that they do not even pay your salary so how is it they get the attention and concern of an elected official. If these idiots are having such a hard time in Canada then it's their own fault. Maybe they might discover what the value of a U.S. citizenship is, and realize that a few years of military service is not a bad price to pay for it. Can't you realize that your actions and public statements concerning these cowards tend to encourage more boys to flee responsibilities, and demoralize those that must stay and await the draft and those who are already serving. You also tend to get Veterans like myself good and mad.

BRONX, N.Y.,  
January 5, 1970.

Representative EDWARD I. KOCH,  
New York, N.Y.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE KOCH: How wonderful to hear and know that you are one of the interested government officials who really understand our American boys who have fled to Canada.

It is a shame that these good American boys who do not believe in killing should be forced to leave the land of their birth and families who love them all for doing what they feel is the right thing.

The best of good luck to you Rep. Koch in this endeavor. You certainly are a representative of the American people to bring the position of these boys to light.

BERGENFIELD, N.J.,  
January 4, 1970.

DEAR MR. KOCH: As a young American, I was very pleased to read of your efforts to grant amnesty to those Americans who have left the country because of their moral commitments. President Lincoln knew the value of educated and principled men to the success of a young country. He knew that despite the face that huge numbers of men actually tried to destroy the union, it would be most sensible to ask them back and have them use their strengths and abilities for America.

I will not point out my reasons for opposing the Vietnam War, but merely thank you for being open-minded enough to see the injustices of it. May your work for the real good of the nation be successful, and may you influence your constituents similarly.

SEA CLIFF, N.Y.,  
January 6, 1970.

HON. EDWARD I. KOCH,  
House Office Building,  
Washington, D.C.

SIR: I seldom write letters of this type. I have an American flag, but never wave it wildly about. I am not a member of a veterans organization, but did serve my country for five and one half years during World War II. I have fathered two sons who have both met their service obligations. I am not one to look for a Communist behind every tree, but sincerely believe there are still some about. You surely must have given them reason to rejoice when you advocated compassion and amnesty to our draft dodgers New Year's Day, on Channel 5 TV.

It is a matter of great concern to me that you, a lawmaker, would take such a position favorable to lawbreakers, rather than to devote your efforts to changing or remaking the laws. In my book, anyone who does not have the guts to stand up and fight for his country, does not deserve to be its citizen. These traitors belong beyond our borders. I fervently hope that in the future, you and all our representatives will speak out to strengthen rather than weaken our country.

UTICA, N.Y.,  
January 6, 1970.

DEAR SIR: In the New York Daily News of Jan. 5 there was a news item concerning your visit to Canada.

My son, ———, is classified as a deserter from the U.S. Navy. I have no knowledge of his whereabouts. The last time I saw him was Nov. 11, 1969 when he was on liberty. He left our home in Utica, New York presumably to return to Portsmouth, Va. He never arrived there.

Since there is a Greyhound Bus leaving Utica for Toronto, Canada, I am tempted to believe he could be in Toronto.

According to the Naval officials he had an excellent record, and did not seem dis-

contented to me. I am very anxious to locate him and will follow any lead.

Have you information as to location or addresses in Canada of organizations or people that would have contact with the American deserters?

Any help you can offer would be deeply appreciated. I might possibly be able to make a trip to Toronto next week.

HAMBURG, N.Y.,  
January 7, 1970.

Representative E. I. KOCH,  
House Office Building,  
Washington, D.C.

MY DEAR SIR: You have been quoted as saying, in reference to the deserters in Canada, that "They should be welcomed back neither as heroes nor as criminals, but as young men who are doing their best to uphold the finest traditions of this country." Now let me ask you this. Those men who didn't desert their country but are now in Vietnam, are they "upholding the finest traditions of their country?"

You are also quoted as saying that there are at least 45,000 to 60,000 young Americans who have emigrated to Canada and that "thousands more are likely to follow." In that statement you are not sticking to the absolute truth. In fact, you are far afield from the truth. When these yellow-bellied cowards deserted this country they ceased to be Americans.

But I'm in favor of letting them return to the States. But I'm also in favor of slapping them into a stockade until there are enough to make it worthwhile to hang the punks at the rate of one an hour, on the hour. These cowardly deserters are something we can very well get along without. They would only pollute every thing they came into contact with.

My great grandfather, my grandfather and my father as well as myself and my two sons all went to war, not because we were in favor of it, but rather because we felt we could do no less. This is our country and as Stephen Decatur once said, "Our country, in her intercourse with other nations, may she always be right, but our country, right or wrong."

So why don't you stick to the job for which you are being paid and let these cowardly punks live in their own stink?

NEW HAVEN, CONN.,  
January 10, 1970.

HON. EDWARD KOCH,  
House of Representatives,  
Washington, D.C.

SIR: I am writing this letter in regard to the enclosed article appearing in the New York Post a few days ago. I believe that your calling for amnesty for draft dodgers is a slap in the face to every decent American and a stab in the back to all our servicemen and veterans who have decided to face up to the responsibilities of citizenship.

Whether or not one supports the United States' policy in Vietnam, everyone is "victimized" by our draft system. Though you suggest amnesty only after the draft is abolished, even then it would be a travesty of justice, as you are, in effect, penalizing those who, faced with the same alternatives as the evaders, choose the lawful one. You also seem to forget that these exiles have broken the law. As you either ignore or belittle this fact, you will only serve to encourage more young men to choose the unlawful course.

All this is made worse because, as my Congressman, you are in a position of responsibility, a quality you have not shown in your statements and actions. Rather than waste our hard earned money on a trip to visit these cowards whom you make appear as noble and American, I suggest you spend

your time and money, which I might add are paid for by those of us still in the country, on some program to benefit the G.I.'s. For example, the government could help those organizations and private citizens (see enclosed) who support our servicemen by enabling them to communicate with their families.

Such constructive measures will benefit our country; something we should all be concerned with in this time of turmoil. Until such time as you rearrange your priorities to the benefit of your constituents, who are law abiding and also "uphold the finest traditions of this country", I not only can't support you, but also can't consider you my representative.

NEW YORK, N.Y.,  
January 11, 1970.

HON. EDWARD I. KOCH,  
Longworth Office Building,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR ED: We have your letter of the 9th enclosing a copy of your statement concerning the young men in Canada.

We feel it was most courageous of you to have issued the statement. Moreover, it was good to read that you urge others to open their eyes to this exodus. Being able to talk to these young people, and to learn their feelings about their country, should help others to realize what it is this war, and our present national aims, does to us.

If we consider that the exile that these people have imposed on themselves is similar to the political imprisonment that others have almost welcomed, we can see how much like non-democratic countries have become. We have been accustomed to reading about the "outs" in South American countries going into jail or into exile. It was accepted by us as a way of life in such areas of the world. How sad it is to see that it has become a way of life here too.

As you say, "most of all, we must never abandon the goal of a free and just society." Keep it up, Ed.

TORONTO, ONTARIO, CANADA,  
January 12, 1970.

HON. EDWARD KOCH,  
House of Representatives,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE KOCH: I wish to express my support of your proposed bill on the floor regarding amnesty. I am an American professional living in Canada as a draft evader. I am a resident here 3 months—my date of induction was for October 7, 1969.

I was formerly a teacher with a Master's Degree with "Teacher Corps" in the ghettos of South Side Chicago. I taught "slow learners" under the auspices of Title I, Department of HEW, in the Farmingdale Public Schools, Long Island. At this time I was being harassed by Local Board No. 3 of Manhattan because I was approaching the age of 26 and because Nixon was about to freeze the draft for the Nov. & Dec. dates preceding the new lottery. Accordingly Board No. 3 vindictively sent me my notice of induction.

At present I am employed as an educational researcher for a private marketing firm in Toronto. As to the question of whether America is losing its intelligentsia as a result of its blundering involuntary draft system—the answer is yes. You are correct in the statement that those who move up here with their families will settle here for the rest of their lives. Their loss of manpower should be made perfectly clear to the House of Representatives—in more mundane terms this is a "brain-drain" emigrating from the U.S.

Your bill for amnesty must be encouraged. No matter what happens, I am still an American citizen who wants to see his country and his family once again. The draft system was and still is barbaric. Intelligent

Americans should not be penalized for their convictions in this situation.

Thank you and good luck!

#### NEW TAX WITHHOLDING TABLES PROVIDE FOR EXCESSIVE WITHHOLDING

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

Mr. VANIK. Mr. Speaker, it has come to my attention that the new tax withholding tables for 1970 provide for excessive withholding for millions of taxpayers. As a result of these improper tax tables, many taxpayers have less take-home pay in spite of tax reduction, enacted by Congress.

I hope that these excessive withholdings are not a deliberate effort to increase Treasury receipts at the expense of needy families. Up to the present time, no satisfactory explanation has been offered as to why the full 5-percent surtax should be withheld during the first 6 months of 1970 instead of a 2½-percent withholding throughout the year.

I am advised that the excessive withholding is applicable to over 6.5 million American taxpayers. Whether it is designed to increase Treasury revenues for the remainder of fiscal 1970 or whether it is designed to prepare the taxpayers for a proposal to extend the 5-percent surtax throughout 1970, it is wrong and contrary to law.

I have requested the Treasury Department to immediately correct the withholding table to comply with Federal law. It is improper and irregular to withhold more than is due. The withholding tables must be reduced to reflect the January 1, 5-percent reduction in the surtax, the June 30, 1970, termination of the surtax, and the \$25 increase in personal exemptions.

Following is a letter on this subject which I directed yesterday to the Secretary of the Treasury, David Kennedy:

JANUARY 20, 1970.

HON. DAVID M. KENNEDY,  
Secretary of the Treasury,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: In a series of articles by Ray DeCrane, Business Editor of the Cleveland Press, one of which is enclosed herewith dated yesterday, January 19, 1970, attention is directed to excessive withholding tables on certain income groups.

I hope that these excessive withholdings are not a deliberate effort to increase Treasury receipts at the expense of needy families. Can your office provide any satisfactory explanation as to why the full 5% surtax should be withheld during the first six months of 1970 instead of providing a 2½% withholding throughout the year?

I am advised that the excessive withholding is applicable to over 6½ million taxpayers. Whether it is designed to increase Treasury revenues for the remainder of fiscal 1970 or whether it is designed to prepare the taxpayers for a proposal to extend the 5% surtax throughout 1970, there is no justification for excessive withholding.

I therefore request your department to immediately correct the withholding table to comply with federal law. It is improper and, I believe, irregular for withholding schedules to withhold more than is due. The withholding tables must be reduced to reflect the

January 1 five per cent reduction in the surtax, the June 30, 1970 termination of the surtax, and the \$25 increase in personal exemptions.

Sincerely yours,  
CHARLES A. VANIK,  
Member of Congress.

#### MARTIN LUTHER KING'S BIRTHDAY—JANUARY 15—SHOULD BE A NATIONAL HOLIDAY

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

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Speaker, the birthday of the Reverend Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr., January 15, was observed by official proclamations, the closing of schools and offices, and religious services throughout the country. It is appropriate that this day be commemorated in honor of a man who has left all Americans a legacy of justice, compassion, and human dignity. No man can deny Dr. King's greatness, nor disclaim him as his brother, without diminishing his own self. For, as Dr. King said:

All humanity is caught in an inescapable network of mutuality, tied in a single garment of destiny. All life is interrelated. To the degree that I harm my brother, to that extent I am harming myself.

Dr. King's path to greatness began when he dedicated his life to the struggle for freedom and dignity—a struggle which his death shows is yet unwon. Yet his path was never one of hatred, as evidenced by his words to white America:

We will match your capacity to inflict suffering with our capacity to endure suffering. We will meet your physical force with soul force. We will not hate you, but we cannot in all good conscience obey your unjust laws . . . (W)e will soon wear you down by our capacity to suffer. And in winning our freedom we will so appeal to your heart and conscience that we will win you in the process.

Consider the remarkable charity of this man who decried hatred, despite the evils inflicted upon black people which he described in the letter which he wrote from the Birmingham jail on April 16, 1963, to several Alabama clergymen who had urged black people in Birmingham to press their cause in the courts and not in the streets:

I guess it is easy for those who have never felt the stinging darts of segregation to say wait. But when you have seen vicious mobs lynch your mothers and fathers at will and drown your sisters and brothers at whim; when you have seen hate-filled policemen curse, kick, brutalize, and even kill your black brothers and sisters with impunity; . . . when you are humiliated day in and day out by nagging signs reading "white" men and "colored"; when your first name becomes "nigger" and your middle name become "boy" (however old you are) and your last name becomes "John," and when your wife and mother are never given the respected title "Mrs."; when you are harried by day and haunted by night by the fact that you are a Negro, living constantly at tiptoe stance never quite knowing what to expect next, and plagued with inner fears and outer resentments; when you are forever fighting a degenerating sense of "nobodiness"; then you will understand why we find it difficult to wait.

The evils which Martin Luther King, Jr., fought still exist. Segregation still exists. Employment opportunity is still denied to blacks and Spanish-speaking Americans and Indians. The Vietnam war continues to take the lives of Americans and Vietnamese and to divert our resources from the tasks which Martin Luther King set for himself, and for us all.

Meaningful school integration is still to be achieved. Figures released by the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare on January 4 all too dramatically attest to this: 76.6 percent of the 6,282,173 black elementary and secondary school students attend schools in which they make up more than half the population; 54.7 percent of the 2,002,776 Spanish-surnamed elementary and secondary school students attend schools in which they make up more than half the population; 38.3 percent of the 177,464 Indian elementary and secondary school students attend schools in which they make up more than half the population; 1,188,268 of the 1,363,254 black elementary and secondary school students in Alabama, Georgia, Louisiana, Mississippi, and South Carolina attend schools which are 99 to 100 percent black; 879,367 of the 1,817,615 black elementary and secondary school students in Illinois, Indiana, Michigan, New York, Ohio, and Pennsylvania attend schools which are 95 to 100 percent black.

The black man is still a second-class citizen—excluded from equal educational opportunity and equal employment opportunity.

But I am not going to recall Martin Luther King's birthday as a prologue to polemic. Rather, I would honor this man—who brought honor to his country and his people and himself through the greatness of his life, and I would recall the words he spoke:

For some strange reason I can never be what I ought to be until you are what you ought to be. And you can never be what you ought to be until I am what I ought to be. This is the way God's universe is made, this is the way it is structured.

Mr. Speaker, our able colleague, Congressman JOHN CONYERS, who has led our efforts to have January 15 declared a national holiday, has submitted H.R. 7703, which I and several of my colleagues have cosponsored. H.R. 7703, if enacted, would designate January 15 a legal public holiday. It is essential that this bill be passed.

By honoring Dr. King, we honor all the minority groups and individuals in this country who have struggled against prejudice and disadvantage. And by honoring him, we commit ourselves to his ideals—brotherhood, compassion, and concern for his fellow men.

#### LEGISLATION TO CURB ILLICIT TRAFFIC IN DANGEROUS DRUGS

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

Mr. VAN DEERLIN. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced two bills which I

believe would help the Government curb the illicit traffic in dangerous drugs.

One measure would require that prescription drugs be distinctively marked and the other would empower the Justice Department to regulate the export of amphetamines and barbiturates.

I was prompted to offer the labeling bill by reports I have received of the difficulties encountered by the Bureau of Narcotics and Dangerous Drugs in attempting to identify contraband tablets and capsules.

In the Bureau's testing and research laboratory, drugs of unknown origin are subjected to basically the same kind of ballistics tests as rifle bullets. I understand this method of identification works about 80 percent of the time, because the presses that stamp out tablets leave unique "signatures"—microscopic imprints that can come from only one press.

But, to be 100-percent effective, the Bureau would have to accumulate samples from every pill press, legitimate and clandestine, in the country, a practical impossibility. And capsules pose an even stiffer challenge to the Bureau's investigators, since they lack the minute markings left by punches and dies on all tablets.

Coded labels would facilitate identification and discourage counterfeiters seeking to capitalize on the reputations of legitimate drug manufacturers.

Besides facilitating identification, coded symbols on individual tablets and capsules would also tend to discourage counterfeiters from seeking to capitalize on the reputations of legitimate drug manufacturers.

Under the circumstances, the Bureau of Narcotics and Dangerous Drugs is performing its investigative functions extremely well. But existing law does not require that pills carry identifying markings, and my proposal, I feel, would close this gap by requiring that every tablet and capsule be clearly marked with symbols representing the identities of both the manufacturer and the drug itself.

Another benefit of a regulation of this sort would be quickly evident in medical emergencies caused by overdosage of drugs. In these situations, moments can be precious, if treatment is to be effective. Speedy identification of the drug that has been ingested can literally make the difference between life and death.

My second bill would give the Justice Department a new tool to control the export of amphetamines and barbiturates, by providing that these particular drugs could be shipped abroad only under conditions stipulated by the attorney general, who could and presumably would authorize exports for genuine medical and health purposes. The two categories of drugs covered by this measure account for at least 90 percent of the dangerous drug smuggling trade, and I have accordingly tried to apply an admittedly strong remedy to that area where the problem is most severe.

In combination, the two bills would not totally eliminate the illicit import traffic in dangerous drugs but they would certainly discourage it. Smugglers will keep trying, even if improved detection

methods are available to Federal authorities. And many of the drugs shipped or taken illegally into this country would be outside the purview of the new regulatory authority over exports which my second proposal would give the Justice Department, since many of the contraband tablets and capsules which eventually find their way to the United States are produced in foreign lands. But the bills would help, I think significantly, and I hope they or similar legislation can be considered at an early date in this session.

#### GULF COAST JUNIOR COLLEGE

(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, Panama City, Fla., has, among others, two institutions in which I take particular pride. One is the Panama City News-Herald, whose editor is Mr. Mike Darley and whose publisher is Mr. Lawrence S. Gibb. The other is the Gulf Coast Junior College. The News-Herald has published a most interesting commentary on Gulf Coast Junior College. It is well worth reading and I submit it for reprinting in the Record and with it a statement from the masthead of the News-Herald which also is well worth reading, from the issue of December 21, 1969:

#### PANAMA CITY NEWS-HERALD

This newspaper is dedicated to furnishing information to our readers so that they can better promote and preserve their own freedom and encourage others to see its blessings. Only when man is free to control himself and all he produces, can he develop to his utmost capabilities.

We believe that freedom is a gift from God and not a political grant from government. Freedom is neither license nor anarchy. It is self-control. No more. No less. It must be consistent with the truths expressed in such great moral guides as the Coveting Commandment, the Golden Rule and the Declaration of Independence.

#### THAT CRAZY GULF COAST!

Panama City's Gulf Coast Junior College just doesn't seem to be able to match up to several new vogues currently sweeping the collegiate world.

Gulf Coast students have not staged a single demonstration or riot, burned a building, kicked out the administration, trampled the American flag in the ground or burned the first draft card.

There's been no drug or sex scandals at Gulf Coast and it's even possible to tell the sexes apart on the campus. The boys look like boys and the girls are pretty, dainty, feminine little creatures who like being females.

Judging by current standards at many institutions of higher learning, there's some other strange things going on at Gulf Coast.

For example, Dr. Rick Morley, the president, and his faculty insist on running the college. Students are pretty much in charge of a great many of their activities, including student government, but all are subject to approval of college officials.

These GCJC students really are a strange crowd. A survey was conducted the other day and it showed that a great majority of the students have respect for law and order, and even respect law enforcement officers and consider them to be on their side.

The greatest surprise of all is the "crazy"

attitude of these Gulf Coast students. It seems that the vast majority of them actually are attending college to get an education! Imagine this, if you can.

Why there are reports that just about all of these students think quite highly of the Establishment and intend to carve a niche in it for themselves. We have not heard of a single one of them plotting a revolution to destroy the system.

They're crazy, man, crazy, that Gulf Coast crowd!

One college official tells us that GCJC students are so interested in obtaining an education that the college has trouble getting them to participate in extracurricular activities. This is a downright insult to such "great" centers of learning as the University of California at Berkeley, San Francisco City College, Columbia and our own University of Florida, which also has been pretty much taken over by the "new breed."

This guy Morley is really a throwback to the "modern" presidents of a great many of our "progressive" universities. He's absolutely archaic in his thinking. Dr. Morley is so "behind the times" that he insists on running his college, calling all the shots . . . refereeing the ball game, dad. And if you don't like it, Buster, he'll put you on the road.

Well, the "progressive educators" wouldn't give Morley much of a grade as a college president in the first place. You see, he worked his way through college with his hands, mostly as a printer's devil, and this kinda disqualifies him for ever being a real egghead educator. It's doubtful if Dr. Karl Marx would have Morley on his faculty in any capacity. Morley is a believer in the dirty old capitalistic, free enterprise system and even goes around bragging about it.

Jumping Josef Stalins, what's this educational world coming to anyhow!

There are some other "weirdos" in positions of high responsibility at Gulf Coast Junior College.

Take George Tapper of Port St. Joe, chairman of the college's board of trustees. He's the son of a fisherman, a World War II flying hero, former state senator and self-made multimillionaire.

The other trustees also are a bunch of hard-headed businessmen and professionals. They include Ed Bandjough of Wewahitchka, a weekly newspaper publisher and city commissioner; Dr. Bob King, Port St. Joe dentist; Ellis Fowhand, Panama City businessman; Dr. Bill Carter, local physician; Bill Welliver, Panama City banker-businessman; Dayton Logue, Panama City lawyer and staunch Republican; and T. Woodie Smith, local funeral home owner.

Then there's Whitey Urquhart, the college's attorney and one of its original trustees. Born in abject poverty, he is one of the city's leading attorneys and businessmen. What kind of system is this that catapults a man from a peon to the top of the ladder?

What a bunch to have running a college! They've spent the tax-payers' money so wisely on class-rooms and real education facilities that Gulf Coast will not share in the State's construction fund bonanza for the next couple of years. This money will go to colleges which went in for frills and now need class-rooms.

Now, seriously speaking, and we mean very seriously, Gulf Coast Junior College is truly a great asset to Bay and Gulf Counties, the two areas it primarily serves.

We are extremely proud of Gulf Coast and the tremendous contribution it has made to our area. We're grateful for educational leaders like Dr. Morley and his outstanding faculty. We're deeply appreciative of the hard work the trustees have done to make the college what it is, and are cognizant of the fact that they've never received any reward for their efforts other than the satisfaction of knowing they have done a good job, which is enough.

Lastly, and of most importance to us, we want to let the thousands of Gulf Coast students, both past and present, know that the community is very, very proud of these fine, decent young citizens and the records they have established.

The record will show that the college has turned out thousands of out-standing students since its doors opened 12 years ago, and a great many of them have become outstanding leaders in the community. The record also will reflect that those who went on to higher institutions of learning have been above average students.

Gulf Coast opened in 1957 with a mere handful of students and it now has over 2,000 fulltime students enrolled. The school serves nearly 6,000 persons in one capacity or another during any given 12-month period and will offer courses in almost anything if community need justifies it.

Yes, Gulf Coast Junior College is truly a Panama City establishment and probably is making the most important contribution to the community of any existing facility.

#### THE LATE HONORABLE FRANKLIN ORTH

(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, those who love the outdoors and who value sound programs for sportsmen and sportsmanship are saddened by the death of the Honorable Franklin Orth, executive vice president of the National Rifle Association and president of the U.S. Olympic Committee.

He was an outstanding sportsman and conservationist and his contributions to the Nation he loved so well are many and great.

I knew Mr. Orth well and counted him one of my closest friends. I personally feel a great sense of loss at his death, and Mrs. Sikes and I extend our deep and earnest sympathies to all the members of his family.

It is my privilege to submit for the RECORD a release from the National Rifle Association, which outlines some of the major points in his career.

I include also a more detailed summary of his career, appearing in the January 16 issue of Gun Week:

[National Rifle Association of America News Release, Jan. 4, 1970]

#### RIFLE ASSOCIATION EXECUTIVE VICE PRESIDENT AND OLYMPIC COMMITTEE PRESIDENT PASSES AWAY

WASHINGTON, D.C., January 4.—Franklin L. Orth, 62, Executive Vice President of the National Rifle Association and President, U.S. Olympic Committee, died suddenly Sunday morning, January 4, at Suburban Hospital, Bethesda, Md.

Mr. Orth had just completed ten years as the top administrator of the NRA at the time of his death. Known throughout the world as an ardent hunter, sportsman and conservationist, he guided the million-member NRA through years of growth when the shooting sports and the recreational use of firearms expanded throughout the country. Mr. Orth was elected President of the United States Olympic Committee in 1968, after many years of activity in international sports competitions.

Prior to his appointment as NRA Executive Vice President in 1959, Mr. Orth served his country in important posts for more than 18 years. From August, 1953, through October,

1959, as Deputy Assistant Secretary of the Army, he directed the activities of the Office of Manpower, Personnel and Reserve Forces. Other important government positions held by him were Head of Operations Control of the Bureau of Internal Revenue from 1952 to 1953; Assistant Chief Counsel of the Office of Price Stabilization from 1951 to 1952, and Legal Consultant to the Administrator of Veterans Affairs from 1946 to 1951.

During World War II, Mr. Orth distinguished himself as a gallant soldier, serving with the famed Merrill's Marauders in Burma. During his tour in the Burma-China Theater, he served as a Battalion Commander and later commanded a regimental combat team fighting seasoned Japanese troops in the jungles. He was on active duty as a Colonel until August, 1946, and continued in the Army Reserve.

Born in Milwaukee, Wisc., Mr. Orth was graduated from the University of Wisconsin in 1928, taking his law degree from the same institution in 1931. It was during his collegiate years, that his participation in sports became, what was to be in his later life, his major interest, the shooting sports and the U.S. Olympic program. At the University of Wisconsin he was prominent in many sports, excelling as captain and stroke on the varsity crew.

Woodson D. Scott, NRA President, today said, "The passing of Franklin Orth is a great loss to his family, many friends and to our nation. He was a great American, dedicated to the ideals of our country for which he worked zealously and which he served so long. He was a great man, loved and respected by all who knew him."

Mr. Orth is survived by his widow, Helen, 15708 White Rock Road, Gaithersburg, Md., and seven children; Marilyn Orth Loman, Snyder, N.Y.; John F. Orth, Buffalo, N.Y.; Rosalie Orth Harrison, Saltspring Island, B.C.; Pamela Orth Peters, New Orleans, La.; Helen Orth Roundtree, Miami, Fla.; and Elizabeth Margot and Franklin L., Jr., of the home address.

Services at the U.S. Army Chapel, Ft. Meyer, Va., and interment at the Arlington National Cemetery will be held January 7, 1970.

[From Gun Week, Jan. 16, 1970]

#### FRANKLIN ORTH, NRA LEADER, DIES JANUARY 4

Franklin L. Orth, 62, executive vice president of the National Rifle Association and president of the U.S. Olympic Committee, died suddenly of a heart attack Jan. 4 at the Suburban Hospital in Bethesda, Md. Mr. Orth had just completed 10 years as the top administrator of the NRA at the time of his death.

He was buried Jan. 6 in Arlington National Cemetery, following services in the Ft. Meyer Chapel.

Known throughout the world as an ardent hunter, sportsman and conservationist, Mr. Orth led the million-member NRA during its most hectic years, when the organization stood firmly against efforts to impose national registration of firearms and the licensing of gun owners.

During his 10-year career with the NRA, Mr. Orth appeared countless times before Congressional investigating committees to plead the case of America's gun-owning sportsman against illogical gun control laws. He also appeared several times on nationwide television and radio as an opponent of firearms registration and owner licensing, and at the same time supported civilian marksman and hunter-safety programs, wildlife conservation and the value of private possession of firearms.

Woodson D. Scott, NRA president, described Mr. Orth's death as "a great loss to his family, his many friends and to our Nation." Scott said Mr. Orth was "a great American, dedicated to the ideals of our country, for

which he worked zealously and for which he served so long. He was a great man, loved and respected by all who knew him."

Mr. Orth began his public service in World War II with a 5½-year tour with the U.S. Army. In 1943, he volunteered for extra-hazardous duty with Merrill's Marauders assigned to long-range penetration operations behind the Japanese lines in Burma, and in China where he served as a Battalion Commander and later commanded a Regimental Combat Team. He was discharged in August, 1946, with the rank of Colonel.

For 10 years prior to entering military service, Mr. Orth was engaged in the general practice of law in partnership with his father in Milwaukee, Wis.

He attended elementary and high schools in Milwaukee and in 1928 received a B.A. degree from the University of Wisconsin. He received his Bachelor of Law Degree from the same school in 1931.

During his undergraduate days, he was prominent in athletics and was captain and stroke oar on the varsity crew. He was one of 10 of his class of 2,000 elected to the senior honorary society, Iron Cross.

Before assuming the executive vice presidency of NRA in 1959, Mr. Orth served in several important posts for the U.S. Government for 18 years. He was Legal Consultant to the Veteran's Administration from 1946 to 1951; was head of the Operations Control Staff of the Bureau of Internal Revenue from 1952 to 1953, and was with the Army Secretariat for Manpower Personnel and Reserve Forces from 1954. He was Deputy Assistant Secretary of the Army when he resigned to take the NRA post.

An ardent big game hunter, Mr. Orth traveled to Asia and Africa in quest of trophies such as tiger, leopard, black panther, lion, elephant and Cape Buffalo.

In addition to his NRA activities, Mr. Orth was very active in his work for the U.S. Olympic Committee, the presidency of which he assumed in 1968, after serving several years as vice president.

Another area of interest for Mr. Orth was the promotion of junior marksmanship programs, which he felt are essential if the shooting sports are to survive.

"I believe that we must reach far more youngsters—giving them essential instruction and introducing them to the enjoyment of hunting and target shooting," Mr. Orth told Gun Week during an October, 1967, interview.

At the same time, Mr. Orth also explained his outlook on firearms legislation. He said:

"Some reasonable legislation is inevitable, but the main problem arises over the differing definitions of that word 'reasonable.' The NRA firmly believes that effective legislation must be aimed directly at the misuse of firearms, and we support severe penalties in instances where guns become an instrument of violence.

"All concerned persons agree that there are some groups which should be denied ownership or possession of firearms. These include the criminal, the mental incompetent, the unsupervised juvenile, the drug addict, the habitual drunkard. Controls on ownership and possession should be directed at these groups, rather than at the law-abiding sportsman.

"We must be alert to be certain that any enacted legislation does not include vague provisions or broad administrative authority which will permit it to be applied in a fashion never intended."

Mr. Orth is survived by his widow, Mrs. Helen Orth, and seven children: Mrs. Marilyn (Orth) Lowman of Snyder, N.Y.; John F. Orth, Buffalo, N.Y.; Mrs. Rosalie (Orth) Harrison of Salt Spring Island, British Columbia; Pamela Alice Peters of New Orleans, La.; Franklin L. Orth Jr., Helen Martin and Elizabeth Margo, at the Orth home in Gaithersburg, Md.

#### SPORTSMEN SADDENED BY ORTH'S DEATH

Sportsmen throughout the country were saddened, Jan. 4, when they learned of the death of Franklin L. Orth, executive vice president of the National Rifle Association.

James M. (Jim) Lee, Jr., Dallas, Texas, acting director of the National Skeet Shooting Association, said, "Mr. Orth will be missed by all gun-owning sportsmen. You just don't find qualified people to take his place. The NSSA is indebted to the work Mr. Orth has done for the shooting sports."

Hugh McKinley, Vandalla, Ohio, Amateur Trapshooting Association director, said, "Mr. Orth's death is a tragic loss to the NRA and to every sportsman in the United States. The ATA offers its sincere sympathies. It will be tough to fill his position."

Charles Dickey, Riverside, Conn., National Shooting Sports Foundation director, said, "Franklin Orth and I were sincere personal friends and hunting companions as well as being associated in the welfare of the shooting sports. The entire shooting fraternity has suffered a tremendous loss in losing this champion of the sportsman's causes. Millions of sportsmen are indebted to the many years of work that Franklin Orth devoted to all phases of the shooting sports."

#### RESOLUTIONS BY THE ASSOCIATION OF THE UNITED STATES ARMY

(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, I am pleased to submit for reprinting in the RECORD a copy of the resolutions adopted by the Association of the United States Army at its 1969 annual meeting. This great organization, which is headed by the Honorable Frank Pace, distinguished former Secretary of the Army, has long stood for patriotic support of the Nation's democratic principles and its Armed Forces.

The resolutions follow:

##### CERTIFICATION

OCTOBER 15, 1969.

I certify that the Preamble and Resolutions Numbers 1 through 12 were adopted at the Annual Business Meeting of the Association of the United States Army held this date.

Resolutions from previous years, specified in Resolution Number 12, follow that Resolution.

ARTHUR SYMONS,  
Secretary.

##### PREAMBLE—WHEN AMERICANS CLOSE RANKS

One year ago, in the preamble to its 1968 resolutions, this Association warned that following the end of the war in Vietnam there would come "a period of great challenge and turmoil" in which there would be a "clamor for imprudent reductions in our armed forces."

That warning was not premature. In recent months, the clamor has exceeded the predictions of a year ago. The criticism persists even in the face of the plain fact that American fighting men continue to be engaged in difficult and dangerous combat in Southeast Asia.

The outcry has created a climate of uncertainty and suspicion that imposes great strains on the military and gnaws at the fabric of American society.

This perilous course must be reversed and the national compass reset on a course that reaffirms the tradition of Americans closing ranks and marching together in a common cause.

The Association of the United States Army pledges its support to the attainment of the nation's world-wide objectives. In carrying out this vow, it deems it essential to remind critics that our military and foreign policy objectives are established by officials elected by the people, and the duty of the military is to carry out missions to achieve those objectives.

On the home front, the Association notes with grave concern that the stability of American society is being severely strained by continuing reckless and unreasoned dissent. It recognizes that, whatever the causes of this feeling, it will not be dissipated by the creation of an equally ugly counter-movement in the streets and on the campuses. The solution lies in patient reliance on traditional American methods: vigorous discussion of issues raised by dissenters and on even-handed justice in invoking the law when the opposition goes beyond legal limits.

The Association is specifically concerned with unwarranted criticism directed at the military leadership of the nation and at the so-called "military-industrial complex." No person or institution is immune to error nor should be exempt from honest censure, but unfounded criticism fomented an atmosphere of distrust that is inimical to the best interests of the nation and breaks faith with American fighting men who are performing so valiantly for the cause of freedom. There is a vital need for a continuous program designed to remind the American people of the duties and contributions of our military leadership and of the essential role of American industry in providing the nation's armed forces with the tools necessary to insure adequate military security.

The Association of the United States Army, confident in the American public's historic ability to study both sides of the issues and then to decide wisely in the nation's best interest, pledges to devote its resources to such a program in the months and years ahead.

In support of this program and with the firm conviction that never before in our history has America had a greater need for a citizenry which understands the vital challenges that confront us, the Association of the United States Army adopts the following resolutions in its 1969 Annual Meeting assembled.

##### NO. 1. LEVEL OF COMBAT READINESS

The United States and the Free World continue to face an indeterminate period of international tension highlighted by communist-exploited political instability, including aggression and insurgency in Southeast Asia, and backed by massive and diversified military power. International stability and order require a level of armed forces-in-being commensurate with our world-wide responsibilities. The national military policy of the United States requires a strategy which includes deterrence, collective security and flexible response, and which employs appropriate elements of military power to help counter any threat.

Expansion of the Active Army has been necessary to insure the preservation of independent non-communist countries and to meet communist aggression, as is being done in Southeast Asia where our soldiers continue to fight gallantly. The well-trained, adequately equipped and combat-ready Reserve and National Guard components of our Army are essential to the security of the United States. United States Army units and advisory groups deployed in key areas overseas, and those maintained in the strategic reserve, must be sufficient to cope with crises in widely separated areas.

The advent of mutual nuclear deterrence increases the possibility of non-nuclear combat, with the attendant requirement for continued emphasis on, and improvement

of, United States Army capabilities in conventional and counter-insurgency warfare.

The United States, as the leading power in the Free World, provides modern, combat-ready forces to support United States' and Free World strategy to deter or stop aggression at any level or scale of armed conflict.

We therefore resolve that in order to fulfill its key role in defending the United States and reinforcing Free World security, the United States Army, including the Reserve and National Guard components, be maintained at sufficient strength to provide modern, well-trained and well-equipped forces capable of meeting our national commitments.

#### No. 2. SUPPORT OF ARMY ROTC PROGRAM

The military security of the United States is largely dependent upon educated and trained leadership. The Army Reserve Officers Training Corps program is a positive contributor to this need. It is a source of young, well-trained men, experienced in citizenship, leadership and self-discipline. All of the traits developed in the ROTC program are requisites to the qualifications of a commissioned officer of the United States Army.

The ROTC program presently provides at least half of the commissioned officers who enter the Army each year. Approximately 300 educational institutions participate in this program, which last year had an enrollment of more than 150,000 cadets. These institutions are representative of a cross-section of American life including all geographic, economic, social, ethnic and educational disciplines which are a vital part of our society and national image.

To clarify existing misconceptions resulting from a lack of knowledge and understanding of the purpose and vital importance of ROTC, it is necessary to educate and inform the public of the compelling need for the continued existence of the ROTC program which provides the high-caliber leaders so necessary to the military establishment.

It is imperative that all Americans recognize the need for the ROTC program as a means of providing well-educated, free-thinking and capable leaders for the armed forces.

We therefore resolve to support the concept and purpose of the Army ROTC program and to support an active campaign publicizing its continuing need and importance to our national defense and the preservation of our way of life.

#### No. 3. EQUITY IN SERVICE PAY

The present communist threat, with its many forms of potential aggression, requires the United States to maintain a variety of responses.

Modern weapons of advanced design demand new techniques of employment, which in turn need highly skilled and trained professional people to operate and maintain them. To have less than the best available skills and mature judgment would be expensive and possibly disastrous.

The need to attract and retain our most highly educated and trained citizens for the military service is a continuing one. Loyalty and dedication can never be completely rewarded by monetary and other benefits. However, much can be done to offset the hardships imposed by a military career through making monetary compensation and other benefits as nearly equitable as possible with comparable civilian skills, education and responsibilities. Financial hardships imposed by creeping inflation in our present economy, the ever-spiraling cost of education and high industrial demand for specialists trained in the service are resulting in increasing losses of military personnel.

Further, the once-attractive retirement benefits of the military services are disappearing through inflation and the limitations imposed by the federal government on retired pay computation.

Corrective measures should be taken to maintain and support restoration of the historic system of computing pay of retired personnel on the basis of current active duty rates.

Another area of inequity is in flight pay for aviation warrant officers. In aviation units, warrant officers and company grade officers fly side by side, experiencing the same risks and facing the same responsibilities. Equalization of flight pay would significantly improve retention of warrant officers.

The Dual Compensation Act also discriminates against the retired regular Army officer in federal employment.

We therefore resolve that existing inequities in pay policies be eliminated. These include, but are not limited to, the following:

(1) The relationship of retired pay to active duty pay.

(2) Equal risk flight pay for warrant officers.

(3) The Dual Compensation Act as it discriminates against retired regular officers in federal employment.

We further resolve to continue to support strongly a modernization of the military pay system that will provide remuneration comparable to that of civilians of equal skill, education and responsibility.

#### No. 4. MILITARY, FAMILY, AND OFF-POST HOUSING

The provision of decent, adequate and livable housing for military personnel is an important factor in maintaining morale and in retaining the skilled military personnel required for maintaining effective United States military forces. Moreover, in overseas areas where dependents are permitted to accompany military personnel the best possible housing should be provided.

On-post housing and furnishings should conform to satisfactory standards. Where on-post housing does not exist, civilian housing should be offered by the United States Army, utilizing a workable rental guarantee program. We further believe that all off-post housing should be available to everyone, regardless of race, color, creed or national origin.

We therefore resolve:

(1) That this organization indorse and support all actions essential to acquire sufficient funds to provide appropriate housing for military personnel, world-wide.

(2) That this organization support the idea that where sufficient and adequate on-post housing does not exist in overseas bases, contractual arrangements should be made to provide off-post housing for military personnel and their dependents in nearby civilian communities, such housing to conform completely to United States standards.

(3) That this organization support—in the strongest possible manner—the concept that all off-post housing should be free of any vestige of discrimination because of race, color, creed or national origin.

#### No. 5. DEFENSE AGAINST BALLISTIC MISSILES AND AIRCRAFT

The Association of the United States Army has continuously supported an adequate air defense for the United States and has recognized the need for deployment of an anti-ballistic missile defense system.

A positive step has been taken by the President of the United States to direct the initial deployment of the Safeguard system, subject to the approval of Congress.

Among other actions taken in respect to air defense during the past year, there has been a reduction in the Army's contribution to the defense against manned bombers by

the inactivation of a number of Hercules missile sites. At the same time, deployment of Vulcan and Chaparral missile units has added to the air defense capability of the field army. The effectiveness of air defense weapons, guns and missiles, as demonstrated in Southeast Asia, points out the necessity of these weapons in the defense of the field army and critical installations against an enemy equipped with large numbers and types of combat aircraft capable of being employed against ground targets. The SAM-D, now under advanced development, is presently the best answer to defense against very low-altitude aircraft and tactical ballistic missiles and will provide a highly mobile, multiple engagement defense capability for use by the field army.

The potential threat to the United States continues to include manned bombers as well as intercontinental ballistic missiles. These bombers could be converted supersonic transports in addition to existing medium- and long-range bombers with air refueling capability. Considering these threats, the principle of defense in depth remains essential to an effective air defense of the United States.

We therefore resolve:

(1) To indorse the favorable action of Congress to authorize the deployment of the Safeguard system as a protection for a minimum number of retaliatory offensive missiles, as defense against an accidental missile launch from outside of the United States and as minimum protection against possible future blackmail by unsophisticated nuclear powers.

(2) To urge the maintaining of strong air defenses of the United States based upon a balanced force of area defenses by fighter-interceptors and terminal surface-to-air missile defenses against bombers.

(3) To favor expedited action to complete research and development of the SAM-D weapon system.

(4) To urge an increased effort to improve the field army air-defense capability through interim deployment of Vulcan and Chaparral units until the SAM-D system becomes operational, and the continued development of advanced anti-aircraft gun systems to complement the SAM-D defense against low-flying aircraft and tactical ballistic missiles.

#### No. 6. MILITARY-CIVILIAN DEFENSE TEAM

In an era of world tensions and the precarious balance of power in which we are now living, the continued superiority of the equipment and capability of our armed forces over those of potential enemies is essential to the defense of our country and the free world.

To obtain the most modern equipment available requires contributions of effort on the part of many elements of our nation, including the military, industrial, labor, academic, scientific and political.

The military must establish realistic and feasible requirements based on the needs of a modern army.

Our universities, colleges and the scientific community have played a vital role in contributing to scientific and technological advancements.

Further, a strong industrial base capable of developing and producing effective and reliable materiel and equipment is necessary to our national survival.

In addition, the American working man has consistently produced the finest materiel for our fighting men.

Finally, the teamwork generated by each of these elements and backed by the far-sighted political support required to fund this important effort has allowed the United States to successfully achieve its objectives in all of the conflicts in which it has been involved by providing well-motivated troops

with the most modern and effective equipment.

We therefore resolve that the Association of the United States Army strongly support the principle of the military-industry-labor-academic-scientific and political team so that United States servicemen can be assured they will not be outgunned by any future enemy.

#### NO. 7. ALL-VOLUNTEER ARMY

Throughout the history of the United States, military security has depended upon the willingness of all able-bodied citizens to serve in the armed forces, either as volunteers or through some form of selective service when the necessity has arisen.

It is recognized that the present selective service system has accomplished the following:

(1) Provided sufficient manpower to the active Army to enable it to accomplish the varied and difficult missions with which it has been charged.

(2) Increased the number of voluntary enlistments for longer periods among those who perhaps would not have considered military service had there been no selective service obligation.

(3) Insured the availability of individuals with varied skills and experience vital to the mission of the Army.

(4) Provided a source of trained manpower for Army Reserve and Army National Guard forces and has created a reservoir of battle-experienced citizens who could be counted on in any emergency requiring rapid expansion of the armed forces.

It is recognized that under future circumstances which might place a lower manpower requirement on the Army, an all-volunteer system of service could be practicable and desirable. However, it does not appear that the personnel requirements under present conditions could be maintained through an all-volunteer system. With an all-volunteer Army, it would be essential to provide a back-up of trained reserve elements in larger numbers than now exist to insure an effective force sufficient to meet any national emergency.

We therefore resolve to support the continuation of a selective service system as long as required, to function in concert with a strong volunteer system.

#### NO. 8. RETIRED MILITARY PERSONNEL

In view of the ever-increasing numbers of retired military personnel, it is desirable that their interest in the Army be maintained. Their special knowledge, experience and loyalty should be better utilized by the United States government and the Army.

We therefore resolve that the Association of the United States Army continue to endorse and support the removal of limitations on the employment of retired military personnel by the federal government; and

We further restate the position of our AUSA president that this great number of retired military, both enlisted and commissioned, be used for the betterment of our country through an effective overall plan and program devised to insure utilization of these men and women; and

We further resolve that, in the interest of providing assistance to retiring and retired personnel, the AUSA urge Department of the Army to continue the Retired Activities Program and expand it as conditions warrant.

#### NO. 9. THE ONE-ARMY CONCEPT

The Association of the United States Army continues to recognize the concept of "One-Army" composed of the active Army, the Army National Guard and the Army Reserve.

There is a continuing need for National

Guard and Reserve forces, properly organized, trained and equipped, and ready to support the active Army in present and future commitments.

To maintain the required level of operational readiness and to insure a smooth transition to active duty of Army National Guard and Army Reserve units, mobilization designees and other individual reservists, every effort must be made to provide needed equipment, technical support and provisions for training and participation in maneuvers and field training exercises.

We therefore resolve to continue our strong support of Army National Guard and Army Reserve forces as vital and essential members of the One-Army team.

#### NO. 10. STABILITY OPERATIONS AND MILITARY ASSISTANCE

In order to prevent or defeat communist-inspired insurgency in developing nations it is necessary to promote stability by establishing and maintaining internal security and by encouraging and supporting those nations in the achievement of needed social, economic and political reforms. The internal security of developing nations is basically the responsibility of their own police, military or paramilitary forces.

Through the use of stability operations and the Military Assistance Program, the United States Army can do much to deter threats to peace by helping small, developing nations meet communist aggression and in the maintenance of internal security and stability. These programs provide an opportunity for developing nations to accelerate their social, economic and political progress. They also promote the foreign policy, national security and strategic objectives of the United States.

The United States Army is deeply involved in the Military Assistance Program and has taken positive steps to deal with communist-inspired insurgency by designating stability operations as one of its principal missions.

We therefore resolve that the Association of the United States Army endorse and support the Army's stability operations and Military Assistance Program as a measure of assisting, at their request, friendly developing nations in preventing or defeating aggression, and urge the full exploitation of our military capabilities for such assistance.

#### NO. 11. ADVANCED DEGREE IN MILITARY ART AND SCIENCE

The program for awarding the degree of Master of Military Art and Science to qualified graduates of the U.S. Army Command and General Staff College is a tangible recognition of the need for stimulating military scholarship within the Army.

The broader significance of proposed legislation authorizing this degree lies in the program's explicit recognition of military art and science as the learned discipline of the military profession, in its assertion that this discipline is worthy of serious scholastic study by the academic community, and in the promise that such recognition will lead to formal academic accreditation of the college and its educational programs.

We therefore resolve that the Association of the United States Army endorse and support the proposal to authorize the commandant of the Command and General Staff College to confer the degree of Master of Military Art and Science (MMAS) upon qualified graduates of that institution.

#### NO. 12. CONTINUING RESOLUTIONS

Ten resolutions adopted at preceding annual meetings are still valid and remain in force.

We therefore resolve that the following continuing resolutions receive the full support of every member of the Association of the United States Army:

Principles of Freedom  
Modern Equipment and Tactical Mobility  
Research and Development  
United States Military Academy  
Civil Defense  
Strategic Airlift and Sealift  
Army Civilian Employees  
National and Post Cemeteries  
Medical and Dental Care  
Retirement Pay Credit for Enlisted Men

#### PRINCIPLES OF FREEDOM

Whereas, the right of peaceable assembly is one of the most cherished rights guaranteed by the founding fathers of this nation; and

Whereas, it is a right for which today thousands of young Americans are standing guard to protect at danger points around the world and are fighting and dying in Vietnam; and

Whereas, the right to disagree also is a cherished right, but it is accompanied by a corollary that this is a nation wherein the majority rules, and those who disagree must do so under due process of law and not violate the principle of freedom which the great majority accept; and

Whereas, in this nation today we have small minorities which have used the right to disagree as a cloak to participate in flagrant demonstrations which violate the principle of liberty under law; and

Whereas, by their actions and their statements, such demonstrations of the minorities constitute a clear and present danger to the accomplishment of the will of the majority and in some instances they have approached treason; and

Whereas, such irresponsible actions of some groups have furnished the material which could damage national morale, provide aid and comfort to the enemy, and grist for the enemy's propaganda machinery;

Now, therefore, be it resolved, that the Association of the United States Army, whose membership is composed of military and civilians alike, reaffirms that the rights of all must be protected and preserved, and also declares that the will of the people must prevail to preserve and protect the foundation stones of our government, our way of life, and our civilization; and

Be it further resolved, that the Association of the United States Army continue its efforts to instill in all Americans a deep sense of responsibility as individual citizens, a profound sense of patriotism, and willingness to fight to preserve our freedom and our way of life, not only for ourselves but for all generations to come. (Resolution No. 6, 1965)

#### MODERN EQUIPMENT AND TACTICAL MOBILITY

We therefore resolve to urge the fullest possible exploitation of tactical mobility by the Army, with special stress on the development of air vehicles capable of extending the combat effectiveness of airmobile units.

We further resolve that procurement of the most modern aircraft, weapons and equipment for the United States Army should be continued at a level to insure sufficient stocks of superior materiel to deter or defeat any potential enemy. (Resolution No. 2, 1968)

#### RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT

We therefore resolve to support restoration of basic and advanced research and exploratory development portions of military budgets to a level adequate to provide those major new weapon systems necessary to achieve and maintain the qualitative superiority of the United States armed forces. (Resolution No. 3, 1968)

#### UNITED STATES MILITARY ACADEMY

We therefore resolve to continue and emphasize a program to encourage outstanding youth to seek appointments to the United

States Military Academy and to search for new ideas leading to its further development and effectiveness. (Resolution No. 8, 1968)

#### CIVIL DEFENSE

Now, therefore, be it resolved, that the Association of the U.S. Army supports civil defense authorities in their efforts to provide the American people with adequate shelter against the effects of nuclear attack. (Resolution No. 6, 1967)

#### STRATEGIC AIRLIFT AND SEALIFT

Now, therefore, be it resolved, that actions be taken to provide continued improvements in, and sufficient amounts of, strategic airlift and fast deployment logistic ships for sealift to meet the operational needs for support of U.S. Army forces. (Resolution No. 9, 1967)

#### ARMY CIVILIAN EMPLOYEES

Now, therefore, be it resolved, that this Association extends special commendation and gratitude to the civilian employees of the Army and recommends that dynamic career programs be maintained to recruit, retain and encourage the continued service of dedicated public servants in consonance with the command responsibilities and missions of the U.S. Army. (Resolution No. 11, 1967)

#### NATIONAL AND POST CEMETERIES

Now, therefore, be it resolved, that it is the considered opinion of the Association of the U.S. Army that the best interests of the nation and the members of our armed forces and their dependents will be served by the expansion of national and post cemetery facilities immediately to insure that the members of our armed forces who have served honorably will be provided a resting place in a military cemetery as a tribute to their service. (Resolution No. 14, 1967)

#### MEDICAL AND DENTAL CARE

Now, therefore, be it resolved, that the Association of the United States Army requests the Department of Defense to take action to provide adequate medical and dental care for dependents of active duty personnel and eligible retired personnel, including adequate facilities for this purpose. (Resolution No. 13, 1964.)

#### RETIREMENT PAY CREDIT FOR ENLISTED MEN

Now, therefore, be it resolved, that this Association encourage and endorse measures which will permit enlisted personnel to receive credit for inactive reserve duty prior to 1 June 1958 for retirement pay purposes. (Resolution No. 15, 1964.)

#### RESOLUTIONS COMMITTEE, 1969

##### CHAIRMAN

Col. Dan E. Craig, USA Ret., Fort Riley-Central Kansas-Victory Division Chapter.

##### MEMBERS

Col. Ray Bagley, USA Ret., Mother Lode Chapter.

SGM Everett M. Bailey, USA Ret., George Washington Chapter.

Mr. Dales M. Boatman, Southern Arizona Chapter.

LTC David F. Boyd, Jr., USAR, Albuquerque Chapter.

LTC Robert W. Dorsey, USAR, Dallas Chapter.

BG William J. Gallagher, PARNG Ret., Blue Mountain Chapter.

Col. John W. Oswalt, USA Ret., Fort Worth Chapter.

Col. Peter S. Peca, USA Ret., Buckeye Chapter.

Mr. J. Francis Raunch, Fort Monmouth Chapter.

Col. Ralph Saenz, USA Ret., Southwest Oklahoma Chapter.

SGM John W. Whitlock, USA Ret., Braxton Bragg Chapter.

#### HON. G. HARROLD CARSWELL

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

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, my warm and sincere congratulations have been extended to the Honorable G. Harrold Carswell and to all the members of his family for the merited recognition which has been given to him as Florida's first nominee to the U.S. Supreme Court. I am one of those who have been privileged to know Judge Carswell throughout his career, from his initial appointment as U.S. Attorney, through his service as District Federal Judge and, subsequently, as Judge of the 5th U.S. Circuit Court. His work in each of these responsible positions has been effective and his ability unquestioned. Throughout his career, he has given outstanding service and his fitness for the highest Court of the land has been established beyond doubt. We in Florida are particularly proud of our fellow citizen and happy for the recognition which has been extended to him. I am confident that his contributions will improve the decisions and the standing of the Court.

#### NATIONAL JAYCEE WEEK AND 50TH BIRTHDAY

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

Mr. HENDERSON. Mr. Speaker, the week of January 18 has been designated as National Jaycee Week. This fine and dynamic organization is celebrating its 50th birthday this year.

Last week I had the pleasure of spending a couple of hours with the president of one of the local Jaycee clubs in my district. He took me to meet some of his friends, who like him, were young business and professional men in his community. They included the operators of a paint store, a dentist, an optometrist. Without exception, these were keen, progressive minded individuals. Most were members of the Jaycees and were, I believe, typical of that organization.

Over the years, as I have observed it in operation, I have been greatly impressed with its dedication to community service and the development and encouragement of leadership by young men.

Individual Jaycee projects in various communities have made remarkable contributions to community progress.

Jaycee programs such as the Distinguished Service Award—DSA—the Outstanding Young Farmer Award—OYF—the Ten Outstanding Young Men—TOYM—and others have recognized, encouraged, and developed leadership and leadership training.

The organization has kept its youth and vitality and insured the influx of new blood and new ideas by limiting its membership to the young men between the ages of 21 to 35.

In these days when it is somehow considered old fashioned to profess openly

and unashamedly a deep-seated faith in God, a belief in the soundness of the free enterprise economic system, in the basic brotherhood of all men, and a dedication to the concept of a government of laws rather than of men, the Jaycees stand out like a beacon to remind us that not all of our Nation's young men have "dropped out and turned on."

Congratulations to one of our finest civic organizations.

#### PERMISSION FOR SPECIAL SUBCOMMITTEE ON INVESTIGATIONS, COMMITTEE ON INTERSTATE AND FOREIGN COMMERCE, TO SIT TODAY

Mr. STAGGERS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Special Subcommittee on Investigations of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce be permitted to sit at 2 o'clock this afternoon.

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

There was no objection.

#### CANDY LABELING ACT, 1970

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

Mr. ROONEY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, a great controversy and much concern surround the issue of cigarette smoking and health. On one point, at least, both the antismoking forces and the cigarette industry find themselves in agreement. Both agree that cigarette promotions should not be directed at children.

Yet it is not necessary to search for very long to find candy cigarettes in the marketplace packaged and promoted to simulate cigarettes and to encourage very small children to imitate the smoking habits of adults.

I am convinced this type of appeal is wrong. Therefore, I am introducing today a bill I believe is a vitally important legislative proposal, the Candy Cigarette Act of 1970. It is designed to halt the packaging and promotion of candy cigarettes to simulate real cigarettes, or in any way associate candy with cigarettes.

Children are invited to consume a wide variety of candy cigarette brands—they can choose "Salems," or "L. & M. 100's," or "Marlboro," or "Kent," or any of the familiar brands of real cigarettes. While such promotions are directed at the very young, Federal and State agencies and private organizations expend vast sums to make the youth of our Nation aware of the potential health hazards associated with smoking. The tobacco industry, itself, has sought to avoid making special appeals to the young in promoting its product.

Congress is presently nearing the completion of its consideration of amendments to the Federal Cigarette Labeling and Advertising Act of 1965, which contains additional provisions to assure that children will not be unduly exposed to cigarette advertisements.

Those who manufacture candy cigarette simulating cigarettes made of tobacco thereby indirectly encourage the smoking of real cigarettes by the youth of the Nation. It is essential that they be similarly restricted.

Congressional legislation is the only answer.

While the tobacco industry, aware of its responsibilities, is opposed to the marketing of candy cigarettes and has wished for a number of years to procure its end; it cannot do the job alone. As the law of trademarks now stands, it is not clear that the manufacturers of cigarettes could successfully sue those candy manufacturers who are busy reproducing cigarette trademarks on the packages of such a dissimilar product as candy cigarettes. In any event, neither the tobacco industry nor anyone else in the private sector can halt the sale of candy cigarettes if the manufacturer avoids reproducing on the package any trademark actually used in connection with cigarettes.

Nor may this matter be left to the States. The cigarette and health controversy is a national problem that the Congress has twice found necessary to deal with on the national level. Candy cigarettes are a small but important and integral part of this whole controversy.

The responsibility in this area clearly lies with the Congress.

This bill I am introducing today is very carefully drawn to effect its stated purpose and no more.

It will only apply to those manufacturers who market candy cigarettes. It will not in any way deprive even those manufacturers of the right to market any kind of candy they wish. The children of America will still be able to enjoy their favorite candy. The only effect of the bill will be to remove from the candy counters and from advertising all package labeling or promotional material which reproduce or simulate the trademarks of any brand of cigarette, or which in any other way associates the eating of candy with actual smoking of tobacco cigarettes.

In my view, this bill is vital to the welfare of the children of this country. For their sake, I respectfully request that all members of this body give the bill their most thoughtful and careful attention.

H.R. 15497

An act to further the general health and welfare by regulating the sale to children and to the general public of candy products portrayed as resembling cigarettes and for other purposes

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States in Congress assembled, That this Act may be cited as "the Candy Cigarette Act of 1970."

SEC. 2. As used in this Act—

(1) The term "candy product" means any candy or confectionary product sold as food for man.

(2) The term "trademark" includes any word, name, symbol, or device or any combination thereof adopted and used by a manufacturer of cigarettes to identify his goods and distinguish them from those manufactured or sold by others.

(3) The term "labeling" means all written, printed, or graphic matter (1) affixed to any candy product or any of its containers

or wrappers or (2) accompanying any candy product.

(4) The term "promotional material" includes all advertising material used at the point of sale or in any media of communications, whether or not approved by the manufacturer, importer or packager of the candy product.

(5) The term "person" means an individual, partnership, corporation, or any other business or legal entity.

(6) The term "cigarette" has the same meaning as in the Cigarette Labeling and Advertising Act (79 Stat. 282, 15 U.S.C. 1331).

SEC. 3. It shall be unlawful for any person to manufacture, import, package for sale or distribution, or promote for sale within the United States any candy product—

(a) When any labeling or promotional material used in connection with the product employs the word "cigarette" or "cigarettes" to identify the product.

(b) When any labeling or promotional material used in connection with the product displays a reproduction, counterfeit, copy, or colorable imitation of any trademark that is registered for use in connection with cigarettes under the United States Trademark Act, as amended (15 U.S.C. 1051, 60 Stat. 427), or the trademark laws of any other country; or when any labeling or promotional material used in connection with the product displays a reproduction, counterfeit, copy, or colorable imitation of any valid trademark used in connection with cigarettes.

(c) When any labeling or promotional material used in connection with the product displays any pictorial representation that suggests or implies any similarity between the product and cigarettes; or when the design, dress, construction, or general appearance of such labeling or promotional material suggests or implies any similarity between the product and cigarettes.

SEC. 4. Any person who violates the provisions of this Chapter shall be guilty of a misdemeanor and shall on conviction thereof be subject to a fine of not more than \$10,000.

SEC. 5. The several district Courts of the United States are invested with jurisdiction for cause shown, to prevent and restrain violations of this chapter upon the application of the Attorney General of the United States acting through the several United States attorneys in their several districts, or upon the application of any party engaged in the manufacture of cigarettes.

SEC. 6. If any provision of this chapter or the application thereof to any person or circumstances is held invalid the other provisions of this chapter and the application of such persons to other persons or circumstances shall not be affected thereby.

SEC. 7. The provisions of this Act shall take effect on July 1, 1970.

#### EVERYONE WILL SUFFER IF RAM-PANT INFLATION IS NOT CHECKED

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

Mr. BERRY. Mr. Speaker, I shall vote to support the President's veto even though the bill would mean a few extra million dollars of Federal money for South Dakota schools, OEO, and welfare programs.

I shall vote this way because I know, as every Member knows, that no school in the Nation will suffer as a result of this veto. Since July 1, 1969, they have been operating on a continuing resolution which has given them the same payments they received in the previous fiscal year, and under another continuing reso-

lution which will be passed following the veto, the same amount will be available for the remainder of this fiscal year.

I think President Nixon was elected with a mandate to stop inflation. How can any administration halt this shrinking dollar with a hostile Congress hell-bent for politics instead of the national welfare?

No school, no welfare program, no social security recipient will be hurt if the veto is sustained, but everyone will suffer if rampant inflation is not checked.

#### BLOOD DONATIONS AT THE CAPITOL ON JANUARY 30

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

Mr. CARTER. Mr. Speaker, Congress, on the 20th of December, 1969, passed a resolution declaring the month of January "Blood Donor Month" which President Nixon signed into law. Because of the holiday season and the frequent occurrence of upper respiratory infections, January has been a month during which it has been difficult to obtain sufficient blood to help our unfortunate brothers who are victims of disease and accidents.

On January 30, in room B-344, of the Rayburn Building, blood will be taken from those of us who are willing and able to give. A careful record will be made of the donors and from it will be determined which side of the aisle is more thoughtful of the unfortunate sick who need blood. It may well be said "greater love hath no man than he that giveth his blood to his fellowman."

The distinguished gentleman from Ohio (Mr. BROWN), and I urge all our plethoric Republican colleagues to participate. The blood you give might help your own family or friends.

Our distinguished colleagues, the gentleman from Hawaii (Mr. MATSUNAGA) and the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. ROONEY) will spark the drive on the Democratic side of the aisle.

#### THE 50TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE JAYCEES

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

Mr. CEDERBERG. Mr. Speaker, at a time when the antics of a few irresponsible young people in the United States compete daily for headlines, it is a real pleasure to take note of the 50th anniversary of a great organization dedicated to recognizing the needs of people and assisting them in solving the problems of their communities. I refer to the U.S. Jaycees and Jaycees all over the world.

In 1920, in St. Louis, Mr. Henry Giesenbier formed a group of young men dedicated to meeting the community problems about which many people were complaining but little was being done. From this small start the organization has grown to encompass over 6,000 chapters and 300,000 young men in the United States alone. Another 100,000 Jaycees from all parts of the world join

U.S. Jaycees in an organization which is now celebrating its 10th birthday, Junior Chamber International.

As a young man just returning from service with the Army during World War II, I joined the Jaycees and I look back with pride on my part in the achievements of my local chapter in Bay City, Mich. I know that this sense of accomplishment is shared by my colleagues who have had the good fortune to be associated with the Jaycee movement. As Jaycees many of us first learned those principles of leadership, and a sensitivity to the problems of our communities, which inspire us to greater efforts in meeting the problems of our great Nation.

Here in the District of Columbia, especially, the Jaycees have made a great number of contributions to the improvement of the community. At the present time over five hundred young men participate in the Jaycee program in the District, and it is heartening to know that here in our Nation's Capital there are dedicated men from every walk of life who work quietly and effectively to meet the many and varied difficulties which are faced by the local citizenry.

I think that we could do no better than to recognize at this time that the motto which has been taken by District of Columbia Jaycees for this 50th Anniversary Jaycee Week, "Young Men Can Change the World," is singularly appropriate in this age of emphasis on youth. We should certainly lend our support to an organization which has dedicated its members to service in the finest tradition of our American way of life.

At this time I would like to commend to the attention of my colleagues the Jaycee creed, with the observation that it contains a great deal of food for thought for each of us as we carry on our work here in the Congress:

We believe—  
That faith in God gives meaning and purpose to human life;  
That the brotherhood of man transcends the sovereignty of nations;  
That economic justice can best be won by free men through free enterprise;  
That government should be of laws rather than of men;  
That earth's great treasure lies in human personality;  
And that service to humanity is the best work of life.

#### ISRAEL AND THE ARABS

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

Mr. SNYDER. Mr. Speaker, on Monday, several of my colleagues in the House introduced a resolution calling for direct negotiations between Israel and the Arab States. I can appreciate the fact that the Israelis and their supporters are concerned that a four-power gaggle of busybodies may attempt to impose an outside solution on the situation—a solution which many fear would be unfavorable to Israel. However, Mr. Speaker, I did not join in sponsorship of the resolution. Recognizing that Israel is a staunch—and perhaps the last—ally and bulwark against Communist expansion

in the Middle East, my reasoning on the problem is as follows:

The Arabs, Mr. Speaker, attacked Israel.

The Arabs, Mr. Speaker, lost.

The Jews, Mr. Speaker, won.

The war, Mr. Speaker, is over.

The present boundaries of the State of Israel are delineated today by how far the Arabs could run in 6 days.

There is an instructive analog in this suprisingly simple chronology; namely:

To demand negotiation from the Israelis seems to me the equivalent of approaching the New York Mets after the seventh game of the world series and requesting that they now negotiate the outcome of the world championship with Baltimore: Or, to use a contemporary example, would the House of Representatives feel competent to request the Kansas City Chiefs to negotiate the outcome of the Super Bowl with the Minnesota Vikings after the Chiefs had just trounced the Vikings by a considerable margin?

I wonder how the victorious Kansas City locker room would have greeted the news that the House of Representatives had just resolved that the Super Bowl trophy was now subject to direct negotiations.

If I were an Arab, which I am not, I think I would watch my language and behavior since the next time around they may find themselves pushed back against the Mediterranean and looking for an island somewhere to occupy.

If this matter comes to a vote, I will probably vote for a resolution calling for direct negotiations as a more acceptable alternative to attempts at imposing a solution from outside, but I believe we must all remember that Israel did not start the war and thus may quite correctly view with skepticism any overtures which could conceivably compromise her existence. There appears to be little to negotiate.

#### THE 50TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE JAYCEES

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

Mr. SNYDER. Mr. Speaker, 1970 marks the 50th anniversary of the founding of the U.S. Jaycees. The people of America and of Kentucky have long recognized the civic virtue and usefulness of this great service organization, and I believe it is only fitting that it be recognized formally during this, its golden anniversary year.

All of us are familiar with the good works of the Jaycees and with the countless selfless projects in which its members participate. The activities of the Jaycees typify in an exemplary way the good work which private initiative, motivated by sincere human and personal concern, can serve to build stronger communities and, subsequently, a stronger and freer America.

In an age when words, studies, and commissions represent the approach to problems, it is indeed heartening to wit-

ness the activities of the Jaycees, "young men of action." The ideals of the Jaycee creed, and the dedication to service which are characteristic of this organization, have inspired young men throughout the world in solving problems which face man and society.

So, on behalf of myself—and on behalf of the people of the Fourth District of Kentucky, whom I represent—I am pleased today to recognize the 50 years of service which the Jaycees represent and to thank them sincerely for being concerned enough to get involved. Based on their record of the first 50 years, I believe that we can look forward confidently to many more years of the great tradition of service to the Jaycees.

#### THE THREATENED VETO OF THE HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE-LABOR DEPARTMENTS APPROPRIATION BILL

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

Mr. McCLORY. Mr. Speaker, it is my understanding that the President intends to veto the appropriation bill—H.R. 13111—which provides the funds for the 1970 fiscal year for the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, the Department of Labor, as well as funds for the Office of Economic Opportunity and several other agencies. I hope that the President reconsiders his position and gives his approval to this measure which was passed by this House and by the other body by substantial majorities.

A principal basis for the threatened veto is the increase in funds appropriated for so-called impacted school aid. This subject was debated fully and fairly by the House, as well as in the other Chamber, and the increase of some \$398 million above the President's budget was approved overwhelmingly. Indeed, a small additional amount was added in the other body to the amount which the House had approved.

Mr. Speaker, I do not question that the existing formula for providing impacted school aid funds for the so-called (b) category students is inequitable as applied to some school districts. The formula for computing impacted school aid should be revised. But it would seem most unwise to cut off such impacted school aid before such a new formula is developed.

In the case of my own congressional district, more than \$2.5 million is involved. The school districts which receive the largest dollar amounts are those which have the greatest need for these funds. These are school districts which provide education to many students from disadvantaged backgrounds. I am confident that other similar losses will be experienced in other parts of the Nation, and that many schoolchildren will be the sufferers. Mr. Speaker, I cannot feel that a veto of this bill, with the funds which it provides for impacted school aid, and various other educational, health, and other benefits, is an essential part of the President's program to curb inflation. I

hope the President will reconsider this step and approve the bill which the House and Senate have passed.

#### HOUSE BLOODMOBILE

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

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, the Red Cross Bloodmobile is scheduled to visit the House side of Capitol Hill January 3—a week from Friday.

All Members have received a pledge card and details of the opportunity to donate blood in a letter signed by TIM CARTER, FRED ROONEY, SPARK MATSUNAGA, and myself.

To reiterate, the opportunity to donate will begin at 9:30 a.m., and go until 3:15 p.m., in the Rayburn first aid station, room B-344. Pledge cards from Members should be returned to Congressman CARTER's office—room 1202—by noon this coming Friday so the Bloodmobile workers will have an idea of their manpower and facility needs throughout the day. Members will be rushed through when they arrive so as to take as little time and inconvenience as possible.

Office and committee staff who plan to donate blood on the 30th should call extension 3780 prior to the drawing so they can be scheduled around Members.

Those of us who are encouraging the rest of the House to make a special effort to donate blood during this drawing feel there is an added significance to donating this year because of the passage of House Resolution 911 during the last session, authorizing the President to declare January as National Blood Donor Month. The President did so on December 30th. This gives us a chance to follow our words with deeds.

January has traditionally been a difficult month in which to fill blood quotas because of poor weather and colds which reduce the physical ability of many to give blood. At the same time, the requirements for donated blood and its derivatives generally increase during the month because of accidents, fires, and illness. We can show our awareness of this need, and encourage others to make greater efforts to fill blood quotas during this time of year, by exemplifying our concern through deeds on January 30.

Along with my colleagues I propose that the aims of this worthy cause will be further promoted if Republicans and Democrats will display some of the historical rivalry between the parties to see which can produce the best record during the January 30 visit of the bloodmobile.

Those who feel that all the Nation's problems cannot be solved by Government in this way are given an opportunity to get involved in the most personal way possible to solve the problem of the need for blood.

And for those who bleed verbally for the needs of society can really bleed on January 30.

Political blood is sometimes drawn right here in this well. Now let us see which side of the aisle bleeds best—and what color the blood is. The lines of

challenge are drawn—now let us draw the blood.

#### "HOPE" WALK

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

Mr. DEL CLAWSON. Mr. Speaker, a form of organized community effort for a worthwhile cause took place last year in Downey, Calif., and I believe it deserves to be called to the attention of my colleagues at a time when so much attention seems to be devoted to demonstrations which are less constructive in nature and particularly since the project in question was sponsored by a youth group. The Downey High School Interact Club took up the cause of Project HOPE and proceeded to sound out the community through its parent organization the Downey Rotary Club, receiving active encouragement from police and civic leaders for a "HOPE walk." Walkers were sponsored and paid an amount of money by their sponsors for each mile completed of a 20-mile course. It is worthy of mention that Dr. Arnold Finch, Downey superintendent of schools, led the walk. Interact club members patrolled the route, Rotary members served water and orange juice to the walkers and police helped watch the route. The walkers have collected over \$3,300 with additional funds still coming in. A donation of 80 percent of the money collected will be made to the SS Hope with the remaining 20 percent divided between the Downey Community Hospital and the Downey Children's Theater. The phenomenal success of the Downey HOPE walk demonstrates the outstanding contribution which youthful vigor, enthusiasm, and new ideas can make to a community which is willing to encourage its idealistic young people to become involved.

#### PRISON REFORM

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

Mr. GUDE. Mr. Speaker, during the recess, the Washington Star published an excellent editorial on prison reform, which merits the attention of my colleagues. We all know that crime, and especially crime in our Nation's capital, has aroused the concern of all our citizens. Crime and public safety rank first on the list of problems calling for action according to the citizens of Maryland's 8th District who responded to my recent opinion poll. I strongly support legislation to strengthen our police force and our courts, and to give the courts the authority to deny bail to persons shown to be dangerous if released. These measures are vital if we mean to cut down on crime in the streets right now. I am equally convinced, however, that we cannot reverse the rising crime rate over the longer run without thorough reform of our correctional system.

The Star editorial reveals the failure of our prisons to rehabilitate criminals,

and points to new programs now being undertaken by the Corrections Department to try to improve this record. It is encouraging that this year's funding for the President's crime program included expanded resources for new correctional programs in the District of Columbia, including the community correctional centers or halfway houses, some of which I toured last fall. We need greater public understanding of the importance of corrections in increasing our safety, and more serious consideration by the Congress of ways to upgrade the system. I hope the Star editorial will provoke some of the thoughtful discussion we need. It follows:

[From the Washington (D.C.) Star, Jan. 11, 1970]

#### PRISON'S ROLE: TO SALVAGE, NOT BURY

The most discouraging of Washington's maze of spiralling crime statistics is this: Of the thousands of felons who serve time in the District prison complex at Lorton, Va., some 60 percent will resume a life of crime on their release—many to turn up again in due course at Lorton.

And at the Women's Detention Center on North Capitol Street, one recent returnee wearily told a Star reporter that she had encountered almost precisely the same faces she had left 11 months before. "I hate to make the picture perfect," she said, "by adding my own."

These are not isolated examples of criminal recidivism, unique to Washington. They illustrate a dismal truth: That the familiar word used to describe prison facilities in this country—institutions of "correction," with the implication that they salvage large numbers of inmates for more productive lives—is in most instances, a misnomer.

For if the term "correction" implies anything in this usage, it is that an earnest, comprehensive effort is being made by prison authorities and by communities-at-large to equip inmates with new job skills, to help them gain greater confidence in their own worth, and to provide them, both in and out of prison, with continuing coordinated forms of aid. Actually, where such programs exist, they very seldom meet all these criteria.

To his credit, the District's director of corrections, Kenneth L. Hardy, is committed to these concepts of human retrieval. During his few years in office, moreover, we think some encouraging advances have been made. But the fight for effective rehabilitation still is uphill. The programs remain imperfect. In fact, even the substantial potential rewards to the community, in terms of reduced crime and fewer taxpayer dollars spent, remain largely unrecognized.

President Nixon's voluminous 1969 package of District anticrime legislation, for example, which leaned heavily on vital improvements in court, police and juvenile needs, virtually ignored the role of corrections. And in responding to the President's specific requests, the Senate has passed four District anticrime bills which likewise avoided the subject.

But Hardy's sharpest setback ironically came not from being ignored, but from a surfeit of attention from a House District subcommittee chaired by Representative John Dowdy of Texas.

In the weeks preceding Congress' recess for Christmas, this little band of legislators, dominated by southern conservatives, went after the D.C. corrections systems in general, and its Negro director in particular, with a fervor unusual even among Capitol Hill investigators.

In substance, the inquiry ranged over dozens of criticisms of Hardy's administrative policies and practices—many passed along

by prison guards to their own Northern Virginia congressmen. The most significant of the complaints, for our purposes of discussion here, accused Hardy of coddling prisoners, of allowing too much "permissiveness." In the course of the inquiry, furthermore, Hardy was subjected to a series of harassments and indignities so flagrant that they could have had no purpose other than to humiliate the man and make him an object of public ridicule.

This is not to say that the District correction facilities are faultless, or that the Dowdy subcommittee failed to find some valid points of criticism. Nor are we arguing that Kenneth Hardy is the world's best prison administrator.

But we are saying, first, that the manner of Hardy's persecution—as detailed at length in *The Star's* news columns—was an outrageous abuse of congressional power. And we are saying also that some members were on the weakest possible ground in suggesting that Hardy might do better to substitute Chairman Dowdy's theories of penal administration for his own.

The true depth of their difference was plainly disclosed in a single brief colloquy. Dowdy's at one stage, had commented that a treatment of prisoners which he considered too lax was inconsistent with the fact that, after all, inmates had been sent to the Lorton prison "for punishment." Hardy replied that the prisoners had not, in fact, been placed in his care for punishment, but as punishment.

The distinction is what much of the fight is really all about, and it is one which ought to be more widely recognized. Dowdy hardly is alone in his views. Indeed, the concept of prisons merely as human storage bins for creatures too dangerous to be cut loose is centuries old. We suspect that a large percentage of the American people has not bothered to look very far beyond that point today. And this is, of course, what gives the Dowdy-Hardy split a vital significance. For if one thing about the anticrime war seems eminently clear to us, it is that little permanent progress will be made until a good many more people place a higher priority on rehabilitating criminals.

This is not to suggest that the most effective rehabilitation operation imaginable will salvage every criminal. But that is quite a pointless consideration in the debate over what now is to be done.

The Dowdy hearings focused principally on a bill sponsored by Representative Scott of Virginia to turn the District corrections department over to the U.S. Bureau of Prisons—an idea which, in fact, has considerable superficial appeal. Since the presumption is that the federal system now is moving toward more enlightened forms of rehabilitation, it may be argued that this could be one means by which the District, so heavily strapped for cash already, might avoid a considerable expense.

But there seems to us little beyond this fiscal consideration to recommend the bill. Hardy contends the fatal flaw in the proposition is that effective rehabilitation is so intimately entwined with community and local governmental programs that a total separation from municipal control would be disastrous. We think that is right. Hardy pleads, also rightly, for more public understanding of what already is being done.

On the sensible theory that rehabilitation is apt to be more effective and less costly outside prison walls than within, for example, the department now is involved with eight halfway houses, which encourage prisoners to work their way gradually back into the community. During the 1969 fiscal year, only about 9 percent of the department's budget was allocated to such community-based facilities. The plan in the 1971 fiscal year is to boost this level beyond 26 percent—consid-

erably above that in most other systems in the country.

Hardy also has made a major effort to substitute, for prison make-work projects, job training which is more relevant to civil employment. At Lorton, courses in data processing and mechanical drafting are among those recently added; funds are being sought for 10 more vocational shops. There is a new Lorton college, with 75 enrolled freshmen. On the drawing boards is a less formal "university of the streets," designed to give post-high school training to potential community leaders.

According to Stuart Adams, the department's research chief, a new methadone project is the first such prison-based antidrug addiction program to be launched. And for the first time here, a determined effort now is under way to measure the practical effectiveness of this whole broadening spectrum of rehabilitation.

These things are a start. Greater cooperation is needed everywhere, most especially, perhaps, within the community itself. Those who doubt the efficacy of the efforts, or who resist the idea of community-based rehabilitation for prisoners, should at least examine the failures of the present system. For the fact so often overlooked is that the prisoner in any event, sooner or later, does return to the streets. The issue is his condition when he returns.

Hardy, in one congressional appearance, said he didn't want "to bury," without hope for the future, even "one person in that jail system." That is a tall order—too tall to fulfill. But it is a proper goal toward which to strive.

#### CHRISTMAS IN VIETNAM

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

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, for the third year in a row, gifts obtained through contributions to the Christmas in Vietnam project were transported from Capitol Hill to servicemen in Vietnam.

This was due to the very able coordination of Mrs. Evelyn Pail, of my staff, who originated the project 3 years ago and has carried it through successfully each year since then, and to the many other Capitol Hill volunteers who worked so diligently.

These included the elves, usually one girl from each floor of each office building who accompanied Santa Claus on his collection rounds; purchasers of gifts, and wrappers, who assembled the items once they had been purchased.

Santa came to us in the person of Joe Dougherty, a Capitol Hill policeman, who visited every office on both sides of the Hill, calling attention of the Congressmen and their staffs to the objectives of the project. This year, the focus was on monetary contributions, with the final total amounting to \$3,100, and the purchasing was divided into several categories: sporting equipment, \$500, which included boxing gloves, football, baseball and basketball equipment, dart boards, and chess sets; utilitarian items \$450, such as shaving cream, soap, Kodak film and mailers, transistor batteries, sewing kits, and so forth; recreational items, \$640, including Christmas trees, card games, paint-by-the-number sets, jigsaw puzzles, playing cards, pocket

games, and so forth, and food items \$1,510, which included hams, cheeses, fruit-cakes, nuts, lemonade, ice tea, and chocolate flavoring to enhance the taste of the water, potted meat, crackers, Life Savers, chewing gum, hard candy, and so forth.

Individual gifts consisting of about seven items were assembled from this collection in the Agriculture Committee room and placed in plastic bags, tied together with a red ribbon and candy cane. Approximately 20 of these packages were assembled in packing boxes along with a canned ham, cheese, and a fruit cake—with the boxes totaling 140. A special debt of gratitude for this task goes to George Misselbach, GPO representative on the Agriculture Committee staff, who singlehandedly accomplished most of the packing effort. The boxes sent included 18 for the hospitals, consisting mostly of games and other recreational items, and 29 Christmas trees with all the trimmings, also addressed to the hospitals.

These boxes were carried by Bekins Van Lines free of charge to Dulles Airport on December 19, where American and Pan American Airlines picked them up on December 20 and transported them without charge to Vietnam. These accommodations were arranged this year by Jeff Sconyers of Senator SPARKMAN's staff. Without his service, the project might well have been impossible.

Other special debts of gratitude go to Jean Morrow, of Representative McCLORY's office, and Philip Aylward, of Representative HANLEY's staff, who spent much time and effort in purchasing many of the items; to Army Diamond, of Representative CLAUSEN's office; and Clara Posey, of Representative RHODES' office who were able to secure sports equipment and fruit cakes at considerable discount; to Grace Hussie and Barb Lissie, of Senator SCOTT's office, who organized the collection effort on the Senate side; to Dorothy Bork, of Representative MIZE's office, who secured all the necessary packing items from the folding room; to Pat Wichser, of Senator PERCY's office, for preparing letters to the units receiving gifts; to members of the nearby naval air facility who helped with the final packaging for overseas shipment; and to other members of my own staff—Madelyn Evans, Vickie Torbeck, and Marijo Gorney—who devoted considerable effort to the project.

Our very special thanks goes, of course, to all Congressmen, Senators, and their staffs, whose generous donations made this year's project the most successful of all.

I am including the text of a telegram from Creighton Abrams, commanding general of American Forces in Vietnam; and also letters from individual recipient units of the gifts, expressing their appreciation:

On behalf of the United States Military Assistance Command, Vietnam, I express to you and the members of the Congress of the United States our thanks and deep appreciation for the generous donation of gifts to the servicemen and women here in Vietnam.

These gifts have been distributed to the

members of our Armed Forces throughout the Republic of Vietnam.

May I wish you a happy and rewarding New Year.

Sincerely,

GEN. CREIGHTON W. ABRAMS.

I'd like to take this opportunity to say thank you for changing the entire mood of Christmas 1969 for the people in the Seventh Air Force Directorate of Information.

As you can imagine our spirits were somewhat low on Christmas Eve spending Christmas some 10,000 miles away from our families. For many of our younger troops it was their first Christmas away from home.

When our boss, Lieutenant Colonel Ellis C. Stewart Jr., returned from the mall room with the huge load of "Christmas" from the Congressional Staff, the entire office staff suddenly had a somewhat different attitude towards Christmas.

It's certainly comforting to know that there's so many good people at home who really care about us over here. Again, thank you and all the people who helped make our Christmas a little brighter.

Sincerely,

M. Sgt. HERBERT W. VAUGHN,  
Combat News Division.

On behalf of our Commanding General, allow me to express our sincere appreciation for the gifts which you sent to the men of the 25th Division. These gifts have been distributed to our wounded servicemen in hospitals throughout our area.

Thank you for your help and best wishes for this holiday season.

Maj. F. D. BANGASSER,  
Assistant Adjutant General.

I wanted to write sooner to let you know that I think it was very thoughtful of Members of Congress and their office staffs and the volunteers to take time out to think of sending gifts to the men over here. I know it took a lot of time and money to do it but it helps the spirit of the men to get something no matter how small it is. It's knowing that some one cares enough to do things for him.

Thanks from all of us to all of you.  
Pfc. DAVID A. MEISENHEIMER.

#### BROADCAST NETWORK NEWS ANALYSIS

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

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, to say that Vice President SPIRO AGNEW's November speech, calling attention to the lack of balance in broadcast network news analysis, has received favorable response, is an understatement of both years—1969 and 1970.

The Vice President's candid and forthright appraisal of the lack of perspective by a handful of eastern-based commentators, was long overdue.

To back up this contention, I offer as evidence a group of editorials that have appeared in Missouri newspapers relative to the Vice President's remarks made in Des Moines, Iowa, on Thursday, November 13, 1969:

[From the Joplin (Mo.) Globe, Nov. 18, 1969]

##### TV'S IMMATURITY

Springing from public charges of bias, the television industry's current self-appraisal of its ability to present balanced news coverage is long overdue.

Vice President Agnew's haymaker tirade on TV commentators, needed to be said. The Veep of late has fearlessly voiced a number of observations on various topics that needed to be aired. Television's method of news handling and post-Presidential speechmaking comment, was the bulls-eye Mr. Agnew hit squarely. But still debatable is whether the tube's difficulties evolve mostly from purposeful intent, or apprenticeship-like mistakes.

Now, TV executives reportedly are concerned that they evidently have misread the preference of American viewer majority. In striving apparently to ferret out the most on-spot "newsworthy" views on certain events and subjects, they have overemphasized the irrelevant and lent tacit approval to the generally disdained.

Yet this may be unfair to the relative newcomer media to the journalism scene. After all newspapers, journals and magazines have been around for a long time. Television is in its infancy. The sad fact is in so many respects television seems perfectly content to wear journalistic diapers. Herein might be the trouble that the media has encountered running counter to the true tastes and desires of their public, whose delayed reactions now are being made known.

Television's advantages of entertainment are undeniable. Their influence on public opinion, especially that formed by people whose main news source is TV, is equally undeniable. There admittedly are flashes of communications near-brilliance on the television screen, such as chronicling space achievements.

But to the seasoned, experienced newspaper and magazine editors and reporters, some of whom by the way certainly are not completely blameless of bias either, the journalistic endeavors of television generally are at best mediocre. And with mediocrity the opportunities are greater for bias, news slanting and over-glamorizing the unglamorous intentionally or otherwise.

Possibly time will correct TV's journalistic shortcomings and ball-fumbblings. The industry may learn by doing but it never will profit by wrongdoing. Then, too, as we say it might merely be a case of growing up, a matter of graduating from puberty to newsmanship adulthood. We shall see.

[From the Hannibal (Mo.) Courier-Post]

##### VICE PRESIDENT AGNEW

Vice President Spiro Agnew is fast becoming one of the most colorful political figures of the past several years.

His sharp tongue, backed by a Funk and Wagnall's vocabulary, is getting more and more space in the news media.

One national news magazine referred to him as "mighty mouth," and although snide, the description is not entirely uncomplimentary.

The average American seems to have taken Agnew as his champion.

Within a few hours after his speech attacking biased television news reports, stations across the country were being bombarded with phone calls in support of what the Vice President said.

And newspapers are getting letters to the editor praising Agnew.

Agnew probably reminds people a little of Harry Truman, the Missouri mule, who had some interesting battles with newsmen and who also had a penchant for saying what he thought in an unequivocal way.

Ignoring partisan politics, the major difference between Agnew and Truman is that Agnew's language is highly literate, while Truman's is earthy.

Both are devastatingly precise.

It's nice to see that "give 'em hell" is not a lost art in American politics.

Unfortunately, most of you will not have access to the entire Agnew speech on tele-

vision news. It is an intelligent, though parochial, criticism.

Here are some excerpts. . .

"Every American has a right to disagree with the president of the United States and to express publicly that disagreement. But the President has a right to communicate directly with the people who elected him and the people of this country have the right to make up their own opinions without having the President's words and thoughts characterized through the prejudices of hostile critics before they can even be digested." Here Agnew was speaking of the instant analysis by television commentators immediately following President Richard Nixon's Vietnam address.

"In the networks' endless pursuit of controversy, we should ask what is the end value . . . to enlighten or to profit? What is the end result . . . to inform or to confuse? How does the on-going exploration for more action, more excitement, more drama, serve our national search for internal peace and stability?"

"Bad news drives out the good. The irrational is more controversial than the rational. Concurrence can no longer compete with dissent. One minute of Eldridge Cleaver is worth 10 minutes of Roy Wilkins. The labor crisis settled at the negotiation table is nothing compared to the confrontation that results in a strike—or, better yet, violence along the picket line. Normality has become the nemesis of the evening news."

"What has this passionate pursuit of controversy done to the politics of progress through logical compromise, essential to the functioning of a democratic society?"

"And the people of America are challenged, too . . . challenged to press for responsible news presentations. This is one case where the people must defend themselves . . . where the citizen—not government—must be the reformer . . . where the consumer can be the most effective crusader."

[From the Columbia (Mo.) Daily Tribune, Nov. 18, 1969]

##### AGNEW'S SPEECH ON TV NEWS

It is certainly legitimate for a public official to comment on the way the television networks cover the news, but there is no excuse whatsoever for him to accompany such discussion with veiled threats of government intervention.

We are referring, of course, to Vice-President Agnew's now famous speech in Des Moines in which he criticized television news, and to the subsequent commentary it engendered.

In discussing this sensitive subject, it is necessary to tip-toe the tenuous route between legitimate comment and the threat of dangerous government control.

In Agnew's speech, his allegation about objectivity is certainly a legitimate commentary. He is entitled to his opinion. But the grave danger surrounding all of this is the fact that he is a highly placed government official and it is hard to separate such commentary from the suspicion that he and the administration might like to see their concerns made into something surer, through some sort of official control.

The federal government has a unique hold over the broadcast media because of the Federal Communication Commission's power to allocate airwave frequencies. The challenge of walking the tightrope between this regulation and freedom of the press is a constant one. Whenever the government interprets its job as one of judging news content, a seriously grave danger exists.

Agnew said after his speech that he did not have such control in mind, and we will give him the benefit of the doubt.

But the report Monday that Herb Klein, Nixon's director of communication, had said

the television industry should scrutinize itself or it would "invite the government to come in," is simply too much. The question of the "government coming in" should not even be raised even though the right of government officials to have their say about the quality of news reporting is legitimate.

There is no doubt Agnew is expressing Nixon's feeling in this attack on television, and when the full weight of the Presidency and Vice-Presidency are put into such an enterprise, one wonders how deep the feelings of antagonism must go and what actions they might promote.

We thought Agnew was particularly far off base in one aspect of his critique; the part having to do with the commentaries of newsmen immediately after Nixon's Vietnam speech of November 3. Here was a case in which the public knew full well opinions were being expressed. In every case the discussions were labelled as analysis. Would the Vice-President take away the right of news commentators to comment on something as public as a President's speech? If the comments had all been favorable would Agnew have made his speech?

In addition, his charge that television commentary of that type somehow poisons the public mind is ridiculous. One need look no farther than the same Nixon speech and its aftermath. Despite the considerable questioning of its merits by television commentators, public opinion polls shortly thereafter scored high marks for Nixon's Vietnam policy, a direct measure of public feeling which gives the lie to Agnew's expressed fears.

The Vice-President and the President should go about their business without worrying so much about the press. The people are smart enough to think for themselves. The television news broadcasts are not so powerful and misleading that they will take us down the primrose path like a nation of ninkompoops.

No doubt, every news gathering and disseminating organization should feel a massive responsibility to present the news fairly. No doubt there are times when this job is done better than others. And no doubt newsmen should constantly strive for a better performance in this area.

But in no case is the threat from erratic news coverage as great as that of a public official who would take steps to correct it.

One is freedom and the other is oppression; it's as simple as that.

[From the Warrensburg (Mo.) Daily Star-Journal, Nov. 18, 1969]

#### WHO, WHAT, WHERE, WHEN, AND WHY

No one takes kindly to criticism, despite the fact it may be well-intentioned and objective.

The press is no exception. The recent storm blown up by Vice President Spiro Agnew's assessment of the news media is a case in point.

Usually after an onslaught by so high ranking a public official there is a brief and pointed period of denial and protest followed by a long and blunted period of quiet. Not so in this case.

The television networks are still smarting over the scathing given them by Agnew. Possibly for good cause, and not simply for the more obvious reason that it was criticism.

Agnew posed a question that has long been an integral part of news reporting . . .

"How far can a report go and still remain factual?"

Certainly, there is no pat answer to the question which demands an answer at every level of reporting.

It is a question that can only be answered by the news media itself.

Frequently, almost invariably, reporters

find themselves in possession of facts and/or information relative to a story which may or may not contribute to the accuracy of what is being reported. Just as frequently the reporter and his or her editor is faced with the decision of how much detail to use.

It is not always good reporting to be objective, but it is always bad reporting to be unfair.

The test of the equity of news reporting is not whether each and every aspect of an issue is thoroughly reported, but whether it was reported in context and in its proper proportion.

The Daily Star-Journal and its counterparts have long ago adopted a means by which a dividing line between objective and subjective reporting can be drawn.

We call it an editorial. When we have something to say, over and above the facts essential to an accurate news report, it will be found here, in this column, on this page.

It is clearly labeled as an editorial. Further, we have adopted a similar policy relative to so called "in depth" reporting. It is set aside from routine news columns and identified by a reporter's "by-line".

We try very hard to keep all three separate. We impose our own restrictions . . . not because we seek to avoid criticism, but because we honestly try to be fair.

Yes, we are opposed to government censorship of all news media, flatly, emphatically.

We are not opposed, however, to the self censorship imposed by fair reporting. We would suggest that if the broadcast networks are truly seeking to avoid criticism, both from official sources and from the public, that they look to their own and adopt a firmer policy of "fair reporting."

[From the Mexico (Mo.) Ledger, Nov. 22, 1969]

THE ATTACKS BY THE VICE PRESIDENT Vice President Spiro Agnew is making headlines criticizing the press and television. More power to him.

Fundamental to America is the right of everyone of us to speak up for what we like, and to speak up against what we don't like.

That includes the Vice President. Even more, we think there is a lot of truth in what he has been saying.

One thing he has been saying is that he does not favor government censorship.

We take him at his word. His critics say that because he is Vice President and criticizing television and the press, he is threatening government controls.

We're against government controls. We believe he is. We believe most Americans are. We think his critics are on the wrong line of attack when they hide behind such an accusation.

He says too many network commentators are biased. Are they?

Yes, most of them are. There are a few, rare exceptions, who are not. But a majority of the commentators we hear show too much bias in their so-called news reports.

However, we know of no commentator who can be accused of being pro-Nixon or pro-Agnew. A vast majority are aggressively against Mr. Nixon, Mr. Agnew and a great deal of the present administration.

That is the right of commentators as people to have an opinion. And they have the right to express their bias, their prejudice as long as they do not do it under the guise of news.

In newspapers, there is a place set aside for opinion, bias, prejudice or whatever name you want to use for it. That place is the editorial column—this column—or the column signed by the writer. Thus the reader is forewarned that whatever he reads under Editorials, or in a signed column is the opinion of the editor or the writer.

Television should use the same technique more.

It is honest.

What isn't honest is for television commentators to use their opinion as news when it isn't news. When it is editorial opinion.

What about prejudice soiling the news columns of newspapers—the Vice President now accuses the Washington Post and the New York Times of this sin. Also Newsweek magazine. He should have included Time magazine which is famous for the opinion—prejudice—it puts in its so-called news columns.

There have been times when both The Post, The Times and Newsweek have been guilty, too. Perhaps, there have been too many times. But guilty or not, the Vice President, you, I, all of us, have every right to demand still more from whatever newspaper we read, whatever news magazine we read, whatever television station or network we watch.

Actually, the higher the standards of responsibility demanded by the public, the still higher the standards they'll get from our free press. That's the way it ought to be, that's the way it is.

And none of this changes another overwhelming fact:

The free press of America today is the best it has ever been and also the best in the world today.

[From the Springfield (Mo.) Leader and Press]

#### SPIRO SPEAKS

At the Republican national convention in 1968, where he was nominated for vice president, Spiro Theodore Agnew, then governor of Maryland, acknowledged that his name was not a household word.

Now, a little more than a year later, the name of Spiro Agnew is definitely a household word—and not too nice a word in some households.

How did this self-made middle-brow suburbanite, the son of a Greek immigrant father (the family name originally was Anagnostopoulos) achieve such prominence in such a short time?

Obviously, by speaking what was in his mind, regardless of the possible consequences. By "telling it like it is," say his proponents. By "putting his foot in his mouth at every opportunity," say his detractors.

He has made, no doubt, a considerable number of enemies for himself as well as for the Nixon administration as a result of some of his observations. One of the most widely quoted—"misquoted," the vice president charges—of these was his famous characterization of those who encourage the Vietnam war moratorium as "an effete corps of impudent snobs."

On the other hand, he has also made a very considerable number of friends for himself and the President in some quarters of the nation, notably in the middle west, where demonstrations against the war policy are not one of the more popular outdoor sports.

At any rate, the chances are excellent that Mr. Agnew will continue to speak his mind and let the chips fall where they may. Only President Nixon can stop him, and he shows no indication of wanting to do so.

[From the Jefferson City (Mo.) News-Tribune, Nov. 16, 1969]

#### VICE PRESIDENT AGNEW HITS TV NETWORKS' ACHILLES HEEL

It is one of the great tragedies of our time when the Vice President of the United States has to speak out forcibly against the biased and unbalanced news reporting and commentaries of our three television networks.

We commend Vice President Agnew, a man of perceptiveness and courage, for doing it.

Our readers will recall that it was the Vice President, who also exposed the leaders of the harmful Moratorium anti-war demonstrations.

The Vice President's latest bombshell has been building up in the minds of the viewing public for almost a decade now. Perhaps, the first big spark came when some network commentators were denounced during the 1964 Republican National Convention in California. There have been many other examples since, including the Chicago riots during which the TV cameras focused on the so-called brutality of police but ignored the confrontation, stone-throwing, etc., of the radicals. The sniping at President Nixon's Vietnam speech by commentators and most recently the contrasting coverage of the Communist-saturated Moratorium Day movement and Veterans Day ceremonies, are other examples.

Some of the network documentaries also have reeked with Communist propaganda.

Mr. Agnew's speech at Des Moines was a measured, documented one, which ought to alert all Americans. For as the Vice President noted the networks hold an unprecedented concentration of power over American public opinion.

If Mr. Agnew wanted to completely document his case, he would be still talking now. He did point to several cases, including the self-appointed commentator "experts" who immediately criticized Mr. Nixon's speech, one which he had given time, talent and the best intelligence estimates of this country.

Moreover, most TV news program viewers, we believe, know they are receiving neatly "packaged" news reports blended to the left with confrontation, violence among their principal ingredients every evening. They are not balanced, unbiased news reports.

There are some obvious, although condemnable, reasons for this. For the networks' commentators and producers are in the main in the liberal or left-wing spectrum. The networks also resort to a sensational-type of reporting because of keen competition. All three have their eyes on Neilsen and other ratings.

The response to Mr. Agnew's speech is highly in his favor—about three to one. In some areas, the support was almost 100 per cent. Moreover, Dean Burch, chairman of the Federal Communications Commission, strongly endorsed the speech. The FCC has received numerous complaints against the networks.

It is quite evident that Mr. Agnew also drew blood in the TV networks' hierarchy. Presidents of CBS, NBC and ABC came running in defense as if a fire alarm had rung.

Dr. Frank Stanton, CBS president, charged the Vice President was trying to intimidate the electronic news medium, which he says depends for its existence upon government licenses. Mr. Stanton is pretty much off base. Local stations must be licensed. But the networks, including CBS, have virtually a free hand. Moreover, we think the networks try at times to intimidate the government and even the people. Their coverage of racial and other issues is a good example.

Vice President Agnew's condemnation is not news to the TV networks. For as Edith Efron suggests in the Sept. 27 issue of TV Guide the networks have known and discussed the growing disdain the public has for their biased, sensationalized reporting. Some officials acknowledge their errors. Obviously, key ones don't and won't.

Contrary to the laments of some network officials, Mr. Agnew did not suggest censorship. Rather, he placed the main responsibility on the networks to correct their erring ways and on the public to let their voice be heard.

In the final analysis, the airways belong to the people and the networks must be re-

sponsible to the views of all the people of this nation. However, we don't think the networks will change easily.

Therefore, we strongly urge the public to begin a strong movement against biased national television network reporting by sending letters in support of President Agnew to local TV outlets for forwarding to the TV network headquarters. We hope the letters, telegrams and telephone calls become a flood which will convince the network moguls that the American public wants responsible, balanced and fair news reporting, commentaries and documentaries.

[From the Lamar (Mo.) Daily Democrat]  
VICE PRESIDENT AGNEW

The television network brass, in responding to the accusations leveled at them by Vice President Spiro Agnew, apparently believed that they were letting the viewing public in on a dark secret, when they made much of the fact that the speech had been prepared at the White House, and that President Nixon knew all about its content ahead of time. This was of course no news to anyone except the most politically naive. Almost everyone would understand that a vice president doesn't roam around the country making speeches of which his chief knows nothing. This was another sample of the cavalier opinion the network officials entertain of their viewing public. First they slant the news in the belief that they can mould public opinion to their own way of thinking. Then they believe that the public hasn't got enough sense to realize that a vice president speaks for the administration. It is true that there are many television viewers as gullible as the brass believes. But there is a sufficient number, not so naive, as the networks are beginning to find out to severely shake them up.

[From the Macon (Mo.) Chronicle-Herald,  
Nov. 15, 1969]

IT SEEMS TO B.

(By Frank P. Briggs)

Vice president Agnew may not be too diplomatic in some of his speeches but in my corner he was as right as rain Friday night when he charged the large news media with a lion's share of the blame for the unrest "rampant" in the nation.

I have said before that if the news media would cease, stop and forget the lavish publicity some of the marches and the riots get, that they'd become unpopular overnight.

It is admitted that a small percentage of the young people are "mixed up" in these ads but this small majority gets more publicity than all the good students get for their deeds of accomplishment. Where's the "one-man one vote" idea in this publicity?

I know that the unusual is news. I know that people want to read of unusual events and care little about the regular run of the mill happenings. But there's a stopping place somewhere in these publicity seeking outrages and I believe, with the Vice President, that we've reached, if not in truth passed that point.

We, of the press, gloat in freedom of the press along with freedom of speech and freedom of worship, but if any of the freedoms are abused they can be withdrawn just as they were accorded. It's time for all of us, big, little old and young, in the news business, to take stock of ourselves and see whether we are on the right—or the wrong—track.

[From the Kennett (Mo.) Daily Democrat]  
MR. AGNEW'S TV CRITICISM

When a representative of this newspaper returned from the 1968 Democratic National Convention in Chicago, The Daily Democrat

commented at great length about the news distortions of the three national television networks. We were critical of the outright distortion of what occurred in Chicago, for we came to realize that many of our readers, exposed to the convention only through the comments of so-called television commentators, possessed a distorted view of the attempted hippie-yippie take-over of the convention and the alleged police brutality that seemingly occurred without provocation.

All of this comment leads to still another comment, this one made by the Vice-President of the United States, Spiro T. Agnew, whose recent speech in Des Moines, Ia., has sent TV network officials and ultra-liberals on the warpath. The Vice-President said that perhaps the time has come for the networks to be "made more responsive to the views of the nation."

Mr. Agnew was distressed, it turned out, over the comments made by TV commentators after President Nixon's much-heralded but nothing-new speech on Vietnam earlier this month. That speech, which didn't exactly win many plaudits—although The Daily Democrat seemed to like it better than most—was rather severely criticized by the commentators who were on hand in television studios to add their generalized observations, some of which were helpful and most of which were verbal platitudes.

When Mr. Agnew suggested that perhaps the television industry might give a little thought to news balance, or at least to commentator balance, he was treading on tender and dangerous ground. Dr. Frank Stanton, the head of CBS, promptly declared that Agnew's suggestion was an "unprecedented attempt by the Vice-President of the United States to intimidate a news medium which depends for its existence upon government licenses." Some believed that Agnew was flicking the whip of possible government repression should the networks and affiliated stations not behave as he wishes them to; others doubt that he had anything like this in mind. It's hard to tell what Mr. Agnew really did mean, and we're not about to put words in his mouth. He's perfectly capable of doing that, all by himself with the aid of his speech-writers.

But we do concur in at least part of his view that television networks, like newspapers, can distort the news, can give only one side of the news, can direct the news so that it gives an impression that is erroneous. To insist that this is not done would be foolish; to insist that it should not happen again is like demanding of a physician that no one be permitted to die.

The U.S. Supreme Court ruled recently that the television industry does not come under the provisions of the freedom-of-the-press protection of the federal Constitution. The basis for this decision was that airways belong to the public, and that regulation of these airways is a proper prerogative of the government. This may be a regrettable decision, as far as TV objectivity is concerned, but it does reflect logic.

Just how the networks can obtain objectivity while not possessing the responsibility of freedom-of-the-press is difficult to imagine. This, in our opinion, is the larger question raised by the Vice-President. Mr. Agnew doesn't have the reputation of implication; what he means he usually says, even if it's wrong. To see him now as a bogey-man of the "independence" of the television networks to misrepresent facts is simply calling upon spectres that don't exist.

There are legitimate grounds for criticism of network reporting; there are also legitimate grounds for criticism of network pontification of the news, and we suggest that it is in this latter category that Mr. Agnew's criticism best fits.

[From the Rolla (Mo.) Daily News]  
**MR. EXECUTIVE VICE PRESIDENT AGNEW SPEAKS UP FOR AMERICA**  
 (By Edward W. Sowers)

The man looked kinda big and sorta fatty-soft as he walked into the big news conference room on Miami Beach. I had never seen him before or heard of him. Nor had some veteran Washington and New York correspondents. That made him truly a man relatively unknown. The other man on the stage was Richard M. Nixon, nominee for President.

"This is Ted Agnew, my choice as running-mate for vice-president", Nixon said, as Herb Klein, his press aide, handed correspondents hastily-prepared biographies of Agnew.

"I intend that Ted Agnew will be a working vice-president—I'll give him plenty to do, particularly in the cities and away from Washington", the confident Nixon said.

That happened a little over a year ago. That much of Nixon's promises has, indeed, come true. Spiro (or Ted, as Nixon calls him), Agnew has become more like an "executive vice-president" in a big corporation than like a figureheaded vice-president which has so often been the case in U.S. history.

Mr. Executive Vice-President Agnew (the way I shall address him if I ever get the chance) is beginning to speak up for "that great silent majority" of Americans. We are led to believe from sources close to the President that Agnew does, indeed, reflect the President's views as well as his own.

First, in New Orleans, Agnew blunted the so-called "moratorium" movement when he characterized its leadership, variously, as "intellectual snobs", "communist-oriented anarchists" and "some well-intentioned citizens misled by that type of leadership". Then, at Des Moines, he got at the root of the problem when he lashed out at television's unbalanced coverage and hasty analysis of the news.

"A small group of men", said Agnew, "numbering no more than a dozen anchor-men . . . settle upon the film and commentary that is to reach the public. . . . Such vast and unchecked power in the hands of a small and unelected elite has served to distort traditional rhythms of normality—our national search for internal peace and stability".

As one engaged for over 40 years in the business of news coverage and interpretation—but not included in Agnew's "unelected elite"—I have long been concerned with what Agnew is now spotlighting so forcefully. I start out day-after-day taking in the "Today" show with my breakfast, for example, and find I cannot digest either the show or my breakfast when I witness Hugh Downs, the "host" presenting the prejudiced commentators immediately after Frank Blair has given a reasonable summary of straight news. It irks and frustrates me no end to see and hear Mrs. Norman Vincent Peale for three minutes and Mrs. Coretta King 30 minutes rebuttal. It is maddening when Bill Graham gets five minutes (and even the president or vice-president no longer time) when a dirty, long- or bushy-haired Carmichael or some smelly, despicable anarchist get 15 minutes as prime time to shout or demonstrate before the cameras with their equally obnoxious followers. Then, on comes the "panel of experts" to cut to pieces the well-thought-out words of our President, our Vice-President, Senators, Congressmen and other authoritative leaders.

When television "editors" (and newspaper and magazine editors, too) present the news and comment in such poor balance, no wonder it confuses the public and tends to lead our system of democracy into a system of "echlocracy" or "government by the mob—mobocracy," as the dictionary defines the term.

A couple of years ago I got the opportunity for an "eyeball-to-eyeball" confrontation with Hugh Downs on this subject of "mobocracy" (when Downs came to M. U. to receive a journalism medal which I would never have approved). I asked Downs why he persisted in presenting so much violence and anarchistic dissent and so little worthwhile citizenship.

He said, "I am seeking justice without violence, but, if necessary, justice with violence".

I quoted him on that statement and sent NBC a copy, and have heard no more about it. More recently, I asked Downs' associate, Frank McGee, why Downs (and the people who arrange his programs) contribute to "mobocracy" with such programs. His answer may provide a key to much that is wrong with television's influence upon our nation.

"Downs is a showman, not a newsmen", said McGee. So, perhaps much of what we see as news and commentary on the news—and the resultant "mobocracy" is showmanship and entertainment.

So, as Agnew says, it is up to television—and newspaper—editors, and to the public—not the government with some kind of censorship—to recognize the cancerous evil of the "mobocracy" they are creating, and take steps to eliminate it with honest, truthful, balanced presentation and interpretation of the news.

**VETO OF HEW APPROPRIATIONS BILL**

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

Mr. ECKHARDT. Mr. Speaker, President Nixon's threatened veto of the HEW appropriations bill flies in the face of the wishes of the American people as well as the official conclusions of the Congress. By way of illustration, I would like to quote from Life magazine's August 15, 1969, presentation of a Louis Harris poll on Federal spending priorities:

The most ominous aspect of the public's unhappiness over the economy is not simply that two-thirds of all those polled feel taxes are "unreasonable." This is up 15% in a decade, but most people always feel taxes are unreasonable no matter what their level. The more disturbing factor is the public loss of faith in the government's judgment about priorities. In Harris' words, "the central motive for paying taxes has begun to disintegrate." As the table below shows, people's traditional dislike for foreign aid programs is now followed closely by their opposition to Vietnam spending, the space program and defense costs in general. By contrast, their spending priorities are all oriented toward domestic programs, with aid to education and various aspects of urban aid the new choice causes.

Where to cut federal spending first:

	Percent
Foreign aid.....	69
Vietnam .....	64
Space program.....	51
Federal welfare.....	37
Other defense spending.....	26
Farm subsidies.....	24

Where to cut federal spending last:

	Percent
Aid to education.....	60
Pollution control.....	38
Federal poverty program.....	34
Federal aid to cities.....	26
Federal highway financing.....	24

The President seeks to defraud the American people when he says that he must veto the HEW appropriations bill because of its inflationary impact, for this is the same President whose own budget requests for fiscal 1970 have been cut by over \$5 billion by this Congress. We cannot let him deny the American people desperately needed funding in the critical areas of health and education.

**ISRAEL**

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

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, I am today joining my colleague, Congressman CLAUDE PEPPER, and a number of other Members of the House in sponsoring a joint concurrent resolution in behalf of fair and just cooperation on the part of our State Department with the free democracy of Israel. A great number of our Members are very much alarmed over the statement made by Secretary of State William P. Rogers, that the American-Jewish leaders approve of the administration's position pertaining to Israel and its Arab enemies. I received much criticism by mail, and from articles in the newspapers. I am satisfied that the attitude of the State Department, as related by Secretary Rogers, does not meet with Prime Minister Golda Meir's approval nor with the American Jewish leaders who have been supporting and working for the future of Israel's freedom and independence. The Soviets are making every effort to create further dissention in the Middle East and are constantly working toward the impeding of Israel's self-government and progress.

The newspapers also record that David Rockefeller, president of one of New York's largest banks, and some of his associates have made visits to the Middle East and conferred with Egypt's President Nasser and Jordan's King Hussein. Upon his return to this country, Rockefeller took advantage of a visit to the White House to report on his talk with Middle East leaders. He is reported to have urged the President to avoid offending President Nasser and some of his associates who have such power over huge oil reserves under their domain.

It is also reported that the Nixon administration has propounded and submitted to Moscow, London, and Paris a series of proposals to pacify the Middle East without any prior consultation with Israel. Everybody wants peace in the Middle East, including Israel and the attitude of our Government to make deals and agreements with the Soviet and Arab leaders without consulting directly with the Israeli leaders is beyond comprehension. This performance of our State Department, leaning toward a one-sided negotiation must bring joy to the leaders of the Soviet Union. Israel has already won great victories in her fight for independent government and democracy and our Nation should insist that there be no one-sided move on the part of

her enemies. The free world, I do not sacrifice Israel to the greed of powerful think, will tolerate any move that might and rich neighbors who would destroy the only true democracy in the Middle East.

Mr. Speaker, I am hereby incorporating with my remarks a copy of the concurrent resolution filed by our colleague, Congressman CLAUDE PEPPER, and of which I am one of the sponsors:

H. CON. RES. 479

Whereas, deep concern has been aroused by the statement of the Secretary of State of the United States of December 9th, making certain proposals for peace in the Middle East between the State of Israel and the Arab States, and

Whereas, such statement of the Secretary of State has been understood as contrary to the previous policy of the United States in the Middle East and to the expressed sentiment of approximately two-thirds of the Senate and the House of Representatives; Now, therefore be it

*Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring),* That it is the sense of the Congress that the policy of the United States for the promotion of peace in the Middle East should be to exert its best efforts to arrange for direct face-to-face negotiations between the State of Israel and the Arab States; and, further, that neither the United States nor any other power should attempt to impose a settlement in the Middle East nor attempt to induce a settlement other than through direct face-to-face negotiations between the State of Israel and the Arab States.

#### DEMOCRATIC CAUCUS ADOPTS RESOLUTION PROPOSING HIGH INTEREST RATES

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

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, today the Democratic caucus of the House adopted unanimously a resolution firmly establishing the Democratic Party's position against high interest rates and urging action to correct the monetary mismanagement of the Nixon administration.

Mr. Speaker, I hope that the appropriate committees and the Members of this House will follow up this resolution with concrete action during this second session to bring economic relief for the American people who are sorely pressed by the highest interest rates in the history of this Nation. It will take action by this Congress because it is apparent that the Nixon administration will do nothing.

The Nixon administration has embarked on the same old discredited course of high interest rates and tight money followed by the two preceding Republican administrations headed by President Hoover and President Eisenhower. The Republicans never learn, they just keep plodding along allowing the banking and big business community to make the real decisions in the economy. The people who profit most from high interest rates are calling the shots on monetary policy in this administration.

Mr. Speaker, I place in the RECORD a copy of the resolution adopted by the Democratic caucus this morning:

Whereas, a decade ago, the Democratic Party stated:

"As the first step in speeding economic growth, a Democratic President will put an end to the present high-interest, tight money policy.

"This policy has failed in its stated purpose—to keep prices down. It has given us two recessions within 5 years, bankrupted many of our farmers, produced a record number of business failures, and added billions of dollars in unnecessary higher interest charges to Government budgets and the cost of living";

Whereas, this policy of low interest and plentiful credit has been a mainstay of the Democratic Party throughout its modern history; and

Whereas, interest rates have skyrocketed to their highest levels in history, crushing the housing market, blocking school construction, water and sewage facilities and the revitalization of our urban and rural communities, and creating unemployment and inflation; and

Whereas, these high interest rates have placed a heavy burden on the low and middle income family; and

Whereas, these high interest rates have gone hand in hand with high prices; be it therefore

*Resolved,* That the Democratic Caucus of the House of Representatives reaffirms the Democratic Party's support of policies and programs to bring about reasonable interest rates and adequate credit; and be it further

*Resolved,* That the Democratic Caucus urges the appropriate Committees of the House, in lieu of leadership from the Executive Branch, to draft a specific program to combat high interest rates and to bring about a more equitable and effective monetary policy for the Nation; and be it further

*Resolved,* That the Members of the Democratic caucus use every means at their command to explain to the American people the causes and the results of the high interest, tight money policies of the Nixon Administration.

As the Members will note, this resolution calls for the appropriate committees of Congress to take action to bring down interest rates. Mr. Speaker, the Banking and Currency Committee will move immediately to follow up the letter and the spirit of this resolution. We will schedule early hearings to seek alternative means of financing housing for the millions of Americans who have been priced out of decent homes by the Nixon administration and the Federal Reserve System. We will seek alternatives to the 9-percent interest rates imposed by the Republican Secretary of Housing and Urban Development, George Romney. We are preparing these hearings right now.

We also will move early in this session on H.R. 11, a bill designed to reform the Federal Reserve System and to coordinate its policies with the broad economic goals of the Nation. This legislation would make the Federal Reserve System responsive to the elected representatives of the people rather than to the banking community which stands to profit from most of the decisions of the Federal Reserve System.

Also, Mr. Speaker, I want to call attention to the fact that this Congress in the closing days of the first session passed legislation which gave the President of the United States adequate and broad powers to control excessive use of credit in inflationary areas of the economy and to control interest rates on that

credit. The President has not used that power and we have seen new actions by administration officials to force up interest rates.

The President should use his powers and should come to Congress if he needs additional tools with which to fight inflation and high interest rates. It is apparent that he is reluctant to take on his friends in the banking and business communities. Until this administration is willing to disturb its banker friends, we will continue to suffer from inflation and high interest rates.

Mr. Speaker, the resolution adopted by the Democrats today can be fairly regarded as the first shot in the 1970 campaign. The country has waited 12 long months for the Nixon administration to do something about high interest rates. Instead, the Nixon administration has allowed interest rates to rise further and faster in a single year than in any previous year in the history of the United States.

The Republicans are refusing to protect the people; the Democrats must now go out and make a crusade on this issue and protect the American public from usurious interest rates.

Mr. Speaker, a great number of people deserve credit for bringing this issue so forcibly before the Democratic caucus. Last August 13, nine members of the Democratic caucus, including myself, were named to study the growing problem of high interest rates.

The interest rate committee appointed by the caucus includes EDWARD BOLAND, of Massachusetts; THOMAS L. ASHLEY, of Ohio; Mrs. EDITH GREEN, of Oregon; JIM WRIGHT, of Texas; ROBERT G. STEPHENS, JR., of Georgia; JAMES M. HANLEY, of New York; SIDNEY R. YATES, of Illinois; and WILLIAM "BILL" CLAY, of Missouri. All of these Members participated in bringing this issue before the caucus.

Also, I want to commend the great leadership of Speaker McCORMACK, Majority Leader CARL ALBERT, Majority Whip HALE BOGGS, Chairman RAY MADDEN, of the steering committee, and the chairman of the caucus, Mr. DAN ROSTENKOWSKI, for their support and counsel on this issue.

#### CRAMER, AUTHOR OF THE ANTI-BUSING AMENDMENT TO THE 1964 CIVIL RIGHTS ACT, PROPOSES CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENT TO OUTLAW BUSING AND INVOLUNTARY TRANSFER OF STUDENTS

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

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Speaker, due to the justifiable public protest, particularly in view of the February 1 deadline ruling of the Supreme Court, over the unwarranted and statutorily prohibited intrusion of the Federal Government in our local school systems, I feel constrained to propose the most meaningful long-range step left to the American people, the passage of a constitutional amendment, which the Court as well as the executive branch must follow, outlawing the busing

of students or the destruction of the neighborhood school system in order to racially mix beyond reason and to accomplish the balancing, rather than the desegregation, of races, and to spell it out in terms no court or bureaucrat can misconstrue. I have therefore today introduced a constitutional amendment, calling upon the State legislatures to act in that it is possible Congress will not, and to call a constitutional convention on this amendment, a procedure that almost succeeded with the Dirksen prayer in schools amendment.

I successfully offered the antibusing and antipupil assignment to accomplish racial balance amendments to the 1964 Civil Rights Act—sections 2000c(b) and 2000c-6(a), United States Code Annotated.

When these amendments were offered, I stated on the House floor:

The purpose of the amendments is to prevent any semblance of congressional acceptance or approval of inclusion in the definition of "desegregation" any balancing of school attendance by moving students across district lines—or between schools within the same district—to level off percentages where one race outweighs another.

Congress clearly intended to protect the rights of students to attend neighborhood schools, to protect the students' rights to not be bused from that neighborhood in order to force a closer approximation in mixing of students to the percentage of population of the races within or in the vicinity of any school district. I am convinced, after following the guidelines and court rulings, that this stated intent of Congress is being subverted, ignored and circumvented.

This has nothing to do with the integration of schools within a school district where the intended purpose of nonmixture is to perpetuate all-black or all-white schools. Brown against Board of Education dealt with such intentional or planned perpetuation of dual school systems.

But the Office of Education has intentionally established quotas and required busing to accomplish quota compliance in a manner that can only result in the eventual congressionally prohibited balancing of the races in all schools on a percentage basis equal or approximating the percentage of mixing in the entire district. This racial balancing is specifically prohibited by my amendments and by the 1964 Civil Rights Act.

The Fifth Circuit Court of Appeals, in implementing Brown against Board of Education a few years ago, wrote these guidelines into its decisions. The court did so despite the congressional mandate outlawing busing and declaring that any plan or program to force increases in percentages of races in already-mixed school systems to more closely approximate the population mixing was contrary to public policy and going beyond any requirement of integration.

Incidentally, and often overlooked, is the fact that this set of guidelines applies only to the South—or to quote the 1966 Commissioner of Education Howe, to "dual school system" States. He so stated before the Select Committee on

the Judiciary, on which I was the ranking minority member, which was appointed in 1966 to look into and try to make some sense out of the guidelines that had just been published by the executive, supposedly to carry out the 1964 Civil Rights Act but which guideline, it is obvious, went far beyond that act or the Supreme Court decisions. The hearings indicated that the purpose of one set of the guidelines was directed at the South and all other States could continue to have de facto segregation in all-black or all-white neighborhoods, or could get away with some mixing but not to increase the percentage of mixing to closely approximate the percentage of blacks and whites in the district. This was done on the theory that those States outside the South had not intentionally, historically, perpetuated separate-but-equal schools.

Thus, the discriminatory, anti-south, "more stringent increase in the quotas required until balance is approximated"—rule became the requirement in the South. Any method to accomplish it was required of the school boards. Busing, transporting outside the neighborhood school areas, even against parents' wishes, eventual elimination of all-white and all-black schools regardless of all-black or all-white surrounding areas—de facto segregation—became the necessary steps forced on school boards in the South to accomplish the goals of the quota system. This was what I clearly intended to prohibit by my amendments. I intended to prohibit the violation of a student's right to go to his neighborhood school when those schools had already been mixed on a "natural" basis of integration. To require busing in order to force an "artificial" increase in percentage of mixing that more closely approximates the balancing of the races in a larger geographical areas outside the neighborhood was what Congress intended, and I intended, to prohibit.

Because of the intolerable situation that has developed, unwanted by blacks or whites, and the tremendous public protest, I am transmitting to the members of the Florida Legislature copies of this amendment, asking for immediate action, thus leading the way for the needed 33 other States to act before it is too late to overcome the bureaucratic and judicial tampering with our local school systems. This tampering has gone far beyond the objective of accomplishing desegregation or the reasonable and prudent mixing of the races. The amendment reads as follows:

H.J. Res. 1056

Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relating to the busing or involuntary assignment of students

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

"ARTICLE —

"Nothing in the Constitution of the United States shall empower any official or court of the United States to issue any order requiring or encouraging, or directing or permitting any funds to be used or withheld to require or encourage, the transportation or busing of pupils or students from one school to another or one school district to another or to force any student or students attending any elementary or secondary school in their own neighborhood, where such school is not established purposely to perpetuate segregation, to attend any other school against the choice of his or her parents, parent or guardian, in order to accomplish any objective or purpose, express or implied under this Constitution.

The February 1 date set in Carter against School Board required unreasonable conformance to standards that are clearly contrary to the 1964 Cramer amendments.

Due to this unjustifiable intrusion by the Federal Government into an area which I thought was statutorily prohibited—the administration of our local school systems—I strongly feel this necessitates the introduction of this amendment and the consideration of it by the State legislatures, as well as the Congress. This is the effective means available for the people of the country to speak through their legislatures and the Congress.

The passage of this constitutional amendment, which the courts as well as the Executive would have to follow, appears to be the most effective long-range answer for the legions of citizens in this country, most of whom have accepted the basic position of the Court in Brown against Board of Education, who do not believe that any and all rights of citizens can be trampled upon to accomplish what now appears to be the obvious objective of balancing the races in the schools despite the violation of other equally important rights that results.

My colleagues from Florida, the Honorable LOU FREY, JR., and the Honorable J. HERBERT BURKE, join me as cosponsors of the constitutional amendment.

#### INTEREST RATE CONTROL ACT OF 1970

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

Mr. ECKHARDT. Mr. Speaker, Representative LEONARD FARBSTEIN, of New York, and I have introduced legislation today to help curb high interest rates, improve the home mortgage situation, and reduce the excessive profits of the banking industry. Unofficially, we call our bill the Interest Rate Control Act of 1970.

One of the most serious manifestations of the inflation we are now experiencing is extremely high interest rates. This is due primarily to the administration's undue emphasis on monetary policy to curb the wage-price spiral. By restricting the supply of money and raising the discount rate, Federal Reserve officials have succeeded in driving up interest rates to their highest levels in history.

Certainly we cannot put the full blame for the monetary situation directly on the Federal Reserve. The inflationary psychology and situation is largely due to poor economic planning in the past and the continued heavy spending on the war in Vietnam. When people and businesses expect prices to continue to rise they will borrow more to buy now. The rise in consumer debt shows no signs of slowing down; plans for business expansion defy all predictions. The demand for all goods, including money, is too high.

When the supply of a commodity is restricted and the demand is expanding the only result possible is an increase in price. In the case of money this happens to be the interest rate. Now, we fully comprehend the meaning of the market and how unwise it is to tamper with the market mechanism. We do not wish to put any artificial barriers in the way of the free market forces.

While most people, especially home buyers and small businessmen, suffer when interest rates are high, there is one sector of our economic structure that does benefit. This is the banking industry where profits continue to grow at an unparalleled rate. There can be no doubt that the high money rates are a result of market pressures and cannot be condemned sweepingly as an explicit effort by the banking industry to raise its profits. We could not support legislating a ceiling on interest rates—we feel that that would only serve to disrupt what is an orderly, but very tight market.

What we propose is that the Congress pass our legislation to put a tax on interest rates, as on excess profits. Such a tax would drain off the excess income engendered by the tight money market, just as excess profits from the inflationary war stimulus is drained off by an excess profits tax.

We are not criticizing the banks for all the recent increases in the prime interest rate. They are simply reacting to the huge loan pressure and the constricted supply of money. We are willing to accept the fact that the huge growth in bank earnings—largely due to the higher rates charged on loans—is incidental. But, just as we feel that it is unfair for corporations to earn extraordinary profits from the war, we feel that it is unfair for the banks to retain a fortuitous, incidental benefit from inflation and measures to curb it. Unlike other industries, the costs of doing banking business during inflation do not rise as rapidly, or more rapidly, than revenues. Their major cost is that of interest on deposits. These particular interest rates are regulated by the Federal Government. The conversion to data processing has also eliminated much of the overhead expense. Therefore, as the price the banks charge for use of their money goes up, so must their profits. Recent bank statements of earnings confirm this:

*Percentage increase in net earnings from 1968 to 1969*

Long Island Trust.....	38.8
First National of New Jersey.....	29.4
United States Trust.....	21.4
Suburban Trust.....	20.7
Northern Trust.....	18.2

Fidelity Union.....	18.1
U.S. National of Oregon.....	17.1
Riggs National.....	15.8
Security Pacific.....	15.5
Citizens & Southern National.....	15.3
Maryland National.....	15.1
Mercantile National*.....	14.6
Connecticut Bank & Trust.....	14.5
First National*.....	14.0
Manufacturers Hanover.....	12.8
Virginia National.....	10.8
Bank of the Southwest*.....	10.5
Republic National*.....	9.4
First National City.....	9.3
J. P. Morgan & Co.....	7.6
Chase Manhattan.....	2.5

\* Texas bank.

It must be noted that there is an inconsistency between the 1968 figures and the 1969 income figures due to new accounting methods. Standard & Poor's estimates that this reduces the actual percentage increase in growth by 4 percent.

It can be seen that banks in all locations and of all sizes showed considerable increases in earnings. As Standard & Poor's puts it:

Bank revenues . . . are at a record level, and they are likely to hold up well, reflecting a high volume of loans carrying satisfactory interest rates, relative to money costs.

The huge rise in earnings is inextricably tied to the growth of the prime interest rate from 6 percent in 1968 to 8½ percent in 1969.

If, as the banks say, they must raise their loan rate in order to ration their loanable funds, our plan would offer no hindrance. Once economic conditions and the interest rate structure returned to normalcy, our tax plan would cease to be operative.

The tax, or as we call it, the "interest stabilization fee," applies to anybody that extends credit of at least \$10,000 at an interest rate over 8 percent. The tax will be equal to 1 percent of the annual interest charge for each 0.1 percentage point by which the annual loan interest rate exceeds 8 percent. Thus, a \$10,000 loan at the current 8½-percent interest rate would bring in \$850 per annum in interest which would be taxed \$42.50—5 percent of \$850. The lender in this case would have a net yearly income on this loan of \$807.50, just slightly more than it would have earned at the lower 8 percent rate. The following table demonstrates how this tax would work over a range of interest rates, assuming a loan of \$10,000:

Interest rate (percent)	Total interest payment	Rate of tax (percent)	Bank earnings	Tax
8.....	\$800	0	\$800.00	\$0.00
8½.....	850	5	807.50	42.50
9.....	900	10	810.00	90.00
9½.....	950	15	807.50	142.50
10.....	1,000	20	800.00	200.00
10½.....	1,050	25	787.50	262.50

As you see, the interest earnings cease to grow after a certain point while Government revenues from the tax rise rapidly. There would be no profit incentive for the banks to raise their rates although there would be nothing to prevent them from doing so if the pressures of the market made such raises expedient.

Several additional points must be emphasized. First, the tax is meant to be operative only in times of extremely high interest rates. Once the rate charge drops below 8 percent there ceases to be an interest stabilization fee. Second, because so many small loans and loans entailing high risk have traditionally, with good cause, earned higher rates of interest, we have specifically exempted such loans from the tax. We are by no means sanctioning such high interest rates but we do recognize that there are differences in the structure of the interest rate pattern. Finally, we are talking about the annual effective rate of interest rather than the nominal rate. We have adopted the provisions of the Truth in Lending Act for this purpose.

Perhaps the most important feature of this plan is the ultimate use of the funds raised from the collection of the fee. We have decided to make the Government National Mortgage Association the recipient of these funds and to use these funds to further the objectives of their office. In other words, we have great concern for the housing market and we are most eager to ease the pressure for mortgage funds, especially for low- and middle-income families. The recent increases in the VA and FHA mortgage rates are another indication of the problem facing our constituents and potential home buyers around the country.

In conclusion, we sincerely believe that our bill will achieve several ends:

First, increase the flow of funds into the mortgage market;

Second, limit the unfair excess profits of the banking industry; and

Third, ease the continual spiral of interest rates upward.

#### TRUTH IN LENDING: A PRELIMINARY REVIEW

The SPEAKER. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Texas, Mr. PATMAN, is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System has submitted to the Congress their annual report on truth in lending for the year 1969 as required by the act. The report is appended to these remarks and the Members are earnestly urged to examine it in detail.

The value of the report is not an accurate reflection of the impact of truth in lending on business and consumer interests because it covers only the 6-month period in which the act was effective.

Mr. Speaker, the Federal Reserve Board is to be commended on its excellent work in implementing this novel, and sometimes complicated, legislation.

Regulation Z, the truth-in-lending regulation, was promulgated by the Board only after long and painstaking consultation with all interested parties including the Members of Congress and the appropriate congressional committees.

After the regulation was promulgated the Board established a program designed to explain to the business community the meaning and effect of the

new law. The Board quite sensibly directed its program primarily at small- and moderate-size creditors who could not afford the counsel of expense involved in a self-education program. In connection with the program, the Board prepared a number of documents in pamphlet form which explain the terms of the act in simplified and easily understood language. Also established was a procedure within the Board to handle the multitude of requests for information and complaints which quite expectedly would result from a new law involving new concepts.

As part of its thorough preparation for the effectuation of truth in lending, the Board conducted a consumer awareness survey in order to gauge the work that needed to be done and to serve as a yardstick of the usefulness of the law for future reference. The results of the consumer awareness survey are quite remarkable and are set forth in the report. A few of the more salient points made in the survey are that knowledge of credit is much broader among higher income groups than among low-income groups. The most common area where those surveyed knew the exact interest rates being paid was in the first mortgage field. In other consumer credit transactions those surveyed were often not aware of the rate of credit charges which they were paying.

The latter fact amply justifies the concern of those of us who supported truth in lending in the very beginning. For it is in the first mortgage field that the annual percentage rate formula has been common practice. Hopefully, truth in lending will extend this concept to all of the areas of credit.

The report referred to follows:

**ANNUAL REPORT TO CONGRESS ON TRUTH IN LENDING FOR THE YEAR 1969 BY THE BOARD OF GOVERNORS OF THE FEDERAL RESERVE SYSTEM**

**ADMINISTRATIVE FUNCTIONS**

*Truth in lending*

On May 29, 1968, the Truth in Lending Act was signed into law. Section 114 of that Act states:

"Not later than January 3 of each year after 1969, the Board and the Attorney General shall, respectively, make reports to the Congress concerning the administration of their functions under this title, including such recommendations as the Board and the Attorney General, respectively, deem necessary or appropriate. In addition, each report of the Board shall include its assessment of the extent to which compliance with the requirements imposed under this title is being achieved."

This is the first annual report on Truth in Lending by the Board and covers not only the period since July 1, 1969, when the Act went into effect but also the period prior to that date when the Board and other Federal enforcement agencies made their initial preparations to meet requirements imposed under the Act.

*Task force established*

Early in 1968 when it became apparent that Truth in Lending would be enacted into law and that the Board would be entrusted with the responsibility of drafting regulations, the Board established a task force of personnel from several Federal Reserve Banks and from the Board's own staff. This task force was assisted by consultants who were specialists in the many aspects of consumer credit, including consumer loans, retail

credit, banking, and real estate mortgage lending.

The initial job of the task force was to familiarize itself with the legislative history of Truth in Lending, with the legislation as enacted by both Senate and House and finally with the report filed by the Conference Committee of the Senate and House of Representatives. Following the signing of the Act (Public Law 90-321; 82 Stat. 146 et seq.) on May 29, 1968, the task force was absorbed into the Board's Division of Supervision and Regulation, and the job of drafting implementing regulations was begun immediately.

It was necessary to publish regulations within as short a time as possible because creditors affected by the Act needed as much advance notice as possible to acquaint themselves with the Act and regulations, to prepare and print new forms, to establish new procedures, and to train their personnel before the effective date of the Act on July 1, 1969.

*Formulation of the regulation*

Because of the large number of creditors affected by the Act, many of whom had never before been subject to government regulation of such a technical nature, it became clear early in the program that the Truth in Lending regulations should be drafted in a form that would serve not only as a legal directive for implementing the Act, but also as an operating handbook. It was therefore decided to make the regulation self-contained and to incorporate provisions of the Act into it.

*Views of other agencies*

Section 109 of the Act states:

"In the exercise of its functions under this title, the Board may obtain upon request the views of any other Federal agency which, in the judgment of the Board, exercises regulatory or supervisory functions with respect to any class of creditors subject to this title."

In keeping with this provision, the Board sought views of other Federal departments and agencies. Many valuable suggestions were obtained, and the Board is grateful for the cooperation and assistance provided by staff personnel of the Department of Agriculture, Farm Credit Administration, Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation, Comptroller of the Currency, Federal Home Loan Bank Board, Bureau of Federal Credit Unions, Interstate Commerce Commission, Civil Aeronautics Board, and the Federal Trade Commission. In addition, many trade associations and consumer organizations provided useful suggestions.

*Advisory Committee on Truth in Lending*

Section 110 of the Act states:

"The Board shall establish an advisory committee to advise and consult with it in the exercise of its functions under this title. In appointing the members of the committee, the Board shall seek to achieve a fair representation of the interests of sellers of merchandise on credit, lenders, and the public. The committee shall meet from time to time at the call of the Board, and members thereof shall be paid transportation expenses and not to exceed \$100 per diem."

Pursuant to this provision, the Advisory Committee on Truth in Lending was appointed by the Board in August of 1968. This Committee reviewed the early drafts of the proposed regulation before it was issued for public comment. Committee members also reviewed the public comments received by the Board and offered many suggestions that were ultimately incorporated into the final regulation. Dr. Richard D. Holton, Dean of the School of Business Administration at the University of California at Berkeley, was named the first chairman of the Committee and still serves in that capacity. The complete list of Committee members together with the dates and purposes of the five Advisory Committee meetings held during 1968 and 1969 is attached to the end of this report as Appendix A.

*Publication of regulation for public comment*

After months of drafting and redrafting, a proposed regulation, entitled "Regulation Z of the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System," was issued for public comment on October 16, 1968. More than 1,000 written comments and suggestions were received from individuals and from commercial, trade, creditor and consumer groups. Although 30 days were allowed for comment, the Board considered all communications it received up to the time the final text of the regulation was completed and issued on February 10, 1969.

*Rate tables and interpretations*

The determination of the annual percentage rate on each consumer credit transaction is one of the key requirements of the Truth in Lending Act and Regulation Z. Mathematical equations and formulas for determining annual percentage rates were developed by the Board and incorporated into a separate Supplement I to Regulation Z. The purposes of the supplement are to establish precise criteria under which computer programs may be written and to aid commercial chart publishers in compiling tables that conform to standards of accuracy set forth in Regulation Z.

In addition the Board published two volumes of annual percentage rate tables that not only serve as tools in the consumer credit field, but also serve as standards for comparison by customers and enforcement officials.

Following the publication of Regulation Z in final form, the Board received numerous requests for clarification of the Regulation as it applied to specific types of transactions. Since the Regulation is written in broad, general terms, it became advisable to issue clarifying interpretations with respect to its application in certain specified cases. Through the end of 1969, 41 interpretations and 2 amendments to Regulation Z were issued by the Board. One additional proposed amendment was issued for public comment. The deadline for comment expires January 22, 1970. As the need arises, further interpretations and amendments will be issued.

*State exemption—Procedure and criteria*

Section 123 of the Truth in Lending Act states:

"The Board shall by regulation exempt from the requirements of this chapter any class of credit transactions within any State if it determines that under the law of that State that class of transactions is subject to requirements substantially similar to those imposed under this chapter, and that there is adequate provision for enforcement."

In order to implement this provision, the Board set forth certain procedures and criteria as Supplement II to Regulation Z which was published for public comment on March 27, 1969. The relatively few comments received came primarily from consumer groups rather than State governments and, for the most part, urged the Board to adopt and enforce stringent requirements for State exemption. Supplement II was published in final form on July 2, 1969.

The Board believes that after an exemption for classes of transactions within a State has been granted, customers should have continued access to Federal or State courts in seeking redress for alleged violations of the disclosure provisions of State statutes, including the right to rely upon Federal or State rules relating to class actions. Accordingly, the Board has published for public comment, as indicated above, a proposed amendment to Regulation Z which would provide that no exemption shall be construed to extend to the civil liability provisions of section 130 and 131 of the Act. The effect of this amendment would be to substitute the applicable disclosure requirements of State law for the requirements of Chapter 2 of the Act following an exemption, thus retaining a basis for liability in the Federal courts.

*State exemption—Applications received*

Formal applications for exemption have been received from Maine, Virginia, Connecticut, Oklahoma and Massachusetts. The Maine and Oklahoma<sup>1</sup> applications have been reviewed for completeness, and notices of their filings have been published in the Federal Register pursuant to Supplement II to Regulation Z (Section 226.12 Supplement). A notice relating to each of the other applications will be published in the Federal Register as soon as the Board determines each to be complete.

## INFORMATION, ENFORCEMENT, COMPLIANCE AND RECOMMENDATIONS

*Distribution of regulation Z to creditors*

The Truth in Lending Act implemented by Regulation Z created new concepts and procedures in the field of consumer credit. The definitions of creditor and consumer credit in the Act and Regulation Z include many persons who had never before considered themselves regularly engaged in consumer credit. No single source was available to provide a reliable list of those who would be affected by the Act and Regulation Z, but estimates varied from 250,000 to more than 1 million.

One of the first projects of the task force was to make a reasonable estimate of the number of copies of Regulation Z needed to serve the persons affected and to arrange for its distribution when published. The problem was simplified substantially when the enforcement agencies agreed to distribute the Regulation to those creditors under their respective jurisdictions.

*Development of the pamphlet "What You Ought To Know About Truth in Lending"*

Regulation Z, no matter how detailed and elementary in its form, could not be relied upon by itself to explain to those affected just what they must know and do to comply with the Act and Regulation. This is particularly true with respect to the thousands of creditors who are not in a position to employ full time legal counsel and who do not have sophisticated equipment to aid them in their accounting and billing. Because of this anticipated information gap, the Board concluded that something more than a regulation drawn in formal terminology would be needed.

To help meet this challenge, the Board employed specialized assistance to aid in preparing the pamphlet, "What You Ought to Know About Truth in Lending." This pamphlet includes the text of both Regulation Z and the Truth in Lending Act. Questions of general application are followed by answers explaining the requirements which are cross referenced to the appropriate section of Regulation Z. In addition, illustrative forms are provided to guide creditors in the development of the new forms needed to comply with Regulation Z and the Act.

Subsequent printings of the pamphlet have included amendments and interpretations issued up to the time of each printing. More than 1,300,000 copies of the pamphlet have been distributed.

*Meetings and seminars*

During the past year, members of the Board's staff and personnel from the Federal Reserve Banks, other enforcement agencies, and many trade associations have responded to requests for speakers at meetings and seminars throughout the nation. The Federal Reserve System and the other enforcement

agencies are continuing their efforts in this area.

Visual aids were also provided by the Board. A professionally produced filmstrip with an accompanying recorded discussion was made available through the Federal enforcement agencies and the Federal Reserve Banks to anyone who expressed interest. Projection slides to be used by speakers were also produced and made available.

*Continued informational effort*

Generally, creditors want to comply with the requirements of Regulation Z. The Act and the Regulation have been in effect for six months, and the program to help the business community comply is continuing and will be fostered by the Board as long as may be necessary to achieve the objective contemplated by the Act.

A valuable tool in the informational program has been the direct correspondence which the various enforcement agencies have had with interested creditors and consumers. By the end of 1969, it is estimated that, collectively, the enforcement agencies under the Act will have replied to more than 20,000 inquiries. Copies of a number of the more significant replies have been published by a commercial publisher in its loose-leaf service on consumer credit.<sup>2</sup>

*Informational programs for the consumer*

At the outset, the Board emphasized information for creditors, since they are subject to civil and criminal penalties for failure to make the required disclosures. Even more important, the entire success of the Act depends upon creditors making meaningful disclosures, and this can be done only if the creditor understands the Act and Regulation Z. However, if the purposes of the Act are to be realized, the consumer must be able to utilize effectively the information given to him. He must have an understanding of the new standardized language of consumer credit brought about by Truth in Lending.

There are numerous consumer organizations throughout the nation capable of reaching a large segment of consumers. These organizations have done a commendable job of explaining Truth in Lending to those within their reach, but the problem remains of reaching the many consumers who have no contact with such organizations.

The Board, with outside professional help, has developed a filmstrip designed to acquaint consumers with the major provisions of Truth in Lending. The filmstrip will be available for public use in January of 1970 and will be distributed by a number of agencies, including the Federal Reserve Banks and field offices of the Federal Trade Commission. The Board seeks the widest possible distribution of this audio-visual tool.

The Federal Trade Commission has prepared three television spot announcements introducing the consumer to the basic facts about Truth in Lending. These spots are to be shown on a pilot basis throughout the country, and it is understood that if a positive response is elicited, this medium of consumer information may be expanded.

*Consumer awareness survey*

Early in 1969, the Board authorized a survey of consumer awareness of the finance charges and interest rates paid on consumer credit transactions. The purpose of this program is to provide a basis for evaluating the effectiveness of the Truth in Lending Act in achieving its goal of assisting consumers in the informed use of credit through the comparison of credit costs charged by the various lenders and retailers. In authorizing this consumer survey program, the Board was motivated by the belief that an appraisal of the effectiveness of Truth in Lending will require something more than knowledge of creditor compliance, namely, some investigation of consumer awareness of finance charges and interest rates.

Most of the interviewing for the initial

survey was done in June 1969, just prior to the effective date of the Truth in Lending Act, with a few of the interviews completed during the first week of July. This timing was intended to establish a benchmark of consumer knowledge before the Act became effective against which the hoped for improvements in the level of consumers' knowledge and awareness could subsequently be measured by another comparable survey.

The 1969 survey was also intended to provide useful information on the existing state of consumer awareness. Knowledge of the extent to which consumers know about credit charges and interest rates and how this knowledge varies among different groups of consumers is necessary for the effective direction of educational efforts in this area. It is also important to know the extent to which consumers are misinformed about such matters as interest rates and the provisions of the Truth in Lending Act.

A specific description and the results of the initial survey are attached to the end of this report as Appendix B.

*Enforcement and compliance*

Under section 108 compliance with the requirements of the Act is enforced by nine separate Federal agencies including the Board. Except for creditors subject to the authority of the Federal Trade Commission, creditors generally come within the jurisdiction of the agency that has general supervision authority over them. The Act spreads enforcement in this way:

The Comptroller of the Currency for National banks.

The Board for State chartered banks that are members of the Federal Reserve System.

The Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation for insured nonmember banks.

The Federal Home Loan Bank Board for institutions under its supervision.

The Director of the Bureau of Federal Credit Unions for Federal credit unions.

The Interstate Commerce Commission for common carriers subject to its jurisdiction.

The Civil Aeronautics Board for air carriers, foreign and domestic, subject to its jurisdiction.

The Secretary of Agriculture for activities subject to the Packers and Stockyards Act, 1921, with certain exceptions.

The Federal Trade Commission for all other creditors not specifically subject to the jurisdiction of one of the above named agencies.

Each of the enforcement authorities as well as each of the twelve Federal Reserve Banks filed with the Board a report covering its respective administrative function under the Act and its assessment of the extent to which compliance is being achieved.

*Reports from the Federal Reserve banks*

In carrying out its enforcement functions under the Act, the Board prepared an examiner's questionnaire for use by System examiners. This questionnaire suggests particular problem areas to be covered in each examination concerning the calculation of the finance charge and annual percentage rate as well as procedures to determine the extent of a bank's compliance with the specific disclosure requirements under various types of credit plans, rescission provisions, and advertising requirements.

Prior to July 1, 1969, each Reserve Bank conducted an intensive training course for its examiners. These sessions were designed to instruct the examiners in the basics of Regulation Z and the use of the Board's annual percentage rate tables and examiner's questionnaire. Without exception, the Reserve Banks report that their examiners have been able to do an effective job overseeing compliance by State member banks.

From the reports received from the Federal Reserve Banks, a compliance pattern can be identified. In the opinion of the Board, State member banks generally are making a conscientious effort to comply, but as might

<sup>1</sup> Oklahoma has adopted the Uniform Consumer Credit Code. In connection with the Oklahoma application, the Board's review of the Code as enacted in that State and its implementing regulations is limited to those provisions which relate directly to Truth in Lending, inasmuch as the other provisions of the Code do not relate to the granting of an exemption.

be expected, the larger banks, with their access to full-time legal advice, are having less difficulty than the smaller banks. While some violations have been detected by bank examiners, they generally result from misunderstandings concerning the requirements of Regulation Z. The Board feels that as its informational efforts continue, all State member banks will attain a high degree of proficiency in the application of Regulation Z.

#### Reports from other enforcement agencies

In response to a request from the Board, the other enforcement agencies have indicated the methods they are using to enforce the Act and Regulation Z, their opinions as to the effectiveness of those methods, and assessments of the level of compliance being attained.

The Board has furnished a copy of its examiner's questionnaire to each of the other enforcement agencies. The Comptroller of the Currency, the Federal Home Loan Bank Board, the Bureau of Federal Credit Unions, and the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation have undertaken procedures similar to those used by the Federal Reserve Bank. The remaining agencies—Federal Trade Commission, Civil Aeronautics Board, Secretary of Agriculture, and Interstate Commerce Commission—are to date relying primarily on complaints and subsequent investigations of those complaints to enforce the Act.

However, because the provisions of the Act and Regulation Z have been in effect for only six months, any over-all evaluation of the extent of compliance must be qualified. The Act and Regulation are new; they cover a larger area than the conventional concept of consumer credit; they affect a large number of creditors, many of which are small businesses or are located in remote areas of the nation.

#### Recommendations

Section 114 of the Act requires the Board to make in each annual report such recommendations as it may deem necessary or appropriate. Since the Act and Regulation Z have been in effect only six months, it is too early to assess fully the extent to which amendments may be necessary or appropriate. However, there are several matters which the Board would like to bring to the attention of Congress.

#### Agricultural Credit

Under section 104 of the Act, credit extended to natural persons for agricultural purposes is subject to the provisions of the Act if the amount is \$25,000 or less, and without limit if a security interest in real property is involved. It has been asserted that activities of farmers, especially those with large operations, are more like those of business than those of consumers and that the requirements of the Act make it difficult for the farmer to conduct the financing of his business of agriculture in a manner in which other businessmen, whose loans are exempt, conduct their financial affairs. Delay because of the right of rescission in many instances works a hardship upon the farmer. The Board believes that credit primarily for agricultural purposes in excess of an appropriate amount<sup>2</sup> should be exempt from the provisions of the Act, irrespective of any security interest in real property.

#### Administrative Enforcement

The Farm Credit Administration is not specified in section 108 of the Act as one of the Federal authorities responsible for administrative enforcement, and therefore the Federal Land Banks, Federal Land Bank Associations, and Production Credit Associations are subject to administrative enforcement of the Federal Trade Commission. We suggest that Congress amend section 108 of the Act so as to delegate to the Farm

<sup>2</sup>The limit applicable to most consumer credit transactions under the Act is \$25,000.

Credit Administration the administrative enforcement responsibility with respect to those creditors which are chartered under Acts which that agency administers. The Farm Credit Administration and the Federal Trade Commission concur in this suggestion.

#### Stipend of Advisory Committee Members

Under section 110 of the Act, members of the Advisory Committee on Truth in Lending are paid transportation expenses and not more than \$100 per diem. In Government service, "transportation expenses" exclude the cost of subsistence (e.g., hotel and meals) while in travel status. Thus, under section 110 each member receives his air, rail, or other fare and a specified sum out of which he must pay his expenses for hotel, meals, and other items incidental to his travel status. To eliminate inequities, section 110 of the Act could be amended to provide that each member receive "travel expenses" and a stipend not to exceed a specified sum per day.

#### Regulatory Function Under the Act

The Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System has completed the task of writing the Regulation to implement the Act, a function delegated to it in section 105 of the Act. The Board therefore suggests that the Congress consider reassigning the Board's regulatory function (as distinguished from its enforcement function) to another agency whose primary function encompasses consumer protection.

#### Conclusions

The consensus among the enforcement agencies is that with few exceptions creditors wish to comply with requirements. There are, however, as is true with any new requirements affecting business procedures, the problems of adapting existing forms and procedures or adopting new forms and procedures.

Generally, where problems of compliance have been encountered, they were found to be products of misunderstanding, and compliance has been achieved following the necessary explanation of the requirements. There is a great deal of work to be done in the informational field, but with the generally prevailing cooperative attitude, there seems little doubt that an even higher degree of compliance can be achieved within the forthcoming year.

Advertising appears to be the most troublesome single problem area. There seems to be some misunderstanding as to limitations on advertising credit terms. There is some feeling that the restrictions are unnecessarily severe and tend to eliminate all advertising of credit terms. As a consequence, customers are said to be unable to shop for credit by reading advertisements; they must physically go from creditor to creditor to ascertain credit terms. We are watching developments in this area closely, but at the present time we are recommending no change in the advertising provisions of the Act.

Finally, it should be emphasized that legitimate business in this country has accepted as reasonable the purposes that led Congress to enact this statute. Translating those general purposes into specific disclosures has meant that virtually every businessman extending credit has had to modify his credit procedures. Although we have tried to avoid needless complexity, the average businessman has been confronted with formidable challenges as he sought to find out which of his procedures had to be changed and how to make sure his new procedures were in compliance with the statute and the regulation. If, as we hope, the difficult changeover period can be completed at a reasonable cost in relation to ultimate benefits, it will be because those who are subject to the new rules have tried to make them work, rather than make work out of them.

#### APPENDIX A.—ADVISORY COMMITTEE ON TRUTH IN LENDING

Chairman, Dr. Richard H. Holton, Dean, School of Business Administration, University of California, Berkeley.

Mr. James M. Barry, Managing Director, Texas Credit Union League, Dallas, Texas.

Mr. Clark W. Blackburn, General Director, Family Service Association of America, New York, New York.

Mr. W. H. Bowman,\* Credit Sales Manager, Davison-Paxon Co., Atlanta, Georgia.

Mr. O. C. Carmichael, Jr., Chairman of the Board, Associates Investment Company, South Bend, Indiana.

Mr. Dick Christman, Dick Christman, Inc., Oklahoma City, Oklahoma.

Dr. Jean A. Crockett, Department of Finance, University of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania.

Mr. George H. Dixon, President, First National Bank of Minneapolis, Minneapolis, Minnesota.

Mr. John E. Eldam, President, Omaha Bank for Cooperatives, Omaha, Nebraska.

Professor David I. Fand, Department of Economics, Wayne State University, Detroit, Michigan.

Mr. Richard G. Gilbert, President, Citizens Savings Association, Canton, Ohio.

Mr. William F. James, President, Bill James Chevrolet Co., St. Louis, Missouri.

Mr. Robert J. Klein, Economic Editor, Consumers Union of the U.S., Inc., Mt. Vernon, New York.

Mr. William F. Melville, Jr., Vice President, Maryland National Bank, Baltimore, Maryland.

Mr. Irving S. Michelman, Executive Vice President, Budget Finance Plan, Los Angeles, California.

Mrs. Doris E. Saunders, Director of Community Relations, Chicago State College, Chicago, Illinois.

Mr. Miles C. Stanley, President, West Virginia Labor Federation, AFL-CIO, Charleston, West Virginia.

Mr. T. G. While, Consultant, The Goodyear Tire and Rubber Company, Akron, Ohio.

Professor William F. Willier, Department of Law, Boston College Law School, Brighton, Massachusetts.

Miss Barbara A. Zimmelman, Executive Director, Central Houston Association, Houston, Texas.

During 1968 and 1969, the Advisory Committee on Truth in Lending has held five meetings at the Board's Building in Washington, D.C., as follows:

#### DATES OF MEETINGS AND PRINCIPAL PURPOSES

September 12-13, 1968: Organization, layout, and major topics of Regulation Z in preparation for publication for public comment.

December 12-13, 1968: Review of public comments received and recommendations for the final draft of Regulation Z for the Board's consideration.

February 27, 1969: Education of creditors with respect to the application of Regulation Z.

September 3, 1969: Educational effort, State exemptions, and problem areas in Regulation Z.

November 20, 1969: Consumer awareness and education with respect to Regulation 2 and State exemption under section 123 of the Act.

#### APPENDIX B.—THE 1969 SURVEY OF CONSUMER AWARENESS OF FINANCE CHARGES AND INTEREST RATES

##### PURPOSE OF SURVEY

The 1969 Survey of Consumer Awareness of Finance Charges and Interest Rates was conducted by the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System for two purposes. The

\*Resigned February 3, 1969; vacancy not yet filled.

general purpose of the survey is to provide a basis for evaluating the effectiveness of the Truth in Lending Act in achieving its goal of assisting consumers in the informed use of credit through the comparison of credit costs charged by various lenders and retailers. Specifically, it is designed to provide information on the extent of consumer awareness of credit charges and interest rates.

This survey is based on information gathered primarily during June 1969, just prior to the effective date of the Truth in Lending Act.

#### SURVEY DESCRIPTION

The 1969 Survey of Consumer Awareness of Finance Charges and Interstate Rates was conducted by a private research firm under contract to the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System. The private researcher developed the sample design, conducted the interviews and prepared the tabulations. The questionnaire was developed by the researcher in consultation with staff members of the Board and of the Federal Reserve Bank of Philadelphia. A Research Subcommittee of the Advisory Committee on Truth in Lending reviewed the questionnaire and made suggestions as did the Office of Statistical Standards of the Bureau of the Budget.

The 1969 Survey of Consumer Awareness included completed interviews with 5,149 households throughout the nation. In all cases the interview was conducted with the head of the household. The interviewers attempted in every case to interview the male head, but if none existed, the female head was interviewed.

The sample design consisted of two independent probability samples. One was an area probability sample drawn from poverty areas within ten metropolitan areas. The second sample was a random probability sample selected from the telephone universe outside the defined poverty areas. The reason for the dual sample selection was to insure an adequate representation of households in low income areas since many of these households do not have a telephone. The total of 5,149 completed interviews included 4,726 from the telephone sample and 423 from the poverty area sample. Most of the poverty area sample was obtained through personal interviews, but 76 were completed by telephone after the interviewer had been unable to reach the head of the household in person.

#### QUESTIONNAIRE COVERAGE

The questionnaire was designed to cover several major areas or knowledge about consumer credit contracts. Households with first mortgage debt contracted within the past five years, debt for home improvements made within the past three years, debt for automobile and household furniture and appliance purchases, within the past twelve months and cash loans made within the past twelve months, were asked about their installment contracts, including the finance charge and interest rate and whether they had shopped for their credit. Those households without automobile or furniture and appliance debt or cash loans contracted within the last twelve months were asked where they would try to obtain such credit if needed and what interest rate they would expect to pay. All sample households were asked about their use of retail charge accounts and credit cards and the interest rates charged on such accounts.

In order to determine the extent to which consumers were aware of the Truth in Lending Act and its provisions, the sample households were asked whether they had heard of a Federal law that requires that consumers be given certain information when they borrow money or finance purchases and whether they knew the name of the law. Those who failed to respond correctly to this question were further prompted by being asked if they had heard of a Federal law called the

"Truth in Lending" law. The consumers who had heard of such a law were asked about the general provisions of the law to determine the extent and accuracy of their knowledge. Finally, all consumers were asked a general question to test their knowledge of the difference between the stated or contract rate of interest and the true annual percentage rate.

#### SURVEY RESULTS

Summary tabulations of the more significant survey questions have just become available. These tables are set forth on pages 10 through 35 of this Appendix.

Initial questions in the survey were designed to determine the homeownership status of the respondents. Homeowners who had contracted first mortgages on their property within five years of the survey—either newly acquired at the time of purchase, takeovers of mortgages held by previous owners, or refinanced mortgages—were asked to indicate the annual percentage rate of interest or finance charge on the mortgage. Similarly, homeowners who had made improvements or repairs on their homes costing \$500 or more within three years of the survey, and had contracted debt to finance the work, were asked the interest charge for this financing. All survey respondents were queried as to other major types of debt incurred within twelve months of the interview date—auto loans for new or used vehicles, household appliance or furniture loans for purchases of items costing \$100 or more, or personal cash loans regardless of purpose.

In the majority of instances, respondents with existing loans thought they knew the true annual percentage rate of interest that had been incurred on the borrowed funds. Not surprisingly, the greatest degree of knowledge related to first mortgage loans; nearly three-fourths of the homeowners thought they knew the interest rate on their mortgage. Approximately one-half of these respondents indicated their rate was between

5½ per cent and 6½ per cent, while the remainder were about equally divided above and below this range. In view of the known structure of mortgage interest rates during the past five years, these answers appear to present a fairly realistic evaluation by the respondents.

There was a rather marked decline in the extent and degree of knowledge of interest rates for other types of credit. Approximately two-thirds of those with home improvement or automobile loans, three-fifths of those with personal cash loans, and less than one-half of those with appliance and furniture loans thought they knew the interest rate on their debt.

However, with the possible exception of home improvement loans, the rates given by these borrowers appear unrealistically low—probably a reflection of thinking the contract rate of interest represents the true annual percentage rate. Fully 70 per cent of those who indicated they knew the annual rate on their automobile loan indicated it was 7 per cent or less, while approximately three-fifths of those starting rates on personal loans and more than one-half of those giving rates for appliance and furniture loans reported similarly. Only in the case of appliance and furniture credit did as many as one-fourth of the respondents report a rate above 11 per cent.

In order to have some basis for comparison, respondents with no outstanding credit balances for autos, appliances or furniture, or personal loans were asked the approximate annual percentage rate of interest they thought they would have to pay in obtaining credit from their preferred lender for such loans. More than three-fifths of the respondents without credit were willing to make such estimates in each instance. As may be seen in the table below, the estimates made by nonborrowers showed a striking similarity to the replies provided by those with outstanding loans.

Interest rate (percent)	Type of loan (percentage of households)					
	Automobile		Appliance or furniture		Personal	
	With loan	No credit	With loan	No credit	With loan	No credit
Up to 7	70	61.0	52.4	55.0	60.9	61.4
Over 7	30	39.1	47.6	45.1	39.2	38.6
Total	100	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0

The survey obtained information on the income and education levels of the heads of households interviewed. Those with low incomes or low education levels showed a high proportion of "don't know" answers when asked their actual or anticipated interest rates for credit. This was especially true in the case of outstanding credit for appliances or furniture, more than three-fourths of the respondents with annual incomes of less than \$5,000 did not know the annual percentage rate of interest on their loan, and nearly three-fourths with grade school education or less did not know.

It is rather significant, however, that a high income or high education level—while substantially reducing the proportion of "don't know" answers—did not markedly "improve" the interest rate estimates given. Using the reported figures on existing automobile loans as an example, the 5 to 7 per cent interest rate range was most frequently reported by all income levels. Approximately three-fifths of those with incomes under \$5,000 who reported an interest rate thought they were paying what appears to be an unrealistically low true annual percentage rate of 7 per cent or less, and about three-fourths of the respondents in each of the other income groups thought likewise.

A somewhat more pronounced difference is observed in terms of education. Using the example of reported rates on appliance or

furniture loans, it may be seen that only about one-eighth of those with grade school educations or less thought they were paying more than 11 per cent interest, while one-third of those with at least some college thought they were paying interest charges over 11 per cent.

Consumer awareness of interest rates appeared to increase with regard to retail charge accounts and bank credit cards. The survey indicated that nearly 65 per cent of the households interviewed had arrangements with department stores, gasoline companies, or other retail stores to charge purchases, with two-thirds of these respondents reporting accounts with service charges and time limits. Nearly 50 per cent of the households did not know the annual percentage rate of interest that was imposed on their most active retail charge account if not paid-up within the "free-ride" period. However, among those who thought they knew, the largest relative proportion—one-third—indicated an interest rate above 17 per cent, and another one-fifth thought their rate was in the 11 to 17 per cent range.

Since most accounts of this type incur interest charges at an annual rate of between 12 per cent and 18 per cent on unpaid balances, it may be said that there was a relatively significant degree of awareness of interest rates for such credit.

In contrast to retail charge accounts, only one-fourth of the respondents indicated ownership of a bank credit card. Slightly more than 50 per cent of those with bank credit cards admittedly did not know the interest rate charged, while another 11 per cent either did not use their card or incurred no interest charge because they paid their balances on a timely basis; a majority of the remainder reported interest rates above 11 per cent with the bulk of this group indicating annual rates in excess of 17 per cent.

Awareness of Truth in Lending was quite limited among respondents to the survey. Less than 50 per cent of the heads of households reported hearing of a Federal law requiring consumers be given certain credit in-

formation, and fewer than one-fourth of this group indicated they knew the name of the law. Those who had not heard of such a law were then asked directly if they know of a "Truth in Lending" law, and approximately one-third said that they had heard of such a law.

All of those who indicated they were aware of Federal legislation on Truth in Lending were asked about the provisions of the law. Only a very small proportion of respondents—less than 5 per cent—indicated the lender was required to specify both the dollar cost and the true annual percentage rate of interest on credit, although nearly two-fifths of the respondents specified one or the

other of these features. A relatively large proportion of respondents—approximately 20 per cent—incorrectly thought the law provided for ceilings on interest rates and charges. Knowledge about Truth in Lending was found to be higher among those with higher levels of income.

One of the final questions on the survey was designed to examine consumer knowledge of the difference between a stated or contract interest rate and a true annual percentage rate of interest. Given a contract rate of 6 per cent, well over one-half of the respondents did not know what the true annual rate would be. Of those giving a figure, a little over one-third properly placed the true rate in the 10 to 12 per cent range.

TABLE 1.—ANNUAL PERCENTAGE RATE OF INTEREST REPORTED ON 1ST MORTGAGE LOANS

	Income					
	Total <sup>1</sup>	Under \$5,000	\$5,000 to \$7,999	\$8,000 to \$9,999	\$10,000 to \$14,999	\$15,000 and over
Number reporting new or refinanced 1st mortgage loans within past 5 years	878	59	179	188	254	174
Number answering interest rate question	802	55	159	173	235	159
Interest rate (percent): <sup>2</sup>						
3 to 5.50	19.7	19.1	15.9	14.8	19.1	27.1
5.75 to 6.50	35.7	27.3	30.3	33.8	38.1	42.9
6.75 and over	18.1	16.4	18.7	17.5	20.1	14.8
Don't know	26.6	37.3	35.2	34.0	22.7	15.1
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0

<sup>1</sup> Sum of the number of households reporting by income does not equal total since not all respondents indicated income level.  
<sup>2</sup> Percentage distribution of those answering interest rate question.

TABLE 2.—ANNUAL PERCENTAGE RATE OF INTEREST REPORTED ON HOME IMPROVEMENT LOANS

	Income			
	Total <sup>1</sup>	Under \$5,000	\$5,000 to \$9,999	\$10,000 and over
Number reporting home improvement loans within past 3 years	341	42	144	147
Number answering interest rate question	303	40	127	130
Interest rate (percent): <sup>2</sup>				
Up to 5	13.9	5.2	13.2	17.8
5.01 to 7	37.0	29.2	31.7	41.4
Over 7	13.9	4.2	17.4	15.8
Don't know	35.3	61.4	37.7	25.0
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0

<sup>1</sup> Sum of the number of households reporting by income does not equal total since not all respondents indicated income level.  
<sup>2</sup> Percentage distribution of those answering interest rate question.

TABLE 3.—ANNUAL PERCENTAGE RATE OF INTEREST REPORTED ON AUTOMOBILE LOANS

	Income					
	Total <sup>1</sup>	Under \$5,000	\$5,000 to \$7,999	\$8,000 to \$9,999	\$10,000 to \$14,999	\$15,000 and over
Number reporting new or used car loans within past 12 months	952	118	238	225	209	140
Number answering interest rate question	908	114	224	216	199	134
Interest rate (percent): <sup>2</sup>						
Up to 5	14.5	12.4	12.8	11.8	17.3	22.3
5.01 to 7	32.0	12.9	29.4	38.4	40.5	38.3
7.01 to 10	11.9	10.7	12.4	8.9	8.4	16.4
Over 10	8.0	7.7	4.3	9.6	9.1	6.6
Don't know	33.5	56.2	41.2	31.3	24.6	16.4
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0

<sup>1</sup> Sum of the number of households reporting by income does not equal total since not all respondents indicated income level.  
<sup>2</sup> Percentage distribution of those answering interest rate question.

TABLE 4.—ANNUAL PERCENTAGE RATE OF INTEREST REPORTED ON APPLIANCE AND FURNITURE LOANS

	Income				
	Total <sup>1</sup>	Under \$5,000	\$5,000 to \$7,999	\$8,000 to \$9,999	\$10,000 and over
Number reporting appliance or furniture loans within past 12 months	622	114	187	123	179
Number answering interest rate question	607	112	182	119	175
Interest rate (percent): <sup>2</sup>					
Up to 5	12.2	5.8	8.7	13.8	17.5
5.01 to 7	11.9	8.9	8.7	17.8	16.7
7.01 to 11	10.4	4.7	12.0	10.7	11.0
Over 11	11.5	2.7	15.8	8.3	15.9
Don't know	54.0	77.9	54.8	49.4	38.9
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0

<sup>1</sup> Sum of the number of households reporting by income does not equal total since not all respondents indicated income level.  
<sup>2</sup> Percentage distribution of those answering interest rate question.

TABLE 5.—ANNUAL PERCENTAGE RATE OF INTEREST REPORTED ON PERSONAL LOANS

	Income					
	Total <sup>1</sup>	Under \$5,000	\$5,000 to \$7,999	\$8,000 to \$9,999	\$10,000 to \$14,999	\$15,000 and over
Number reporting cash personal loans within past 12 months	705	86	195	138	177	91
Number answering interest rate question	639	77	180	121	166	83
Interest rate (percent): <sup>2</sup>						
Up to 5	6.9	9.4	7.9	8.5	5.7	3.1
5.01 to 7	28.2	29.8	26.0	21.8	34.3	25.9
7.01 to 11	13.5	7.7	16.5	15.5	11.4	11.1
Over 11	9.1	3.3	6.3	8.8	11.4	13.6
Don't know	42.4	49.7	43.3	45.4	37.0	46.3
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0

<sup>1</sup> Sum of the number of households reporting by income does not equal total since not all respondents indicated income level.  
<sup>2</sup> Percentage distribution of those answering interest rate question.

TABLE 6.—ANNUAL PERCENTAGE RATE OF INTEREST ANTICIPATED FOR AUTOMOBILE LOANS

	Income						
	Total <sup>1</sup>	Under \$3,000	\$3,000 to \$4,999	\$5,000 to \$7,999	\$8,000 to \$9,999	\$10,000 to \$14,999	\$15,000 and over
Number reporting no existing new or used car loans	3,911	480	479	893	615	734	472
Number answering interest rate question	3,767	440	455	875	597	720	465
Interest rate (percent): <sup>2</sup>							
Up to 5	12.3	7.8	9.4	12.6	13.5	16.0	12.1
5.01 to 7	26.6	18.4	20.4	29.2	25.8	29.1	29.0
7.01 to 11	19.5	12.4	11.6	16.3	20.4	20.8	31.7
Over 11	5.4	1.7	1.7	4.7	6.4	8.1	8.2
Don't know	36.3	59.7	56.9	37.2	33.8	26.0	19.1
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0

<sup>1</sup> Sum of the number of households reporting by income does not equal total since not all respondents indicated income level.  
<sup>2</sup> Percentage distribution of those answering interest rate question.

TABLE 7.—ANNUAL PERCENTAGE RATE OF INTEREST ANTICIPATED FOR APPLIANCE AND FURNITURE LOANS

	Income						
	Total <sup>1</sup>	Under \$3,000	\$3,000 to \$4,999	\$5,000 to \$7,999	\$8,000 to \$9,999	\$10,000 to \$14,999	\$15,000 and over
Number reporting no existing appliance or furniture loans	3,977	466	466	873	666	758	524
Number answering interest rate question	3,785	409	440	843	649	737	513
Interest rate (percent): <sup>2</sup>							
Up to 5	10.3	9.0	8.4	10.7	9.5	12.6	9.4
5.01 to 7	23.0	13.5	17.9	23.4	23.7	25.9	28.3
7.01 to 11	18.9	10.3	10.3	14.6	20.6	22.1	28.6
Over 11	8.4	2.6	4.1	6.8	9.7	13.2	11.4
Don't know	39.4	64.7	59.3	44.4	36.4	26.4	22.3
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0

<sup>1</sup>Sum of the number of households reporting by income does not equal total since not all respondents indicated income level.  
<sup>2</sup>Percentage distribution of those answering interest rate question.

APPENDIX B

TABLE 8.—ANNUAL PERCENTAGE RATE OF INTEREST ANTICIPATED FOR PERSONAL LOANS

	Income						
	Total <sup>1</sup>	Under \$3,000	\$3,000 to \$4,999	\$5,000 to \$7,999	\$8,000 to \$9,999	\$10,000 to \$14,999	\$15,000 and over
Number reporting no existing cash personal loans	4,222	507	526	951	702	769	520
Number answering interest rate question	3,991	444	496	910	678	735	508
Interest rate (percent): <sup>2</sup>							
Up to 5	11.2	7.6	10.8	11.7	9.8	13.9	11.7
5.01 to 7	27.6	19.6	20.8	28.5	29.3	30.0	30.1
7.01 to 11	19.2	9.7	12.9	13.7	20.6	22.8	31.1
Over 11	5.2	2.2	2.3	3.3	6.9	7.9	7.7
Don't know	36.8	60.9	53.1	42.7	33.3	25.3	19.5
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0

<sup>1</sup>Sum of the number of households reporting by income does not equal total since not all respondents indicated income level.  
<sup>2</sup>Percentage distribution of those answering interest rate question.

TABLE 9.—RETAIL CHARGE ACCOUNTS

	Income						
	Total <sup>1</sup>	Under \$3,000	\$3,000 to \$4,999	\$5,000 to \$7,999	\$8,000 to \$9,999	\$10,000 to \$14,999	\$15,000 and over
Number reporting arrangements for retail charge purchases	3,259	220	290	703	582	762	535
Percent	63.4	36.2	47.0	59.4	67.9	79.5	85.1
Number reporting no arrangements for retail charge purchases	1,885	389	327	481	275	197	94
Percent	36.6	63.8	53.0	40.6	32.1	20.5	14.9
Number indicating accounts with service charges and time limits	2,405	111	185	508	440	622	444
Interest rate (percent): <sup>2</sup>							
Up to 5	12.9	5.6	16.8	10.5	14.6	13.3	13.3
5.01 to 11	11.2	5.6	8.3	12.4	11.4	13.3	8.9
11.01 to 17	10.4	3.6	5.7	8.5	8.8	12.5	14.9
Over 17	17.4	4.0	7.7	13.3	19.8	18.7	25.6
Don't know	48.0	81.1	61.5	55.3	45.4	42.2	37.4
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0

<sup>1</sup>Sum of the number of households reporting by income does not equal total since not all respondents indicated income level.  
<sup>2</sup>Annual percentage rate of interest reported on retail charge accounts (percentage distribution).

TABLE 10.—BANK CREDIT CARDS

	Income					
	Total <sup>1</sup>	Under \$3,000	\$5,000 to \$7,999	\$8,000 to \$9,999	\$10,000 to \$14,999	\$15,000 and over
Number reporting ownership of a bank credit card	1,324	166	241	243	313	266
Percent	25.8	13.6	20.4	28.4	32.7	42.3
Number reporting no bank credit card	3,813	1,058	939	613	645	363
Percent	74.2	86.4	79.6	71.6	67.3	57.7
Interest rate (percent): <sup>2</sup>						
No interest	4.6	2.4	2.2	2.9	6.1	5.5
0.01 to 5	7.7	4.5	7.2	7.4	9.3	9.1
5.01 to 11	9.3	3.2	11.8	8.7	10.7	11.4
11.01 to 17	8.7	3.7	4.0	10.7	9.6	14.4
Over 17	11.2	5.1	11.8	11.4	13.9	14.4
Do not use	7.1	15.0	8.4	6.7	4.3	5.9
Don't know	51.4	66.0	54.6	52.2	46.2	39.2
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0

<sup>1</sup>Sum of the number of households reporting by income does not equal total since not all respondents indicated income level.  
<sup>2</sup>Annual percentage rate of interest reported on bank credit cards (percentage distribution).

TABLE 11.—KNOWLEDGE OF TRUTH IN LENDING

	Income						
	Total <sup>1</sup>	Under \$3,000	\$3,000 to \$4,999	\$5,000 to \$7,999	\$8,000 to \$9,999	\$10,000 to \$14,999	\$15,000 and over
Number reporting hearing of a Federal law that requires consumers be given certain credit information	2,289	132	189	474	426	547	416
Number indicating they knew name of the law	546	12	18	75	92	167	158
Percentage distribution: <sup>2</sup>							
Truth in Lending	80.4	60.7	60.0	78.6	75.6	86.5	81.4
All others	6.7	32.1	5.7	2.8	11.0	3.6	7.2
Don't know	12.9	7.1	34.3	18.6	13.4	9.9	11.4
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0

<sup>1</sup>Sum of the number of households reporting by income does not equal total since not all respondents indicated income level.  
<sup>2</sup>Name of law given by those indicating they knew name of the law.

TABLE 12.—KNOWLEDGE OF PROVISIONS OF TRUTH IN LENDING LAW

	Income						
	Total <sup>1</sup>	Under \$3,000	\$3,000 to \$4,999	\$5,000 to \$7,999	\$8,000 to \$9,999	\$10,000 to \$14,999	\$15,000 and over
Number answering affirmative when asked directly if they had heard of a Truth in Lending law	1,631	89	140	361	304	386	270
Number indicating they knew name of the law (from table 11)	546	12	18	75	92	167	158
Total answering question on provisions of the law	2,145	96	157	428	391	545	426
Lender must specify: <sup>2</sup>							
Dollar cost and annual percentage rate of interest of credit	4.9	3.3	3.2	5.8	4.1	4.9	6.8
True interest rate	20.2	10.4	10.7	12.5	22.7	24.6	26.8
Dollar basis cost	15.0	7.4	16.6	16.5	13.6	15.5	17.5
Interest on loan	18.4	11.2	20.1	18.2	21.4	20.3	15.0
Other disclosure to borrower	9.2	8.3	6.5	7.3	8.7	10.2	12.0
Law provides protection against excessive interest rates and charges, or otherwise protects consumer	16.0	18.3	18.1	16.7	17.2	15.0	13.1
All other answers	3.8	3.7	2.6	3.2	4.2	3.6	4.9
Don't know	18.2	45.4	26.6	24.4	23.9	12.0	10.0
Total <sup>3</sup>							

<sup>1</sup>Sum of the number of households reporting by income does not equal total since not all respondents indicated income level.  
<sup>2</sup>Provisions of the law as indicated by those who had heard of truth in lending (percentage distribution).  
<sup>3</sup>Will not total to 100 since more than 1 answer was possible.

TABLE 13.—KNOWLEDGE OF INTEREST RATES

	Income						
	Total <sup>1</sup>	Under \$3,000	\$3,900 to \$4,999	\$5,000 to \$7,999	\$8,000 to \$9,999	\$10,000 to \$14,999	\$15,000 and over
Number estimating the true annual percentage rate of interest if the stated or contract rate was 6 percent.....	5,142	607	617	1,184	857	959	629
Interest rate (percent): <sup>2</sup>							
6 percent or less.....	12.3	6.6	11.3	12.8	17.2	12.5	11.9
6.01 to 9.....	6.0	2.7	4.5	6.4	6.8	5.7	7.2
9.01 to 12.....	15.1	3.1	6.3	11.9	16.5	24.6	30.1
12.01 and over.....	9.6	1.4	5.3	8.6	9.3	13.9	17.7
Don't know.....	57.1	86.1	72.5	60.3	50.2	43.2	33.0
Total.....	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0

<sup>1</sup> Sum of the number of households reporting by income does not equal total since not all respondents indicated income level.  
<sup>2</sup> Estimates of true annual percentage rate of interest (percentage distribution).

TABLE 14.—ANNUAL PERCENTAGE RATE OF INTEREST REPORTED ON 1ST MORTGAGE LOANS

	Education				
	Total <sup>1</sup>	Some high school or less	Graduated high school	Some college	Graduated college or higher
Number reporting new or refinanced 1st mortgage loans within past 5 years.....	878	237	317	137	183
Number answering interest rate question.....	802	219	289	119	171
Interest rate (percent): <sup>2</sup>					
3 to 5.50.....	19.7	21.0	14.7	21.6	21.1
5.75 to 6.50.....	35.7	29.9	34.4	36.9	44.8
6.75 and over.....	18.1	14.2	18.0	25.9	16.3
Don't know.....	26.6	34.8	33.0	15.7	17.7
Total.....	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0

<sup>1</sup> Sum of the number of households reporting by education does not equal total since not all respondents indicated highest education completed.  
<sup>2</sup> Percentage distribution of those answering interest rate question.

TABLE 15.—ANNUAL PERCENTAGE RATE OF INTEREST REPORTED ON HOME IMPROVEMENT LOANS

	Education			
	Total <sup>1</sup>	Some high school or less	Graduated high school	Some college or higher
Number reporting home improvement loans within past 3 years.....	341	124	116	100
Number answering interest rate question.....	303	113	101	89
Interest rate (percent): <sup>2</sup>				
Up to 5.....	13.9	14.2	15.1	12.7
5.01 to 7.....	37.0	28.7	36.2	45.0
Over 7.....	13.9	11.5	16.5	16.9
Don't know.....	35.3	45.6	32.1	25.4
Total.....	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0

<sup>1</sup> Sum of the number of households reporting by education does not equal total since not all respondents indicated highest education completed.  
<sup>2</sup> Percentage distribution of those answering interest rate question.

TABLE 16.—ANNUAL PERCENTAGE RATE OF INTEREST REPORTED ON AUTOMOBILE LOANS

	Education					
	Total <sup>1</sup>	Grade school or less	Some high school	Graduated high school	Some college	Graduated college or higher
Number reporting new or used car loans within past 12 months.....	952	111	202	325	151	159
Number answering interest rate question.....	908	106	195	310	144	149
Interest rate (percent) <sup>2</sup>						
Up to 5.....	14.5	11.3	14.6	15.3	14.7	16.2
5.01 to 7.....	32.0	20.9	32.8	34.4	35.8	38.7
7.01 to 10.....	11.9	8.7	5.6	13.7	13.4	13.3
Over 10.....	8.0	3.1	5.1	7.4	11.7	8.6
Don't know.....	33.5	56.1	41.8	29.3	24.4	23.2
Total.....	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0

<sup>1</sup> Sum of the number of households reporting by education does not equal total since not all respondents indicated highest education completed.  
<sup>2</sup> Percentage distribution of those answering interest rate question.

TABLE 17.—ANNUAL PERCENTAGE RATE OF INTEREST REPORTED ON APPLIANCE AND FURNITURE LOANS

	Education				
	Total <sup>1</sup>	Grade school or less	Some high school	Graduated high school	Some college or higher
Number reporting appliance or furniture loans within past 12 months.....	622	109	136	218	155
Number answering interest rate question.....	607	109	133	213	148
Interest rate (percent): <sup>2</sup>					
Up to 5.....	12.2	2.9	9.0	14.5	15.4
5.01 to 7.....	11.9	12.3	10.4	15.6	11.9
7.01 to 11.....	10.4	8.2	11.1	8.0	14.1
Over 11.....	11.5	3.3	8.0	11.7	21.5
Don't know.....	54.0	73.4	61.6	50.3	37.0
Total.....	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0

<sup>1</sup> Sum of the number of households reporting by education does not equal total since not all respondents indicated highest education completed.  
<sup>2</sup> Percentage distribution of those answering interest rate question.

TABLE 18.—ANNUAL PERCENTAGE RATE OF INTEREST REPORTED ON PERSONAL LOANS

	Education				
	Total <sup>1</sup>	Some high school or less	Graduated high school	Some college	Graduated college or higher
Number reporting cash personal loans within past 12 months.....	705	204	235	111	153
Number answering interest rate question.....	639	185	213	99	142
Interest rate (percent): <sup>2</sup>					
Up to 5.....	6.9	5.0	5.8	7.0	11.7
5.01 to 7.....	28.2	30.3	24.2	29.6	27.4
7.01 to 11.....	13.5	9.5	19.2	12.2	8.8
Over 11.....	9.1	6.2	8.1	10.8	10.6
Don't know.....	42.4	49.1	42.7	40.4	41.6
Total.....	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0

<sup>1</sup> Sum of the number of households reporting by education does not equal total since not all respondents indicated highest education completed.  
<sup>2</sup> Percentage distribution of those answering interest rate question.

TABLE 19.—ANNUAL PERCENTAGE RATE OF INTEREST ANTICIPATED FOR AUTOMOBILE LOANS

	Education						
	Total <sup>1</sup>	Grade school or less	Some high school	Graduated high school	Some college	Graduated college	Post-graduate college
Number reporting no existing new or used car loans.....	3,911	705	875	1,165	504	400	231
Number answering interest rate question.....	3,767	655	843	1,137	491	386	229
Interest rate (percent): <sup>2</sup>							
Up to 5.....	12.3	10.9	10.6	13.0	12.5	15.2	12.6
5.01 to 7.....	26.6	19.7	25.7	28.9	28.6	24.3	30.9
7.01 to 11.....	19.5	12.6	13.6	16.8	27.0	26.6	30.7
Over 11.....	5.4	2.7	4.0	4.7	6.4	10.9	10.0
Don't know.....	36.3	54.0	46.2	36.7	25.5	23.0	15.8
Total.....	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0

<sup>1</sup> Sum of the number of households reporting by education does not equal total since not all respondents indicated highest education completed.  
<sup>2</sup> Percentage distribution of those answering interest rate question.

TABLE 20.—ANNUAL PERCENTAGE RATE OF INTEREST ANTICIPATED FOR APPLIANCE AND FURNITURE LOANS

	Education						
	Total <sup>1</sup>	Grade school or less	Some high school	Graduated high school	Some college	Graduated college	Post-graduate college
Number reporting no existing appliance or furniture loans.....	3,977	668	875	1,191	545	419	252
Number answering interest rate question.....	3,785	603	838	1,148	533	399	244
Interest rate (percent): <sup>2</sup>							
Up to 5.....	10.3	8.5	9.2	10.6	10.9	9.6	12.0
5.01 to 7.....	23.0	16.8	21.2	24.4	27.6	24.4	28.7
7.01 to 11.....	18.9	11.4	13.3	18.8	21.4	27.0	23.9
Over 11.....	8.4	4.4	4.3	7.2	13.3	14.9	15.6
Don't know.....	39.4	58.9	52.0	39.0	27.0	24.1	19.9
Total.....	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0

<sup>1</sup> Sum of the number of households reporting by education does not equal total since not all respondents indicated highest education completed.  
<sup>2</sup> Percentage distribution of those answering interest rate question.

TABLE 21.—ANNUAL PERCENTAGE RATE OF INTEREST ANTICIPATED FOR PERSONAL LOANS

	Education						
	Total <sup>1</sup>	Grade school or less	Some high school	Graduated high school	Some college	Graduated college	Post-graduate college
Number reporting no existing cash personal loans.....	4,222	774	961	1,269	550	420	214
Number answering interest rate question.....	3,991	694	916	1,215	533	401	204
Interest rate (percent): <sup>2</sup>							
Up to 5.....	11.2	8.5	11.4	11.2	11.4	12.7	12.5
5.01 to 7.....	27.6	20.8	24.9	27.8	33.2	27.9	33.5
7.01 to 11.....	19.2	12.5	12.8	18.0	23.8	28.7	29.5
Over 11.....	5.2	3.0	2.5	5.0	7.3	9.5	10.0
Don't know.....	36.8	55.2	48.3	38.0	24.4	21.1	14.5
Total.....	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0

<sup>1</sup> Sum of the number of households reporting by education does not equal total since not all respondents indicated highest education completed.  
<sup>2</sup> Percentage distribution of those answering interest rate question.

TABLE 22.—RETAIL CHARGE ACCOUNTS

	Education					
	Total <sup>1</sup>	Grade school or less	Some high school	Graduated high school	Some college	Graduated college or higher
Number reporting arrangements for retail charge purchases.....	3,259	389	595	1,049	500	696
Percent.....	63.4	42.3	52.3	67.7	73.8	85.1
Number reporting no arrangements for retail charge purchases.....	1,885	530	543	501	178	122
Percent.....	36.6	57.7	47.7	32.3	26.2	14.9
Number indicating accounts with service charges and time limits.....	2,405	215	407	775	419	580
Interest rate (percent): <sup>2</sup>						
Up to 5.....	12.9	6.9	11.6	12.1	16.6	13.8
5.01 to 11.....	11.2	10.6	11.5	12.4	12.3	7.7
11.01 to 17.....	10.4	3.0	7.0	10.3	12.7	14.2
Over 17.....	17.4	4.9	10.9	14.7	22.2	26.3
Don't know.....	48.0	74.7	59.0	50.5	36.3	38.0
Total.....	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0

<sup>1</sup> Sum of the number of households reporting by education does not equal total since not all respondents indicated highest education completed.  
<sup>2</sup> Annual percentage rate of interest reported on retail charge accounts (percentage distribution).

TABLE 23.—BANK CREDIT CARDS

	Education						
	Total <sup>1</sup>	Grade school or less	Some high school	Graduated high school	Some college	Graduated college	Post-graduate college
Number reporting ownership of a bank credit card.....	1,324	126	215	427	204	197	121
Percent.....	25.8	13.7	18.9	27.6	30.2	37.9	40.6
Number reporting no bank credit card.....	3,813	791	921	1,121	472	324	176
Percent.....	74.2	86.3	81.1	72.4	69.8	62.1	59.4
Interest rate (percent): <sup>2</sup>							
No interest.....	4.6	2.2	3.6	3.7	4.1	6.0	8.9
0.01 to 5.....	7.7	7.0	7.1	6.2	9.2	9.9	8.9
5.01 to 11.....	9.3	12.5	8.0	10.1	7.6	8.6	9.7
11.01 to 17.....	8.7	0.4	7.5	6.3	9.9	13.0	17.8
Over 17.....	11.2	1.8	7.1	8.2	17.7	17.5	22.4
Do not use.....	7.1	13.6	11.1	8.1	4.6	2.9	3.5
Don't know.....	51.4	62.5	55.6	57.5	47.0	42.1	29.0
Total.....	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0

<sup>1</sup> Sum of the number of households reporting by education does not equal total since not all respondents indicated highest education completed.  
<sup>2</sup> Annual percentage rate of interest reported on bank credit cards (percentage distribution).

TABLE 24.—KNOWLEDGE OF TRUTH IN LENDING

	Education						
	Total <sup>1</sup>	Grade school or less	Some high school	Graduated high school	Some college	Graduated college	Post-graduate college
Number reporting hearing of a Federal law that requires consumers be given certain credit information.....	2,289	187	393	739	413	333	214
Number indicating they knew name of the law.....	546	9	42	144	130	119	99
Percentage distribution: <sup>2</sup>							
Truth in lending.....	80.4	35.0	69.1	83.6	82.4	79.5	83.1
All others.....	6.7	45.0	9.9	3.1	4.3	8.4	7.8
Don't know.....	12.9	20.0	21.0	13.2	13.3	12.0	9.2
Total.....	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0

<sup>1</sup> Sum of the number of households reporting by education does not equal total since not all respondents indicated highest education completed.  
<sup>2</sup> Name of law given by those indicating they knew of the law.

TABLE 25.—KNOWLEDGE OF PROVISIONS OF TRUTH IN LENDING LAW

	Education						
	Total <sup>1</sup>	Grade school or less	Some high school	Graduated high school	Some college	Graduated college	Post-graduate college
Number answering affirmative when asked directly if they had heard of a truth in lending law.....	1,631	157	272	560	277	232	127
Number indicating they knew name of the law (from table 24).....	546	9	42	144	130	119	99
Total answering question on provisions of the law.....	2,145	162	304	695	405	346	224
Lender must specify (percent): <sup>2</sup>							
Dollar cost and annual percentage rate of interest of credit.....	4.9	1.4	3.9	4.7	5.3	7.0	6.3
True interest rate.....	20.2	8.2	13.0	16.7	26.6	26.1	31.2
Dollar basis-cost.....	15.0	7.6	15.1	16.5	18.2	12.9	14.5
Interest on loan.....	18.4	11.9	21.3	20.0	16.8	17.2	19.8
Other disclosure to borrower.....	9.2	2.8	7.6	8.4	11.2	12.8	10.0
Law provides protection against excessive interest rates and charges, or otherwise protects consumer.....	16.0	25.2	19.0	14.8	12.4	15.3	12.8
All other answers.....	3.8	.9	4.2	3.7	4.6	4.4	4.0
Don't know.....	18.2	44.6	21.3	21.8	11.0	10.3	8.0
Total.....	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0

<sup>1</sup> Sum of the number of households reporting by education does not equal total since not all respondents indicated highest education completed.  
<sup>2</sup> Provisions of the law as indicated by those who had heard of truth in lending (percentage distribution).  
<sup>3</sup> Will not total to 100 since more than 1 answer was possible.

TABLE 26.—KNOWLEDGE OF INTEREST RATES

	Education						
	Total <sup>1</sup>	Grade school or less	Some high school	Graduated high school	Some college	Graduated college	Post-graduate college
Number estimating the true annual percentage rate of interest if the stated or contract rate was 6 percent.....	5,142	918	1,138	1,550	678	521	297

Footnotes at end of table.

	Education						
	Total <sup>1</sup>	Grade school or less	Some high school	Graduated high school	Some college	Graduated college	Post-graduate college
Interest rate (percent): <sup>2</sup>							
6 percent or less.....	12.3	7.3	11.4	13.7	15.7	15.1	11.0
6.01 to 9.....	6.0	4.0	4.8	6.5	6.7	6.9	5.2
9.01 to 12.....	15.1	4.1	11.1	14.9	23.3	27.4	32.6
12.01 and over.....	9.6	4.1	6.6	11.2	13.7	11.1	15.8
Don't know.....	57.1	80.5	66.2	53.7	40.5	39.6	35.4
Total.....	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0

<sup>1</sup> Sum of the number of households reporting by education does not equal total since not all respondents indicated highest education completed.  
<sup>2</sup> Estimates of true annual percentage rate of interest (percentage distribution).

REPORT ON SOUTHEAST ASIAN VISIT

The SPEAKER. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Mississippi (Mr. MONTGOMERY) is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. MONTGOMERY. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate being given this opportunity to report to my colleagues on my recent trip to Southeast Asia. My visit to the U.S. servicemen in South Vietnam this Christmas was actually my third Christmas in Vietnam. I am pleased to report that after careful analysis of the current military situation I am convinced that President Nixon's policy of Vietnamization is working and will continue to work.

Of course, it is easy to become overly optimistic about the outcome of the war when one observes the progress made by the South Vietnamese forces in just this last year. For this reason I have tried to analyze my findings as objectively as possible in order to make certain my conclusions were based on fact and not wishful hoping.

One reason I believe we will continue to withdraw troops is the proficiency of the four South Vietnamese divisions plus improvements of other South Vietnam military units. These troops realize the U.S. forces are withdrawing, and consequently they have prepared themselves for the day when the defense of South Vietnam will rest entirely on their shoulders, and the shoulders of their fellow countrymen.

It was also reassuring to learn that the regional and populace forces are able to perform their assigned tasks of protecting the provinces and the villages.

I can also report to you, Mr. Speaker, that President Thieu's policy of issuing guns or weapons to the individuals who make up the people's self-defense force is working very well. It would not have been possible to pursue such a policy a year ago, but fortunately the South Vietnamese with the help of American troops have managed to free 92 percent of the population from Communist domination.

And I might say, Mr. Speaker, 2 years ago if you would have tried to give guns to individuals more than likely these guns would have ended up in the hands of the VC. That is not the case now.

The vast majority of the South Vietnamese people realize that democracy is by far the most preferable form of government. The South Vietnamese have also come to realize that the Vietcong

are the ones responsible for their misery and suffering. For these reasons President Thieu's policy of arming the people has proved successful.

Mr. Speaker, when I reported to you and my colleagues last year I recommended and urged that the United States withdraw a minimum of 100,000 U.S. troops from South Vietnam. I know that I cannot take credit for what has taken place, but by April 1 of this year America will have withdrawn 110,000 servicemen from South Vietnam. I believe that we can continue to withdraw troops during 1970 until we have withdrawn an additional 75,000 to 100,000 men by January 1, 1971. Although I feel it would be a very serious mistake for President Nixon to publicly state a withdrawal timetable I do believe we should work toward a goal of withdrawing most of our combat troops by mid-1972.

I would hasten to point out however that the United States will have military forces in South Vietnam for many years to come, as has been the case in Europe where we still have well over 100,000 troops and which has been the case in South Korea where we have around 50,000 Americans there—and they have been there for almost 20 years. I believe it will be necessary to retain a force of 50,000 to 75,000 men in South Vietnam for technical and support purposes.

In spite of what you might have read in the newspapers or hear over the television or radio the morale of the U.S. servicemen is excellent. These are fine fighting young men we have in Vietnam. They are about 25 pounds heavier and about 2 inches taller on the average than their fathers were in World War II.

Their major concern—and I am talking about these young Americans fighting in Vietnam—seems to be the continued antiwar protests in America. They are worried about these protests.

Many of the servicemen with whom I visited—and there have been quite a few for the last 3 years—99 percent of them understand that our flag is committed in Vietnam and they understand their obligation to this flag.

One disturbing thing I did find on my trip was the lack of unity among the elected leaders in South Vietnam. Some Members of the National Assembly have accused President Thieu of being a dictator. I would admit that President Thieu has taken a hard-nosed approach in some matters but I feel it was necessary for him to do so under the circumstances.

My personal observations and communications that I have received from our American advisers indicate that President Thieu is doing a commendable job and is the best man for the position.

While in Vietnam I also investigated the alleged killings at Mylai. I can say without equivocation that whatever did happen at Mylai was an isolated incident. It has not affected the morale of our troops nor the people of Vietnam. It will not have any effect on the outcome of the war. Frankly I cannot quite understand why the Army has handled the situation in the manner that they have. The national press has also forgotten to mention the untold number of atrocities and mass killings committed by the Vietcong and the North Vietnamese. Mr. Speaker, I believe it is also right and proper that we not be too quick to judge the men implicated in this alleged massacre.

I found our pacification program to be working very well in Southeast Asia. Our servicemen in pacification are showing the Vietnamese people that the United States is truly trying to help them achieve a democratic form of government through free elections. As a consequence the South Vietnamese are realizing that the Vietcong is the real enemy.

Mr. Speaker, I might say if any of my colleagues would like to comment as I touch on these different subjects on Vietnam I certainly would like to have their opinions or comments.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. ROGERS).

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

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

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. First, I wish to commend the gentleman from Mississippi for taking the time during the recess between the first session and the second session of the 91st Congress to go to Vietnam and make the study which he has made. Those of us in the Congress who have had the opportunity to observe the gentleman from Mississippi in his studies in connection with Vietnam recognize that he is a student who is interested in trying to help solve the problem. I for one want to commend him for his action and giving us the benefit of his thinking in that regard.

Naturally we are all concerned as to how soon we can bring an end to the situation in South Vietnam. I would appreciate it if the gentleman could give us the benefit of his thinking on this

question. While the gentleman says that he does not think we should have a timetable, he has pointed out that the Vietnamization program of the President is working. Does the gentleman think it is working to the point that at sometime soon we may be assured of the end of the casualties in that area? What are your thoughts in that regard?

Mr. MONTGOMERY. First, I thank the gentleman for his comments. I know he has been interested in my trip and he has been very patient in letting me talk with him at different times about my thoughts on the subject of Vietnam.

I believe that if other nations, such as China and Russia, do not become heavily involved in Vietnam—in North Vietnam or South Vietnam—the way the war is presently progressing, I have set a timetable for myself to have most of our combat fighting ground troops out of Vietnam by mid-1972. I think such a target will give the South Vietnamese enough time to completely take over the fighting.

As I mentioned in my remarks, it seems to me, as we have done in Europe and Korea, that we shall have to keep some type of advisory and technical support in South Vietnam to help these people for some time to come. But I would say that by mid-1972, the way the war is progressing now, we should have most of our combat fighting forces out of Vietnam, in my opinion.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. I thank the gentleman.

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

Mr. MONTGOMERY. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. BRINKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I, too, wish to commend my colleague from the State of Mississippi for his taking the time today to speak on the subject of Vietnam, and in permitting us to participate with him; furthermore, I wish to commend him for his trip to Vietnam.

I share the gentleman's concern over the Mylai incident and the hasty condemnation of Lieutenant Calley. In criminal justice in this Nation we have the rule that a man is presumed innocent until proven guilty beyond a reasonable doubt. We believe in that rule. Certainly we should apply that standard in this case also.

In the civil law of this country we also have a provision called the emergency doctrine. Under that doctrine if one, while driving a car or engaging in other pursuits, is confronted with a sudden emergency not of his own making, he is not held to the same standard of care to which he is normally held. Applying that standard to a situation of war, we certainly should withhold judgment in order to guarantee this soldier a fair and equitable trial.

Mr. MONTGOMERY. I certainly agree with the gentleman from Georgia. I appreciate very much his comments on the Mylai incident.

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

Mr. MONTGOMERY. I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. TAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, I, too, would like to commend the gentleman from Mississippi and the gentleman from

Georgia on the statements they have made in regard to the Mylai incident.

Lieutenant Calley's home of record is Waynesville, N.C., which is in the congressional district I represent.

However, he spent most of his life in Miami, Fla. He entered the service with a fine civilian record. He was promoted from a private to a lieutenant. He was decorated in service six times.

Mr. Speaker, I have been greatly concerned that he was being tried by the press and being convicted without being given a fair trial. Witnesses have been interrogated and their testimony has been published nationwide on the front pages of newspapers, and pictures of horror and death and destruction have appeared in papers with insinuations that Lieutenant Calley caused this. Of course, one man's service cannot cause such destruction. Lieutenants do not make military policy.

Mr. Speaker, I hope the press will discipline itself and will give this young man an opportunity for a fair trial in a proper court without trying him and convicting him in the newspapers.

Mr. MONTGOMERY. Mr. Speaker, I certainly thank the gentleman from North Carolina for his remarks. They are certainly appropriate at this time.

Mr. Speaker, further commenting on the Mylai situation, in response to the gentleman from North Carolina, while in South Vietnam I had arranged to go to Mylai, but the day before my scheduled visit there had been some VC activity in that area, and it was recommended that we not go into Mylai. However, we did fly over that area, although it is one of the few places in South Vietnam which still cannot be entered with any fair amount of safety.

Mr. TAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. MONTGOMERY. I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. TAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, would the gentleman from Mississippi agree with me that the war in Vietnam is a very peculiar war, one in which we cannot tell our friends from our enemies? An innocent civilian by day becomes a deadly killer by night, and all this complicates the situation when we start accusing the GI's of murder when they shoot what they think are enemies.

Mr. MONTGOMERY. That is certainly true. I may say that whatever happened in Mylai, it has had no effect on the Vietnamese people themselves. I visited various hamlets and villages. They like the Americans and they know what type job the Americans are doing. Mylai has had no effect on the morale of the American troops.

Mr. Speaker, I met the three top American officials in Vietnam, Admiral McCain, General Abrams, and Ambassador Bunker, and all three were optimistic about our being able to turn a large share of the war and the fighting over to the South Vietnamese. General Abrams was optimistic and expressed his opinion, in that down-to-earth language for which he is so well known when he told me:

I will eat the fatigues I am now wearing if the two South Vietnamese divisions below

the DMZ cannot repel any Communist attack that comes through the DMZ.

Of course, I would like to add that this is dependent on our air support in the event of such an attack. Mr. Speaker, all indications are there will be some type of Communist offensive during the Tet which comes in February. It is my opinion that with our air and artillery and helicopter support the South Vietnamese will be able to repel any attack.

Mr. Speaker, I would also like to share with the Members my experience in attempting to visit the U.S. servicemen being held as prisoners of war in North Vietnam. I must admit the idea of going to North Vietnam and trying to visit with American prisoners was not original with me. The idea was suggested to me by a member of the armed services stationed at the Pentagon. By the same token, I was most sincere in my request for a visa to enter North Vietnam. As expected, my attempts were rejected. A radio broadcast came out of Hanoi denying my visit with American prisoners.

Mr. Speaker, the Hanoi message I received was a typical North Vietnam propaganda blast. I also received a message from the DRVN representatives to the Paris peace talks, and under permission I have obtained, I will read this message. I might add that I received a similar reply from the Foreign Ministry of North Vietnam.

It came to me, a Member of Congress. This is from the North Vietnamese Ministry:

Mr. GILLESPIE V. MONTGOMERY,  
Member of Congress,  
Washington, D.C.:

Waging war aggression on Viet Nam, U.S.A. has committed monstrous crimes against Vietnamese people.

U.S. airmen held in North Viet Nam have bombed and killed many civilians and destroyed many villages and towns in North Viet Nam. Yet after capture they have received humane treatment pursuant to policy DRVN Government: They enjoy medical care when they are ill, and are allowed on regular basis to receive letters and packages from their families.

To our deep regret it is not now convenient for your coming to Hanoi in view of continued U.S. attacks on D.R.V.N.

HEAD OF SECRETARIAT,  
Foreign Ministry, D.R.V.N.

Members can see just how ridiculous this message is.

Even though I was rejected in this attempt, I intend to continue to harass the North Vietnamese in any way possible until they abide by the Geneva Convention on the Treatment of Prisoners of War.

Another military matter I should like to bring to the attention of my House colleagues is the announced decision to return Okinawa to the Government of Japan. I feel very strongly this would be a very serious mistake on the part of the United States.

In addition to the fact that Okinawa holds a great deal of historical and sentimental value for all Americans, the island is of strategic importance from a military and financial standpoint.

Its historical and sentimental value stems from the loss of 12,000 U.S. servicemen who gave their lives to capture

Okinawa. It is valuable militarily, since this island is the only United States territory within a reasonable distance of Peking, Tokyo, Seoul, Saigon, Bangkok and Hanoi. Okinawa is the site for nuclear and modern conventional weapons needed for the preventive defense of the Pacific. If we were to lose possession of Okinawa it would mean removing these sophisticated weapons back to Guam, back to Hawaii, or even back to the west coast.

Since Okinawa is where we repair all of our wheeled and tracked vehicles used in South Vietnam and Southeast Asia, the financial consequences of returning the island will not make the U.S. taxpayers very happy. We can repair these vehicles at Okinawa at the rate of \$2.50 an hour, whereas the cost stateside would be in the neighborhood of \$8.50 an hour. This does not include the additional 2 months of deadlining the vehicle or the added cost of transporting the equipment a further distance.

Mr. Speaker, I have tried to touch on some of the high spots of my trip and to give some insight into my findings on the Vietnam war and on other military situations, following visits to Southeast Asia for 3 successive years. If any other Member would like to make any comment at this time I shall certainly be glad to yield to him.

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

Mr. MONTGOMERY. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. McKNEALLY. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I greatly enjoyed the gentleman's report on his trip to South Vietnam. I certainly approve and endorse everything he has said with reference to the Mylai incident and all the other subjects about which he spoke.

I am pleased to join with the gentleman in praising the high quality of the service of our men there. Certain it is that this war, while it may be one that is fought in a peculiar way, is one that also is received back home in a peculiar way.

I would like to emphasize, while I have the opportunity to do so, the fact that our soldiers are going about the business of doing their job well although they may not like the job they are doing. In typical American fashion they have taken on a responsibility by delegation of their country, and they are doing it. I was greatly impressed not only with the ordinary resourcefulness which is always a characteristic of the American soldier, but once again by his great compassion. Because the American soldier is always interestingly compassionate to his enemy and those he meets and fights with and identifies with, I might say it comes as rather an odd thing that all of a sudden we have discovered that some of our soldiers have gone haywire and adopted the tactics of our enemy. It seems to me we should do a little factfinding. I was staying in the same place with General Peers, an extraordinary capable gentleman, and Mr. Robert McCrate, who is from my own State, and Mr. Walsh, who are investigating this incident. It seems to me it would be rather appropriate and

a credit to us if we allowed factfinders and legal processes to deal with this subject, which has been so much in the newspapers. I had occasion, also, while I was there to visit many hospitals.

It is probably the most inspiring thing in the whole world to visit a military hospital and see the men and see how quickly they recover not only their health but their sense of humor and sense of balance. It is most heartening and inspiring to see this. I must pay tribute, as well, Mr. Speaker, to the helicopter crews which take a healthy man who has been struck down by hostile enemy action and transport him quickly to the hospital, ministering to him on the way, deliver him to our doctors who operate, and return him to his hospital bed almost in full and brimming health, just as he was when he was attacked. That is what was so arresting about going to these hospitals. You see all of these smiling faces of the men who are in command of themselves despite the fact that they had an amputation which followed the hostile enemy action. So we pay tribute here to the hospital people and all of those people who have come together in that country to help make sense out of the situation in which we have been involved.

I cannot fail also to note before I finish that my own returning sentiment and conviction was one of cautious optimism. Nobody wants to make predictions about this war. Too many people were previously frosted by predictions which they made and which misled us, so nobody does it any more. But through the actions and statements of our people we find a measure of optimism based on, I might say in a generous sort of way, the eagerness of the South Vietnamese to take command of their war as well as the new training and new spirit which derive from the Tet offensive of 1967. This offensive had the reverse effect of what the enemy hoped for. So I say to the House and to the Members and to you, Mr. Speaker, I do believe we are in a sound position there and are well organized. All of these voices which are raised on our campuses and voices raised in this House indeed are not of course doing us any benefit and, as a matter of fact, they are not even reporting the situation down there at all accurately.

Mr. MONTGOMERY. I thank the gentleman from New York for his very fine and appropriate remarks. I know the gentleman was in Vietnam for around 5 days also during the Christmas season.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from New York (Mr. PIRNIE).

Mr. PIRNIE. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding to me.

I take this opportunity to commend the gentleman in the well not only for his excellent use of his time during the period between our sessions so as to make this hazardous and difficult trip to Southeast Asia, but also for his contribution to the morale of our servicemen whom he visited there.

The reports which we have received are full of praise for the manner in which he conducted himself, the sincer-

ity of his interest and the depth of his inquiry. He contributed a great deal and his report here today to his colleagues will be deeply appreciated.

I, too, have been concerned about the impact of events and careless comments here at home have upon the fighting men far away. People are willing to make great sacrifices if they feel that their efforts are understood and that the results that they are seeking are applauded. It is not simply for praise or recognition, it is because they like to feel that they are part of a great tradition in which men have sacrificed their comfort and their security in behalf of the Nation they love. So I am sure that the presence of the gentleman from Mississippi was a gesture of recognition and appreciation that gave a great deal of inspiration and courage. I know that some of the personal visitations which he made were most timely and were deeply appreciated. I congratulate the gentleman upon this service to his country. His efforts were not in vain.

Mr. MONTGOMERY. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from New York (Mr. PIRNIE) for his very kind remarks. I know of his great and strong interest in the war in Vietnam. I know of his military background, and again I thank the gentleman for his comments.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. DICKINSON. Mr. Speaker, I rise once again to voice my concern for the well-being of over 1,400 Americans who are listed as "missing in action" or "prisoner of war." I commend the gentleman from Mississippi (Mr. MONTGOMERY) for his efforts to visit North Vietnam in order to visit with American prisoners of war.

Unfortunately, Mr. Speaker, his request for a visa was denied. The Hanoi government issued a typical statement of propaganda when it rejected the request. Hanoi insists that American servicemen are "war criminals" who have committed monstrous crimes against the Vietnamese people.

The North Vietnamese in their propaganda blast claim that—

They [POWs] have received humane treatment pursuant to policy DRVN Government and they enjoy medical care when they are ill, and are allowed on regular basis to receive letters and packages from their families.

Mr. Speaker, nothing could be further from the truth. The North Vietnamese and the Vietcong have violated and continued to violate every provision of the Geneva Convention. Former POW's who were released or escaped have testified, in detail, violation after violation committed by the North Vietnamese and the Vietcong.

The North Vietnamese and the Vietcong have refused to identify the prisoners they hold; they refuse to allow impartial inspection of camps; they will not permit free exchange of mail between prisoners and their families; they have not released the seriously sick or injured prisoners; and they refuse to negotiate seriously for the release of all prisoners. The North Vietnamese and the Vietcong have violated the requirements of the

1949 Geneva Convention in every conceivable way.

Mr. Speaker, I strongly commend the gentleman from Mississippi's action. I also commend those members who voted unanimously, 405 to 0, for the resolution expressing that—

The Congress strongly protests the treatment of United States servicemen held prisoner by North Vietnam and the National Liberation Front of South Vietnam, calls on them to comply with the requirements of the Geneva Convention, and approves and endorses efforts by the United States Government, the United Nations, the International Red Cross, and other leaders and peoples of the world to obtain humane treatment and release of American prisoners of war.

#### GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. MONTGOMERY. Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks on this particular subject.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

#### THE NEED FOR ASSISTANCE TO THE EDUCATIONALLY DISADVANTAGED

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. HAGAN). Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. PERKINS) is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Speaker, yesterday I was pleased to share with my colleagues the results of inquiries I have made throughout the Nation with local school districts concerning the operation of Elementary and Secondary Education Act title I programs for disadvantaged children.

Today in addition I am placing in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD following my remarks more responses from that inquiry.

Mr. Speaker, I continue to be appalled at the attitude of some of my well-meaning colleagues and some spokesmen for the White House who continue to damn ESEA with something less than faint praise.

This is an obvious device to cast doubt upon a program without the facts to support a direct criticism of it. Thus the question is asked: Is the money we are spending really making any difference in the education of children?

While I have no doubt from the results of the questionnaires I have received that the answer to this question is a positive yes, and while the hearings that we have held in each of the last four sessions of the Congress indicate that the answer is a positive yes, the question continues to be posed.

I can positively state from the evidence at hand that any lack of effectiveness is directly due to the unwillingness of the executive branch and the Congress to commit funds to enable these programs to operate at the level the authorizing legislation contemplates.

Mr. Speaker, if the Congress were presented with evidence that a certain type of aircraft would cost \$1 million to build, what kind of aircraft do you suppose

we would obtain if we were to provide only \$250,000 with the instruction to the builder to build the airplane according to his \$1 million design.

This is precisely what we are asking the educators to do with the Elementary and Secondary Education Act. When we do not provide enough funds to a local school system to implement its programs the school system is left with two choices. Either it must limit the program operation to a very small number of children, thus denying the program to many who need and would benefit from it or it must devise programs that apply to all of the target children in which case the affect on achievement of the student will be considerably reduced. I believe that the time is long overdue when we should fully fund these programs. The additional funds provided in the bill the President threatens to veto does not approach full funding but it does enable school districts to maintain at the 1968 operational level programs for the disadvantaged.

Mr. Speaker, during our discussion yesterday, questions were asked as to the effectiveness of title I in raising the achievement levels of disadvantaged children. My response then—and my response now—is that local school superintendents, those people best able to evaluate local programs, overwhelmingly advise us that their title I programs are effective.

I asked my colleagues to read carefully the questionnaires which I made part of the RECORD yesterday. If they have done so, they will see that of the 64 school officials who responded to the question of whether their title I program is effective in meeting special education needs of educationally disadvantaged children, 64—or 100 percent—responded affirmatively.

Let us review some of the responses. To the question: "Is your program effective?"

Dallas County, Ala., responded:

Yes, we are confident that our Title I programs have been very effective in meeting the needs of disadvantaged children.

From Tuscon, Ariz., "A resounding success."

From San Antonio, Tex.:

Yes, the few programs we have are very effective in helping the educationally disadvantaged child.

From Seattle, Wash.:

Yes, our Title I programs have demonstrated success among the members of our target population.

From Norfolk, Va.: "To a vast degree."

From St. Joseph, Mo.: "Absolutely."

The questionnaires which I will place in the RECORD today follow the same pattern:

From Grand Rapids, Mich.:

Yes. No question about it.

From Davidson County, Tenn.: "Definitely."

And Mr. Speaker, contrary to what some allege, these evaluations are not mere observations. They are not just off the top of the head comments from school administrators, as some allege. A further review of the responses reveals

that such evaluations are made on the basis of scientific studies and recognized testing.

From Florence, Ala.:

Yes. Studies and research data relative to services and activities in our local system indicate great progress of pupils participating in Title I activities, progress to the extent achieved impossible without these supplementary programs and services. Items which are hard to measure such as attitude toward school, a pupil's image of himself and his opportunities, etc., have been emphasized with remarkable progress being achieved.

From San Jose, Calif.:

Yes; and we have test data to prove it. . . . We can document who is getting services—what the services are—and that these services are effective. We can show community support for expansion of services if needed.

From Brunswick, Ga.:

Our Title I programs are showing concrete results in meeting the needs of educationally disadvantaged children in the areas that we have funds for elementary of the special programs. Program evaluation: Glynn County, Georgia, pupils participating in the Title I, ESEA, Reading Improvement Program during the 1968-69 school term were given a standardized pre and post test (California Reading Achievement Test). 363 elementary pupils were tested in October, 1968, and again in April, 1969. The average pupil grade placement gain was .72. The average normal pupil grade progress for this period of time would be .55. The above average gain in pupil grade placement progress of .17 alone points out the significant value of this program. Six weeks, summer, 1969, reading program for 678 pupils who were tested (California Reading Achievement Test) pre and post showed an average gain of .42 grade. This was about 1/2 year progress. Six weeks, summer 1969, dropout program has shown positive results. Dropouts during summer (between school terms) has been reduced as follows: Summer 1967, 237 dropouts; summer 1968, 256 dropouts; summer 1969, 91 dropouts.

From Wichita, Kans.:

Yes. We have had annual evaluations of our Title I program. The results have shown a consistent pattern of progress in regard to the improvement of reading. About 50 percent is spent in supportive programs and activities that have contributed to pupil educational progress.

From Shelby, Miss.:

We can and are reaching the disadvantaged. Substantial improvement in reading, math, and language arts achievement, plus more regular attendance is borne out by the results of standardized achievement tests. The greatest obstacle is civil rights groups which try to make Title I into a welfare program.

Today I will insert the questionnaire from Charlestown, W. Va., a school district operating a substantial title I program, with an annual allotment for this program in excess of \$1 million. Their title I program is evaluated as follows:

Recent audit by HEW indicates that funds in Kanawha County are reaching the disadvantaged and are not being misdirected. They further conclude that the only way we can have a more effective program is to receive adequate funding.

In order to obtain the most current information possible on the status of vocational education programs throughout the Nation, I asked the American Vocational Association to do a telephone sur-

vey of State vocational education agencies to obtain the latest information.

That survey was conducted on January 19 and information continues to be assembled which I will share with my colleagues when I receive it.

To date it discloses the following situation in the States indicated.

#### MARYLAND

Two letters of credit from U.S. Office of Education have been received but no Federal funds for vocational education have been allocated to any county in Maryland. The counties have been told that unless additional Federal money is appropriated, they will be cut one-third from what they received last year on their Federal reimbursement.

Thus far, the State of Maryland has maintained an open admissions policy to vocational education; however, unless new programs are added, a selective admissions policy must be employed next year in some counties to take care of demands.

Every county in Maryland has prepared an annual and a long-range plan for vocational education. Annual plans show that each county could spend six times more than they will get under the present level of funding. Baltimore City could use the entire Federal allotment.

Paperwork for projects has been completed and new starts can be made now if funding is available.

#### WISCONSIN

Wisconsin made a commitment for programs for this fiscal year based on the assumption that Federal funding would be available. Local programs are now started and underway.

If funds are cut from last year, the school districts will be forced to borrow funds to make up the deficit. This means that State and local taxes must be raised. Subsequently, programs for the next year will be cut unless Federal funding is available.

#### NEW YORK

New York does not operate under a system of reimbursement, so there has been no reason to cut back; however, what has happened is simply that the vocational programs were not started. Thus the State has been limited this year in moving toward the goals outlined in the State plan for vocational education. Adult programs in particular have been tremendously limited.

The amount available to New York under the \$488 million allocation can be wisely spent for parts D and H, and in all cases where there is 2-year money. The State is presently in process of budgeting for 1971, and the State plan for vocational education is virtually a meaningless exercise unless the State knows in advance what the level of Federal funding will be.

#### KENTUCKY

Requests for vocational funds far exceed the amount of Federal funds available to reimburse on programs. The 40-percent set-asides have made it necessary for Kentucky to spend \$1,911,000 less than was spent on regular programs last year. Cuts have been particularly heavy in terms of postsecondary and

adult programs. Additional cuts will be made in travel and equipment. The next 10 days will be crucial to expenditure of funds in Kentucky at the level of \$488 million. Acceptable programs can be planned and generated if Federal funding at that level is available by February 1.

#### TENNESSEE

The cutback in Federal funds this year has virtually eliminated adult vocational programs in Tennessee. A 75-percent reduction was necessary and this has affected some 18,000 adults. This was the only flexible funding where cuts could be made.

Additional Federal funds can be spent if available in the next 2 weeks. The only place where Tennessee might have difficulty is in the cooperative program which serves primarily an inschool group of students.

#### NEW JERSEY

Approximately \$1 million will be cut from on-going programs of last year. The set-asides for postsecondary are going to junior college programs. There has been virtually no expansion in secondary programs this year.

Twenty-seven area vocational school projects are awaiting Federal funding for construction, State, and local matching funds were made available last year in a \$27 million bond issue.

New Jersey is prepared to wisely spend additional funds this fiscal year. There is now a \$25 million backlog in applications that are approvable and awaiting funding. Work study money is badly needed. Part G funds—cooperative—could be used with virtually no problem. New Jersey could easily use three times the amount it will be allocated under the \$488 million appropriation.

#### CALIFORNIA

After passage of the 1968 amendments, California changed its concept of Federal funding for vocational education from a project basis to that of an entitlement basis. Two requirements must be met by school districts: they must offer bona fide vocational programs and they must generate the excess costs above the average daily attendance costs. This new concept for funding has created unprecedented demands for vocational programs. Last year California spent \$54 million in State and local funds for vocational education. This year, State and local expenditures are expected to approximate \$300 million.

Thus, California is prepared, under this new concept for funding, to wisely spend and commit all Federal funds for vocational education that could be made available in this fiscal year, and spending will not be on a "crash basis." In fact, unless additional Federal funds are available, the local school districts must get the funds, which are already committed for programs, from State and local sources. This can only mean an increase in State and local taxes.

California, given present funding is doing only a portion of the job that needs to be done in vocational education. If programs are to expand, funding must also expand.

#### MASSACHUSETTS

Under the existing Federal allocation, very, very few expansions in vocational education programs will take place. A \$24 million in project requests are now awaiting funding based on the planning and projections asked for in the 1968 vocational education amendments.

If \$488 million is available, Massachusetts can allocate funds in this fiscal year for projects that are already on hand.

#### GEORGIA

The State of Georgia has been traveling on faith that Federal vocational funds would continue, at a minimum, equal to that of last year. The State has already extended itself in supporting \$200,000 in cooperative education programs; additional cuts must be made in equipment used in vocational education programs for youth and adults.

If \$488 million is available, the State of Georgia will have no difficulty in committing the funds this fiscal year. At the present time, operational costs and construction are being held up pending Federal funding.

#### OHIO

At the present level of funding—1969—Ohio is cutting back in construction, supplemental equipment, training programs for vocational personnel, and adult vocational programs.

If \$488 million is available Ohio would have no difficulty in committing funds this fiscal year. It would be spent in areas mentioned, and would be most useful in preparing teachers to take care of the anticipated growth in enrollments.

#### ILLINOIS

At this time no action has been taken to cut programs. This will not be done until the level of Federal funding is known. Illinois this year doubled its State commitment to vocational education and is now in a period of growth and expansion which is in keeping with the spirit of the 1968 amendments. A decrease in Federal expenditures will create a serious setback.

If \$488 million is made available, Illinois will have no difficulty in committing its share of these funds wisely.

#### PENNSYLVANIA

The existing 1969 level of Federal funding for vocational education finds Pennsylvania in this situation: 12 relatively new community colleges which have created demands for vocational-technical education. These institutions have been through a period of remarkable growth and development, but no help can be given them for programs of vocational-technical education beyond that now committed.

Ten branch campuses of Pennsylvania State University that are anxious to sponsor vocational programs for adults, particularly in rural areas, will receive no Federal funds for vocational education purposes.

Secondary programs are in a serious dilemma. The second semester has already begun, and no new programs can now be started in the 622 local school districts in the State.

Teacher education has been curtailed. Plans had been made to train teachers

for disadvantaged, the handicapped, and for working in cooperative programs. Likewise, State staff has been curtailed and there is no help available to local districts to serve these particular needs identified in the 1968 amendments.

Pennsylvania will be hard pressed to keep programs going that are already underway. There will be no new programs, or new starts.

If \$488 million is available, Pennsylvania will have no difficulty in wisely committing its funds. There is a backlog of construction projects and adult programs that could be started.

#### TEXAS

The most serious cutbacks made thus far have been in adult education programs and in the purchase of equipment. There is on file, and approved, 43 applications for area schools. Only four can be funded at the present level of Federal funding. Teacher training programs have been drastically curtailed.

If \$488 million is available, Texas will have no difficulty in committing funds. Adult classes will be reopened; area schools will be designated, and new programs equipped.

#### MICHIGAN

Ongoing programs have been cut clear across the board; there is no money for equipment; no new programs; no upgrading of ongoing programs.

Requests are approved for \$11 million in construction; only \$3 million will be funded. Of particular importance is a facility to provide vocational instruction to delinquent youngsters. It is impossible to operate vocational programs in the existing setting.

Requests have been approved for \$10 million in equipment, pending the availability of funding.

If funds are available by February 1, at the level of \$488 million, Michigan can easily use all the Federal funds that will be allotted.

#### NORTH CAROLINA

This State is in the process of reorganizing all of vocational education within the State, including a revision of the middle school curriculum—junior high school—to provide occupational information and work experience. In addition to the secondary programs, there are post-secondary institutions strategically located throughout the State. Only the provision of State funds has enabled North Carolina to make progress this year.

North Carolina can use the Federal funds that will be available this fiscal year if the \$488 million is appropriated.

The questionnaires referred to follow:

RESPONSE OF ORRIN J. SMUCKER, COLUMBUS CITY SCHOOLS, COLUMBUS, OHIO, JANUARY 20, 1970

How many children in your district are benefitting from education programs funded under Title I of ESEA?

Answer: 9,030 pupils in year long programs.

What is the ADA in your school district grades K-12?

Answer: Title I Programs.

What was the amount of your ESEA Title I grant in each of the following fiscal years?

Answer: 1968 \$2,343,945.58; 1969 \$2,291,174.41; 1970 \$2,036,788.98.

What additional funds, if any, could you

effectively apply to your Title I programs in fiscal year 1970 over and above the present level of funding? In fiscal year 1971?

Answer: 1970 \$750,000; 1971 \$2,500,000—only if received early enough in the fiscal year to obligate it within the time limits.

In your judgment, do you believe that the Title I programs are needed to meet the special needs of educationally disadvantaged children?

Answer: Large numbers of pupils are not experiencing academic success. There is a higher rate of absence in high priority schools. There is a comparatively high rate of staff mobility. There is a high percentage of above age pupils.

Do you regard your present Title I programs as effective in meeting special education needs of educationally disadvantaged children?

Answer: More than two-thirds of the participants in ESEA Title I programs have shown measurable growth in the areas of identified needs.

Recent hearings in Washington disclosed that inadequate funding was the greatest obstacle in the path of more effectively reaching the disadvantaged. Others now contend that we cannot effectively utilize extra funds contained in the HEW Appropriation Bill because the funds are being misdirected and are not reaching the disadvantaged contemplated under Title I ESEA. Your brief comments on these contentions would be appreciated.

Comment:

RESPONSE OF GARY A. CRISMAN, COORDINATOR OF FEDERAL PROGRAMS, CENTRAL DAUPHIN, HARRISBURG, PA., JANUARY 20, 1970

How many children in your district are benefitting from education programs funded under Title I of ESEA?

Answer: 477.

What is the ADA in your school district grades K-12?

Answer: 12,353.

What was the amount of your ESEA Title I grants in each of the following fiscal years?

Answer: 1968 \$95,367.78, 1969 \$78,774.40, 1970 \$58,000.36.

What additional funds, if any, could you effectively apply to your Title I programs in fiscal year 1970 over and above the present level of funding? In fiscal year 1971?

Answer: 1970 \$25,000, 1971 \$25,000.

In your judgment, do you believe that the Title I programs are needed to meet the special needs of educationally disadvantaged children?

Answer: YES!

Do you regard your present Title I programs as effective in meeting special education needs of educationally disadvantaged children?

Answer: Yes, our programs are as effective as humanly possible within the limited budget prescribed for us by the Department of Education, Harrisburg, Pennsylvania.

Recent hearings in Washington disclosed that inadequate funding was the greatest obstacle in the path of more effectively reaching the disadvantaged. Others now contend that we cannot effectively utilize extra funds contained in the HEW Appropriation Bill because the funds are being misdirected and are not reaching the disadvantaged contemplated under Title I ESEA. Your brief comments on these contentions would be appreciated.

Comment: The educationally disadvantaged child is being "touched", not reached. However, we need to go beyond this to "reach" this type of child.

The upward inflationary economical trend in the United States cannot continue another year. But education is not the place to cut appropriations. Education is the real "growth, strength, development and success" of these United States of America! Our children need an education to survive in this

world! Local Educational Agencies need additional funds to meet the needs of these students.

These specially labeled students need the services of highly qualified personnel. Eminent professionals demand costly salaries. However, in our particular school district we have been most fortunate. The salaries of our staff have remained the same since the inception of our ESEA I program. However, this trend cannot continue another year.

Prices of educational materials and equipment have soared way out of proportion (manufacturers, dealers and suppliers have used the education of our children to fatten their own pocketbooks). Therefore, additional subsidies are required to support these phases of our educational endeavors.

RESPONSE OF FREDERICK C. BOMBERGER, ASSISTANT TO SUPERINTENDENT, LEBANON, PA., JANUARY 20, 1970

How many children in your district are benefitting from education programs funded under Title I of ESEA?

Answer: 400 economically disadvantaged. What is the ADA in your school district grades K-12?

Answer: 4963,061.

What was the amount of your ESEA Title I grant in each of the following fiscal years?

Answer: 1968 \$62,961, 1969 \$72,029, 1970 — Have not received our entitlement figures!

What additional funds, if any, could you effectively apply to your Title I programs in fiscal year 1970 over and above the present level of funding? In fiscal year 1971?

Answer: 1970 \$10,000, 1971 \$10,000—Additional program for Spanish-speaking children.

In your judgment, do you believe that the Title I programs are needed to meet the special needs of educationally disadvantaged children?

Answer: Very definitely—The effect has provided an up-dating of our curriculum.

Do you regard your present Title I programs as effective in meeting special education needs of educationally disadvantaged children?

Answer: Yes, but it could be expanded.

Recent hearings in Washington disclosed that inadequate funding was the greatest obstacle in the path of more effectively reaching the disadvantaged. Others now contend that we cannot effectively utilize extra funds contained in the HEW Appropriation Bill because the funds are being misdirected and are not reaching the disadvantaged contemplated under Title I ESEA. Your brief comments on these contentions would be appreciated.

Comment: More realistic funding is necessary if we are to meet the needs of these children. The Federal Government must assume a greater proportionate share of the educational program.

RESPONSE OF R. KEITH UDALL, SUPERINTENDENT, APACHE COUNTY HIGH SCHOOLS DISTRICT NO. 90, SPRINGVILLE, ARIZ., 85938, JANUARY 20, 1970.

How many children in your district are benefitting from education programs funded under Title I of ESEA?

Answer: 355.

What is the ADA in your school district grades K-12?

Answer: 645.185—9-12 only in District.

What was the amount of your ESEA Title I grant in each of the following fiscal years?

Answer: 1968 \$30,243.00, 1969 \$30,499.96, 1970 \$27,163.10.

What additional funds, if any, could you effectively apply to your Title I programs in fiscal year 1970 over and above the present level of funding? In fiscal year 1971?

Answer: 1970 \$10,000.00, 1971 \$15,000.00.

In your judgment, do you believe that the Title I programs are needed to meet the

special needs of educationally disadvantaged children?

Answer: Yes, we are a low income County with the majority of the children that are helped coming from the Navajo Reservation.

Do you regard your present Title I programs as effective in meeting special education needs of educationally disadvantaged children?

Answer: As effective as possible on a limited scale—and where funding is late in coming.

Recent hearings in Washington disclosed that inadequate funding was the greatest obstacle in the path of more effectively reaching the disadvantaged. Others now contend that we cannot effectively utilize extra funds contained in the HEW Appropriation Bill because the funds are being misdirected and are not reaching the disadvantaged contemplated under Title I ESEA. Your brief comments on these contentions would be appreciated.

Comment: The funds that come to our district are reaching the disadvantaged. We could do a better job if we were sure from year to year what amounts we would secure.

RESPONSE OF BURTON FROBERG, NORTH KINGSTOWN SCHOOL DEPARTMENT, NORTH KINGSTOWN, R.I., JANUARY 20, 1970

How many children in your district are benefitting from education programs funded under Title I of ESEA?

Answer: 220.

What is the ADA in your school district grades K-12?

Answer: 1-12, 5,800.

What was the amount of your ESEA Title I grant in each of the following fiscal years?

Answer: 1968 \$53,959.00, 1969 \$62,965.00, 1970 \$56,466.00.

What additional funds, if any, could you effectively apply to your Title I programs in fiscal year 1970 over and above the present level of funding? In fiscal year 1971?

Answer: 1970 \$75,000, 1971 \$100,000.

In your judgment, do you believe that the Title I programs are needed to meet the special needs of educationally disadvantaged children?

Answer: Yes. Local tax revenues inadequate.

Do you regard your present Title I programs as effective in meeting special education needs of educationally disadvantaged children?

Answer: Yes.

Recent hearings in Washington disclosed that inadequate funding was the greatest obstacle in the path of more effectively reaching the disadvantaged. Others now contend that we cannot effectively utilize extra funds contained in the HEW Appropriation Bill because the funds are being misdirected and are not reaching the disadvantaged contemplated under Title I ESEA. Your brief comments on these contentions would be appreciated.

Comment: None.

RESPONSE OF H. B. GEISTER, GERING CITY SCHOOLS, GERING, NEBR., JANUARY 20, 1970

How many children in your district are benefitting from education programs funded under Title I of ESEA?

Answer: 93.

What is the ADA in your school district grades K-12?

Answer: 2,200.

What was the amount of your ESEA Title I grant in each of the following fiscal years?

Answer: 1968, \$36,847; 1969, \$30,377; 1970, \$27,690.

What additional funds, if any, could you effectively apply to your Title I programs in fiscal year 1970 over and above the present level of funding? In fiscal year 1971?

Answer: 1970, \$38,000; 1971, \$41,000.

In your judgment, do you believe that the Title I programs are needed to meet the special needs of educationally disadvantaged children?

Answer: Yes.

Do you regard your present Title I programs as effective in meeting special education needs of educationally disadvantaged children?

Answer: Yes.

Recent hearings in Washington disclosed that inadequate funding was the greatest obstacle in the path of more effectively reaching the disadvantaged. Others now contend that we cannot effectively utilize extra funds contained in the HEW Appropriation Bill because the funds are being misdirected and are not reaching the disadvantaged contemplated under Title I ESEA. Your brief comments on these contentions would be appreciated.

Comment: If funds were available we could maintain present programs effectively.

RESPONSE OF JIM CHERRY, SUPERINTENDENT, DEKALB COUNTY, DECATUR, GA., JANUARY 20, 1970

How many children in your district are benefitting from education programs funded under Title I of ESEA?

Answer: Approximately 2,000 pupils.

What is the ADA in your school district grades K-12?

Answer: 78,742.

What was the amount of your ESEA Title I grant in each of the following fiscal years?

Answer: 1968, \$308,651; 1969, \$302,730; 1970, \$230,746.

What additional funds, if any, could you effectively apply to your Title I programs in fiscal year 1970 over and above the present level of funding? In fiscal year 1971?

Answer: 1970, \$750,000—\$1,250,000; 1971, \$900,000—\$1,500,000.

In your judgment, do you believe that the Title I programs are needed to meet the special needs of educationally disadvantaged children?

Answer: Yes, very definitely. Funds from this program have made it possible for the DeKalb School System to develop programs especially designed to assist the disadvantaged child. Without these funds, such programs would not be possible.

Do you regard your present Title I programs as effective in meeting special education needs of educationally disadvantaged children?

Answer: It is effective so far as the limited amount of funds that are available. However, additional funds would make it possible to do so much more for these children. Additional remedial reading programs would be established, programs with specialists in other areas of instruction, expand programs for emotionally and physically handicapped children, and a much more substantial reduction in the pupil-teacher ratio for disadvantaged children.

Recent hearings in Washington disclosed that inadequate funding was the greatest obstacle in the path of more effectively reaching the disadvantaged. Others now contend that we cannot effectively utilize extra funds contained in the HEW Appropriation Bill because the funds are being misdirected and are not reaching the disadvantaged contemplated under Title I ESEA. Your brief comments on these contentions would be appreciated.

Answer: All the funds for Title I Grants are used for instructional salaries for remedial reading in disadvantaged areas. The cost of administration is paid by local funds. This school system has insisted on placing such funds in a program where it would be the most effective. If additional funds were available, of course these programs would be greatly expanded and enriched.

RESPONSE OF A. C. WOODBURN, ALAMOGORDO PUBLIC SCHOOLS, ALAMOGORDO, N. MEX., JANUARY 20, 1970

How many children in your district are benefitting from education programs funded under Title I of ESEA?

Answer: 653.

What is the ADA in your school district grades K-12?

Answer: 9,586.

What was the amount of your ESEA Title I grant in each of the following fiscal years?

Answer: 1968 \$135,718, 1969 \$119,934, 1970 \$109,455.

What additional funds, if any, could you effectively apply to your Title I programs in fiscal year 1970 over and above the present level of funding? In fiscal year 1971?

Answer: 1970 \$24,480, 1971 \$32,640. Program cost increase=6%/year. These additional amounts would permit us to implement the programs as planned in 1968 and cover inflation cost increases.

In your judgment, do you believe that the Title I programs are needed to meet the special needs of educationally disadvantaged children?

Answer: Yes, some special earmarked allocation is required or all the money is applied equally for all the pupils. Public pressure does not consider disadvantaged pupils.

Do you regard your present Title I programs as effective in meeting special educational needs of educationally disadvantaged children?

Answer: Yes, our programs were, for the most part, in the areas of self-image and communication arts to improve self-image and self-realization.

Recent hearings in Washington disclosed that inadequate funding was the greatest obstacle in the path of more effectively reaching the disadvantaged. Others now contend that we cannot effectively utilize extra funds contained in the HEW Appropriation Bill because the funds are being misdirected and are not reaching the disadvantaged contemplated under Title I ESEA. Your brief comments on these contentions would be appreciated.

Comment: Funds in our program have reached the disadvantaged in their entire path through school, grade 1 through 12. Irresponsible accusations should not be allowed to jeopardize this program regardless of politics, budget or selfishness.

RESPONSE OF RICHARD PHEATT, DIRECTOR OF RESEARCH, TOLEDO CITY, TOLEDO, OHIO, JANUARY 20, 1970

How many children in your district are benefitting from education programs funded under Title I of ESEA?

(Answers to these questions are being given from home, over a weekend. Thus they are close estimates. Office data not available.)

Answer: About 10,800.

What is the ADA in your school district grades K-12?

Answer: Enrollment 62,145, ADA about 58,000.

What was the amount of your ESEA Title I grant in each of the following fiscal years?

Answer: 1968 \$1,300,000, 1969 \$1,200,000, 1970 \$1,100,000.

What additional funds, if any, could you effectively apply to your Title I programs in fiscal year 1970 over and above the present level of funding? In fiscal year 1971?

Answer: 1970 \$450,000, 1971 \$500,000. These funds should and could go for research into better assessment of achievement levels and into summer school classes alone.

In your judgment, do you believe that the Title I programs are needed to meet the special needs of educationally disadvantaged children?

Answer: Very much so. I think it is true that there has been some ineffective expenditure, but this is always true of experiment.

research and development. It does not represent waste. We are exploring, all of us.

Do you regard your present Title I programs as effective in meeting special education needs of educationally disadvantaged children?

Answer: Much of it very effective, I believe. Some does not seem to be effective, but measurement of achievement has not been dramatic nor efficient as it should be. We work at this.

Recent hearings in Washington disclosed that inadequate funding was the greatest obstacle in the path of more effectively reaching the disadvantaged. Others now contend that we cannot effectively utilize extra funds contained in the HEW Appropriation Bill because the funds are being misdirected and are not reaching the disadvantaged contemplated under Title I ESEA. Your brief comments on these contentions would be appreciated.

Comment: Adequate funding is essential. It must be continued, at least, and expanded as costs go up. There should be more research into more efficient expenditure of funds, as well as better auditing of books for better accounting in expenditures. Congress should have "better news!"

RESPONSE OF E. L. PHILLIPS, ASSOCIATE SUPERINTENDENT, DURHAM CITY SCHOOLS, DURHAM, N.C., JANUARY 20, 1970

How many children in your district are benefitting from education programs funded under Title I of ESEA?

Answer: 2,500.

What is the ADA in your school district grades K-12?

Answer: 13,733.

What was the amount of your ESEA Title I grant in each of the following fiscal years?

Answer: 1968 \$439,561, 1969 \$424,188, 1970 \$395,891.

What additional funds, if any, could you effectively apply to your Title I programs in fiscal year 1970 over and above the present level of funding? In fiscal year 1971?

Answer: 1970 \$75,000, 1971 \$75,000.

In your judgment, do you believe that the Title I programs are needed to meet the special needs of educationally disadvantaged children?

Answer:

Do you regard your present Title I programs as effective in meeting special education needs of educationally disadvantaged children?

Answer:

Recent hearings in Washington disclosed that inadequate funding was the greatest obstacle in the path of more effectively reaching the disadvantaged. Others now contend that we cannot effectively utilize extra funds contained in the HEW Appropriation Bill because the funds are being misdirected and are not reaching the disadvantaged contemplated under Title I ESEA. Your brief comments on these contentions would be appreciated.

Comment: In our unit the funds definitely are reaching the disadvantaged children.

The uncertainty as to the amount of funds to be received makes it difficult to plan. For example, under our regular budget we are already beginning to look for personnel for 1970-71, because we have a fairly accurate idea about how much money we will have. We do not know often until very near the end of a current fiscal year what we may expect for the next year from Title I funds. It would also be a great help if funds not used in one fiscal year could be carried forward and spent in the next fiscal year.

RESPONSE OF GEORGE G. KERR, BOARD OF EDUCATION OF KANAWHA COUNTY, CHARLESTON, W. VA., JANUARY 20, 1970

How many children in your district are benefitting from education programs funded under Title I of ESEA?

Answer: 8,628.

What is the ADA in your school district grades K-12?

Answer: 52,252.65 (1968-69).

What was the amount of your ESEA Title I grant in each of the following fiscal years?

Answer: 1968 \$1,491,183, 1969 \$1,327,166, 1970 \$1,202,580.

What additional funds if any, could you effectively apply to your Title I programs in fiscal year 1970 over and above the present level of funding? In fiscal year 1971?

Answer: 1970 \$100,000 (small amount due to lateness in school year), 1971 \$2,500,000.

In your judgment, do you believe that the Title I programs are needed to meet the special needs of educationally disadvantaged children?

Answer: Yes.

Do you regard your present Title I programs as effective in meeting special education needs of educationally disadvantaged children?

Answer: Yes.

Recent hearings in Washington disclosed that inadequate funding was the greatest obstacle in the path of more effectively reaching the disadvantaged. Others now contend that we cannot effectively utilize extra funds contained in the HEW Appropriation Bill because the funds are being misdirected and are not reaching the disadvantaged contemplated under Title I ESEA. Your brief comments on these contentions would be appreciated.

Comment: Recent audit by HEW indicates that funds in Kanawha County are reaching the disadvantaged and are not being misdirected. They further conclude that the only way we can have a more effective program is to receive adequate funding.

RESPONSE OF LAURENCE W. JENKINS, WEBER DISTRICT, OGDEN, UTAH, JANUARY 20, 1970

How many children in your district are benefitting from education programs funded under Title I of ESEA?

Answer: 206 children directly, 9,563 children grades K-6 indirectly.

What is the ADA in your school district grades K-12?

Answer: 17559.22 ADA—18426 ADM.

What was the amount of your ESEA Title I grant in each of the following fiscal years?

Answer: 1968 \$58,000, 1969 \$51,366, 1970 not declared.

What additional funds, if any, could you effectively apply to your Title I programs in fiscal year 1970 over and above the present level of funding? In fiscal year 1971?

Answer: 1970 \$65,000, 1971 \$65,000.

In your judgment, do you believe that the Title I programs are needed to meet the special needs of educationally disadvantaged children?

Answer: Yes.

Do you regard your present Title I programs as effective in meeting special education needs of educationally disadvantaged children?

Answer: Yes.

Recent hearings in Washington disclosed that inadequate funding was the greatest obstacle in the path of more effectively reaching the disadvantaged. Others now contend that we cannot effectively utilize extra funds contained in the HEW Appropriation Bill because the funds are being misdirected and are not reaching the disadvantaged contemplated under Title I ESEA. Your brief comments on these contentions would be appreciated.

Comment: Weber County's disadvantaged are scattered throughout 30 schools in our district. Combined they amount to about 500 students but it is hard to point to any particular school or schools with large numbers of disadvantaged. Consequently, we have designed our project to serve 11 of the elementary schools having the largest numbers of the disadvantaged. Title I has made

possible health and library services which we could not ordinarily have provided.

RESPONSE OF LEONARD G. STEINLE, SUPERINTENDENT USD 348, BALDWIN CITY, KANS., JANUARY 20, 1970

How many children in your district are benefitting from education programs funded under Title I of ESEA?

Answer: 44 directly, an additional 50 indirectly.

What is the ADA in your school district grades K-12?

Answer: 948.

What was the amount of your ESEA Title I grant in each of the following fiscal years?

Answer: 1967-1968 \$7,598, 1968-1969 \$6,990, 1969-1970 \$6,400, estimated.

What additional funds, if any, could you effectively apply to your Title I programs in fiscal year 1970 over and above the present level of funding? In fiscal year 1971?

Answer: 1970 ½ Psychologist \$5,000+, ½ Speech and Hearing, 1971 Therapist \$4,500, additional reading teacher \$6,500. Total additional \$16,000.

In your judgement, do you believe that the Title I programs are needed to meet the special needs of educationally disadvantaged children?

Do you regard your present Title I programs as effective in meeting special education needs of educationally disadvantaged children?

Answer: Yes.

Recent hearings in Washington disclosed that inadequate funding was the greatest obstacle in the path of more effectively reaching the disadvantaged. Others now contend that we cannot effectively utilize extra funds contained in the HEW Appropriation Bill because the funds are being misdirected and are not reaching the disadvantaged contemplated under Title I ESEA. Your brief comments on these contentions would be appreciated.

Comment: I have been an administrator in two different systems and feel that the Title I funds were well used for the educationally deprived.

RESPONSE OF SALEM SCHOOL DISTRICT, MAIN ST., SALEM, N.H., JANUARY 20, 1970

How many children in your district are benefitting from education programs funded under Title I of ESEA?

Answer: 36.

What is the ADA in your school district grades K-12?

Answer: 4307.6.

What was the amount of your ESEA Title I grant in each of the following fiscal years?

Answer: 1968 \$7,907, 1969 \$7,262, 1970 \$9,375.

What additional funds, if any, could you effectively apply to your Title I programs in fiscal year 1970 over and above the present level of funding? In fiscal year 1971?

Answer: 1970 at least \$1,000, 1971 same as above.

In your judgment, do you believe that the Title I programs are needed to meet the special needs of educationally disadvantaged children?

Answer: Yes.

Do you regard your present Title I programs as effective in meeting special education needs of educationally disadvantaged children?

Answer: Yes.

Recent hearings in Washington disclosed that inadequate funding was the greatest obstacle in the path of more effectively reaching the disadvantaged. Others now contend that we cannot effectively utilize extra funds contained in the HEW Appropriation Bill because the funds are being misdirected and are not reaching the disadvantaged contemplated under Title I ESEA.

Your brief comments on these contentions would be appreciated.

Comment:

**RESPONSE OF DR. DOUGLAS S. RITCHIE, SUPERINTENDENT, JR. No. 8, CITY OF MADISON, MADISON, WIS., JANUARY 20, 1970**

How many children in your district are benefitting from education programs funded under Title I of ESEA?

Answer: 721.

What is the ADA in your school district grades K-12?

Answer: 30,602.

What was the amount of your ESEA Title I grant in each of the following fiscal years?

Answer: 1968 \$371,000, 1969 \$362,000, 1970 \$362,000.

What additional funds, if any, could you effectively apply to your Title I programs in fiscal year 1970 over and above the present level of funding? In fiscal year 1971?

Answer: 1970 \$37,000, 1971 \$58,000.

In your judgment, do you believe that the Title I programs are needed to meet the special needs of educationally disadvantaged children?

Answer: Yes.

Do you regard your present Title I programs as effective in meeting special education needs of educationally disadvantaged children?

Answer: Yes.

Recent hearings in Washington disclosed that inadequate funding was the greatest obstacle in the path of more effectively reaching the disadvantaged. Others now contend that we cannot effectively utilize extra funds contained in the HEW Appropriation Bill because the funds are being misdirected and are not reaching the disadvantaged contemplated under Title I ESEA. Your brief comments on these contentions would be appreciated.

Comment: All new programs have problems. If this has been true it needs correction. Confusion leads to indirectness. I firmly believe that federal control and federal direction of ESEA Title I is the answer to the above charges. A good start has been made to date under Title I ESEA to help disadvantaged pupils—don't curtail the program! We think it to be the best of the ESEA Titles.

**RESPONSE OF WALTER R. SCHWARZ, PENDLETON COUNTY SCHOOLS, FRANKLIN, W. VA., JANUARY 20, 1970**

How many children in your district are benefitting from education programs funded under Title I of ESEA?

Answer: 399.

What is the ADA in your school district grades K-12?

Answer: 1,517.52.

What was the amount of your ESEA Title I grant in each of the following fiscal years?

Answer: 1968 \$105,226, 1969 \$93,959, 1970 \$83,360.

What additional funds, if any, could you effectively apply to your Title I programs in fiscal year 1970 over and above the present level of funding? In fiscal year 1971?

Answer: 1970 \$10,000, 1971 \$30,000.

In your judgement, do you believe that the Title I programs are needed to meet the special needs of educationally disadvantaged children?

Answer: In Pendleton County approximately one fault of the children can be concretely identified as educationally disadvantaged with that many students an impoverished district as ours cannot possibly raise the revenue and attract competent teachers to meet the special needs in the manner suggested by authorities.

Do you regard your present Title I programs as effective in meeting special education needs of educationally disadvantaged children?

Answer: With the information and instruction that were given at the advent of Title I ESEA, I feel that Title I has had an effect on the educationally disadvantaged children of Pendleton County.

Recent hearings in Washington disclosed that inadequate funding was the greatest obstacle in the path of more effectively reaching the disadvantaged. Others now contend that we cannot effectively utilize extra funds contained in the HEW Appropriation Bill because the funds are being misdirected and are not reaching the disadvantaged contemplated under Title I ESEA. Your brief comments on these contentions would be appreciated.

Comment: Very few local districts are deliberately misdirecting funds. Agencies such as community action of the OEO with little training and background report I suppose what they think they know or see. All of the funds are being used for the disadvantaged here. A lot of the misunderstanding comes in the debate over what is disadvantaged or deprived. Many times too many people have views all based on experience and training or lack of it.

ESEA Title I would best be utilized if local education agencies were given more funds and help on how to best use the funds and then to give them funds in advance with some assurance that funding will continue. It is extremely difficult to plan outstanding programs without any idea of how much money you will have or when you will get it and what kind of cuts you will have to endure because of political necessity or expedience.

Make it a long range program. Fund it properly, have a resource center to help develop local guidelines and keep politics out of the educational wellbeing of these disadvantaged students and we will show you what we can do.

**RESPONSE OF J. HERSHEL MORGAN, SUPERINTENDENT, MINGO COUNTY SCHOOLS, WILLIAMSON, W. VA., JANUARY 20, 1970**

How many children in your district are benefitting from education programs funded under Title I of ESEA?

Answer: 5427.

What is the ADA in your school district grades K-12?

Answer: 9660.

What was the amount of your ESEA Title I grant in each of the following year?

Answer: 1968 \$487,523, 1969 \$752,178, 1970 \$679,880.

What additional funds, if any, could you effectively apply to your Title I programs in fiscal year 1970 over and above the present level of funding? In fiscal year 1971?

Answer: 1970 No additional funds, 1971 No additional funds.

In your judgment, do you believe that the Title I programs are needed to meet the special needs of educationally disadvantaged children?

Answer: All funds should be used for all children in the school system. This country was founded and has prospered on that principal.

Do you regard your present Title I programs as effective in meeting special education needs of educationally disadvantaged children?

Answer: Yes, except that county school systems are boxed in by the guidelines and restricted as to the use of the funds.

Recent hearings in Washington disclosed that inadequate funding was the greatest obstacle in the path of more effectively reaching the disadvantaged. Others now contend that we cannot effectively utilize extra funds contained in the HEW Appropriation Bill because the funds are being misdirected and are not reaching the disadvantaged contemplated under Title I ESEA. Your brief

comments on these contentions would be appreciated.

Comment: None.

**RESPONSE OF H. B. MITCHELL, SEMINOLE INDEPENDENT SCHOOL DISTRICT No. 1, SEMINOLE, OKLA., JANUARY 20, 1970**

How many children in your district are benefitting from education programs funded under Title I of ESEA?

Answer: 707.

What is the ADA in your school district grades K-12?

Answer: 1584.761.

What was the amount of your ESEA Title I grant in each of the following fiscal years?

Answer: 1968 \$79,840, 1969 \$62,167, 1970 \$50,192.

What additional funds, if any, could you effectively apply to your Title I programs in fiscal year 1970 over and above the present level of funding? In fiscal year 1971?

Answer: 1970 \$15,000, 1971 \$20,000.

In your judgment, do you believe that the Title I programs are needed to meet the special needs of educationally disadvantaged children?

Answer: Yes.

Do you regard your present Title I programs as effective in meeting special education needs of educationally disadvantaged children?

Answer: Yes, for the programs we have. But we need more programs than our money will permit us to have.

Recent hearings in Washington disclosed that inadequate funding was the greatest obstacle in the path of more effectively reaching the disadvantaged. Others now contend that we cannot effectively utilize extra funds contained in the HEW Appropriation Bill because the funds are being misdirected and are not reaching the disadvantaged contemplated under Title I ESEA. Your brief comments on these contentions would be appreciated.

Comment: Our money is being directed to the disadvantaged children. There are so many more things we could do if we had the money.

**RESPONSE OF SUPERINTENDENT ARCHIE BRECHT, HIGHMORE PUBLIC SCHOOL DISTRICT, HIGHMORE, S. DAK.**

Dear Superintendent:

Reckless charges are being made that Title I ESEA funds are being misdirected or wasted or are not effective in accomplishing the purposes for which they are provided. It would be appreciated if the following questions could be responded to as briefly and as quickly as possible to facilitate their current use and analysis.

How many children in your district are benefitting from education programs funded under Title I of ESEA?

Answer: 36.

What is the ADA in your school district grades K-12?

Answer: 496.

What was the amount of your ESEA Title I grant in each of the following fiscal years?

Answer: 1968, \$17,256; 1969, \$15,759; 1970,

What additional funds, if any, could you effectively apply to your Title I programs in fiscal year 1970 over and above the present level of funding? In fiscal year 1971?

Answer: 1970, \$10,000; 1971, \$20,000.

In your judgment, do you believe that the Title I programs are needed to meet the special needs of educationally disadvantaged children?

Answer: Yes.

Do you regard your present Title I programs as effective in meeting special education needs of educationally disadvantaged children?

Answer: Yes, but can be improved.

Recent hearings in Washington disclosed that inadequate funding was the greatest

obstacle in the path of more effectively reaching the disadvantaged. Others now contend that we cannot effectively utilize extra funds contained in the HEW Appropriation Bill because the funds are being misdirected and are not reaching the disadvantaged contemplated under Title I ESEA. Your brief comments on these contentions would be appreciated.

Comment: Advance funding is our greatest need for well planned programs.

RESPONSE OF EDWARD L. HUTCHCROFT, SUPERINTENDENT, WEST BRANCH SCHOOLS, WEST BRANCH, IOWA, JANUARY 20, 1970

How many children in your district are benefitting from education programs funded under Title I of ESEA?

Answer: 131.

What is the ADA in your school district grades K-12?

Answer: 962.9.

What was the amount of your ESEA Title I grant in each of the following fiscal years?

Answer: 1968, \$26,689; 1969, \$23,589; 1970, \$21,847.

What additional funds, if any, could you effectively apply to your Title I programs in fiscal year 1970 over and above the present level of funding? In fiscal year 1971?

Answer: 1970, \$10,000; 1971, \$11,800.

In your judgment, do you believe that the Title I programs are needed to meet the special needs of educationally disadvantaged children?

Answer: Yes.

Do you regard your present Title I programs as effective in meeting special education needs of educationally disadvantaged children?

Answer: Yes.

Recent hearings in Washington disclosed that inadequate funding was the greatest obstacle in the path of more effectively reaching the disadvantaged. Others now contend that we cannot effectively utilize extra funds contained in the HEW Appropriation Bill because the funds are being misdirected and are not reaching the disadvantaged contemplated under Title I ESEA. Your brief comments on these contentions would be appreciated.

Comment: I cannot speak for other districts. As for our district, we feel we are using the funds as was intended under the title I, ESEA bill. It is doubtful that our program under title I can be continued unless more adequate funding is forthcoming.

RESPONSE OF TED R. REDHAIR, EXCELSIOR SPRINGS PUBLIC SCHOOLS, EXCELSIOR SPRINGS, MO., JANUARY 20, 1970

How many children in your district are benefitting from education programs funded under Title I of ESEA?

Answer: 185.

What is the ADA in your school district grades K-12?

Answer: 2,790.

What was the amount of your ESEA Title I grant in each of the following fiscal years?

Answer: 1968 \$35,999, 1969 \$35,381, 1970 \$27,416.

What additional funds, if any, could you effectively apply to your Title I programs in fiscal year 1970 over and above the present level of funding? In fiscal year 1971?

Answer: 1970 \$5,000, 1971 \$10,000.

In your judgment, do you believe that the Title I programs are needed to meet the special needs of educationally disadvantaged children?

Answer: Some program is definitely needed but I believe each district can design a program best—I would favor a less restrictive type of aid.

Do you regard your present Title I programs as effective in meeting special education needs of educationally disadvantaged children?

Answer: As effective as we can devise a program within the framework of the present law.

Recent hearings in Washington disclosed that inadequate funding was the greatest obstacle in the path of more effectively reaching the disadvantaged. Others now contend that we cannot effectively utilize extra funds contained in the HEW Appropriation Bill because the funds are being misdirected and are not reaching the disadvantaged contemplated under Title I ESEA. Your brief comments on these contentions would be appreciated.

Comment: We could utilize a somewhat higher level of funding effectively. Funds for general aid such as P.L. 824 Impact Aid have been much helpful to our district.

RESPONSE OF LUTHER M. BARRETT, SUPERINTENDENT, ESCANABA AREA PUBLIC SCHOOLS, ESCANABA, MICH., JANUARY 20, 1970

How many children in your district are benefitting from education programs funded under title I of ESEA?

Answer: 1969, 310.

What is the ADA in your school district grades K-12?

Answer: 4478.9.

What was the amount of your ESEA Title I grant in each of the following fiscal years?

Answer: 1968 \$64,030, 1969 \$65,350, 1970 \$53,679.

What additional funds, if any, could you effectively apply to your Title I programs in fiscal year 1970 over and above the present level of funding? In fiscal year 1971?

Answer: This depends upon how many restrictions might be placed on the use of such funds. If we could determine our own uses, we could well twice what we have been receiving, and apply it all to the educationally disadvantaged.

In your judgement, do you believe that the Title I programs are needed to meet the special needs of educationally disadvantaged children?

Answer: Yes, because of the lack of other funds for schools, the Title I funds are needed. However, I feel the guidelines should be more flexible because the present format does not apply to all areas.

Do you regard your present Title I programs as effective in meeting special education needs of educationally disadvantaged children?

Answer: Yes. The comments of teachers involved in the program as well as the statements made by the parents of children enrolled would lead us to believe that what we are doing is effective.

Recent hearings in Washington disclosed that inadequate funding was the greatest obstacle in the path of more effectively reaching the disadvantaged. Others now contend that we cannot effectively utilize extra funds contained in the HEW Appropriation Bill because the funds are being misdirected and are not reaching the disadvantaged contemplated under Title I ESEA. Your brief comments on these contentions would be appreciated.

Comment: Money should be allocated on what a local community determines it needs. It bothers me when we are told that we should spend the same per child for a six-week summer program as we spend per child for our school year program of 38 weeks. I feel this is a waste of money. We could benefit many more children with the same allocation of funds if we were not "guided" so much.

RESPONSE OF DR. ROY A. ALCORN, SUPERINTENDENT, ROANOKE CITY, ROANOKE, VA., JANUARY 20, 1970

How many children in your district are benefitting from education programs funded under Title I of ESEA?

Answer: 3132.

What is the ADA in your school district grades K-12?

Answer: 18,037.93 as of December 30, 1969.

What was the amount of your ESEA Title I grant in each of the following fiscal years?

Answer: 1968 \$586,238, 1969 \$497,325, 1970 \$438,572.

What additional funds, if any, could you effectively apply to your Title I programs in fiscal year 1970 over and above the present level of funding? In fiscal year 1971?

Answer: 1970 \$100,000, 1971 \$140,000.

If your judgment, do you believe that the Title I programs are needed to meet the special needs of educationally disadvantaged children?

Answer: Yes.

Do you regard your present Title I programs as effective in meeting special education needs of educationally disadvantaged children?

Answer: Yes.

Recent hearings in Washington disclosed that inadequate funding was the greatest obstacle in the path of more effectively reaching the disadvantaged. Others now contend that we cannot effectively utilize extra funds contained in the HEW Appropriation Bill because the funds are being misdirected and are not reaching the disadvantaged contemplated under Title I ESEA. Your brief comments on these contentions would be appreciated.

Comment: Additional funding would permit more individualized, thus more effective instruction for the disadvantaged. Some programs by their very nature upgrade all instruction, thus helping non-Title I pupils. This could be prevented only by having segregated schools for the disadvantaged. This is neither feasible nor desirable.

RESPONSE OF MR. CHRIS D. CORBIN, SUPERINTENDENT, SPECIAL SCHOOL DISTRICT, FORT SMITH, ARK.

How many children in your district are benefitting from education programs funded under Title I of ESEA?

Answer: 8,934 students are enrolled in Title I schools and receive benefit of instructional materials, etc. 2,146 of these students receive direct personal services (food, clothing, medical and dental care, etc.).

What is the ADA in your school district grades K-12?

Answer: 12,230.

What was the amount of your ESEA Title I grant in each of the following fiscal years?

Answer: 1968, \$313,836; 1969, \$294,354; 1970, \$269,655.

What additional funds, if any, could you effectively apply to your Title I programs in fiscal year 1970 over and above the present level of funding? In fiscal year 1971?

Answer: Conservative estimates, 1970, \$75,000; 1971, \$100,000.

In your judgment, do you believe that the Title I programs are needed to meet the special needs of educationally disadvantaged children?

Answer: Very definitely, yes. In our opinion, this district could effectively utilize a much larger appropriation than we are now receiving.

Do you regard your present Title I programs as effective in meeting special education needs of educationally disadvantaged children?

Answer: Yes, but because we have to spread a relatively small amount of money over a large area our program's effectiveness is hampered.

Recent hearings in Washington disclosed that inadequate funding was the greatest obstacle in the path of more effectively reaching the disadvantaged. Others now contend that we cannot effectively utilize extra funds contained in the HEW Appropriation Bill because the funds are being misdirected and are not reaching the disadvantaged contemplated under Title I ESEA. Your brief

comments on these contentions would be appreciated.

Comment: In our case we have followed the guidelines outlined by HEW and feel that we have been effective in reaching and helping our disadvantaged students. We also believe we could do more with more funds.

RESPONSE OF E. R. LYON, BARRE CITY SCHOOL, BARRE, VT.

How many children in your district are benefitting from education programs funded under Title I of ESEA?

Answer: 159.

What is the ADA in your school district grades K-12?

Answer: 2,863.

What was the amount of your ESEA Title I grant in each of the following fiscal years?

Answer: 1968 \$22,139, 1969 \$18,810, 1970 \$22,545.

What additional funds, if any, could you effectively apply to your Title I programs in fiscal year 1970 over and above the present level of funding? In fiscal year 1971?

Answer: 1970 \$20,000, 1971 \$40,000.

In your judgment, do you believe that the Title I programs are needed to meet the special needs of educationally disadvantaged children?

Answer: Yes.

Do you regard your present Title I programs as effective in meeting special education needs of educationally disadvantaged children?

Answer: Yes, as far as they go. Funds are inadequate.

Recent hearings in Washington disclosed that inadequate funding was the greatest obstacle in the path of more effectively reaching the disadvantaged. Others now contend that we cannot effectively utilize extra funds contained in the HEW Appropriation Bill because the funds are being misdirected and are not reaching the disadvantaged contemplated under Title I ESEA. Your brief comments on these contentions would be appreciated.

Comment: The funding is inadequate, they are effective as far as they go.

RESPONSE OF LARRY O. WILSON, BESSEMER, ALA.

How many children in your district are benefitting from education programs funded under Title I of ESEA?

Answer: 8,174.

What is the ADA in your school district grades K-12?

Answer: 7,717.

What was the amount of your ESEA Title I grant in each of the following fiscal years?

Answer: 1968 \$388,041, 1969 \$357,180, 1970 \$321,427.

What additional funds, if any, could you effectively apply to your Title I programs in fiscal year 1970 over and above the present level of funding? In fiscal year 1971?

Answer: 1970 \$75,000, 1971 \$75,000.

In your judgment, do you believe that the Title I programs are needed to meet the special needs of educationally disadvantaged children?

Answer: Yes.

Do you regard your present Title I programs as effective in meeting special education needs of educationally disadvantaged children?

Answer: Yes.

Recent hearings in Washington disclosed that inadequate funding was the greatest obstacle in the path of more effectively reaching the disadvantaged. Others now contend that we cannot effectively utilize extra funds contained in the HEW Appropriation Bill because the funds are being misdirected and are not reaching the disadvantaged contemplated under Title I ESEA. Your brief comments on these contentions would be appreciated.

Comment: Our school district could more effectively utilize not only additional funds but the initial grants if there were appropriated and funded for a 3-5 year period rather than a fiscal year. This type funding would allow for projection and planning which presently is impossible under the present law.

RESPONSE OF JAMES R. BACHER, ROME CITY SCHOOLS, ROME, N.Y.

How many children in your district are benefitting from education programs funded under Title I of ESEA?

Answer: 722.

What is the ADA in your school district grades K-12?

Answer: 4,500.

What was the amount of your ESEA Title I grant in each of the following fiscal years?

Answer: 1968 \$158,709, 1969 \$228,973, 1970 \$276,523.

What additional funds, if any, could you effectively apply to your Title I programs in fiscal year 1970 over and above the present level of funding? In fiscal year 1971?

Answer: 1970 \$50,000, 1971 \$75,000.

In your judgment, do you believe that the Title I programs are needed to meet the special needs of educationally disadvantaged children?

Answer: Yes.

Do you regard your present Title I programs as effective in meeting special education needs of educationally disadvantaged children?

Answer: Yes.

Recent hearings in Washington disclosed that inadequate funding was the greatest obstacle in the path of more effectively reaching the disadvantaged. Others now contend that we cannot effectively utilize extra funds contained in the HEW Appropriation Bill because the funds are being misdirected and are not reaching the disadvantaged contemplated under Title I ESEA. Your brief comments on these contentions would be appreciated.

Comment: Extra funds can always be used. I suggest that early appropriations would aid school districts in planning expenditures. As of Jan. 16 we are still waiting to hear what monies are available.

RESPONSE OF L. G. DERTHICK, SUPERINTENDENT, MONONGALIA COUNTY, MORGANTOWN, W. VA.

How many children in your district are benefitting from education programs funded under Title I of ESEA?

Answer: 2,396.

What is the ADA in your school district grades K-12?

Answer: 10,249.

What was the amount of your ESEA Title I grant in each of the following fiscal years?

Answer: 1968 \$305,989, 1969 \$270,263, 1970 \$247,695.

What additional funds, if any, could effectively apply to your Title I programs in fiscal year 1970 over and above the present level of funding? In fiscal year 1971?

Answer: 1970 not available, 1971, \$204,000.

In your judgment, do you believe that the Title I programs are needed to meet the special needs of educationally disadvantaged children?

Answer: Yes.

Do you regard your present Title I programs as effective in meeting special education needs of educationally disadvantaged children?

Answer: Yes.

Recent hearings in Washington disclosed that inadequate funding was the greatest obstacle in the path of more effectively reaching the disadvantaged. Others now contend that we cannot effectively utilize extra funds contained in the HEW Approp-

riation Bill because the funds are being misdirected and are not reaching the disadvantaged contemplated under Title I ESEA. Your brief comments on these contentions would be appreciated.

Comment: Target area schools are presently identified by the number of low income students rather than by the number of educationally disadvantaged children. If this were reversed, the educational program could be enhanced tremendously.

RESPONSE OF FRANKLIN W. SANDERS, ASSOCIATE SUPERINTENDENT FOR STATE AND FEDERAL PROGRAMS, FAYETTE COUNTY PUBLIC SCHOOLS, LEXINGTON, KY.

How many children in your district are benefitting from education programs funded under Title I of ESEA?

Answer: 9,500.

What is the ADA in your school district grades K-12?

Answer: December 16, 1969—32,794.

What was the amount of your ESEA Title I grant in each of the following fiscal years?

Answer: 1968 \$424,932, 1969 \$519,287, 1970 \$488,753. Tentative.

What additional funds, if any, could you effectively apply to your Title I programs in fiscal year 1970 over and above the present level of funding? In fiscal year 1971?

Answer: 1970 \$300,000, 1971 \$500,000.

In your judgment, do you believe that the Title I programs are needed to meet the special needs of educationally disadvantaged children?

Answer: Yes. We are able to do more for these children than we normally could do with this added money.

Do you regard your present Title I programs as effective in meeting special education needs of educationally disadvantaged children?

Answer: No, because the funds are inadequate. However, the programs we have are providing sound educational programs as far as they go, for our children.

Recent hearings in Washington disclosed that inadequate funding was the greatest obstacle in the path of more effectively reaching the disadvantaged. Others now contend that we cannot effectively utilize extra funds contained in the HEW Appropriation Bill because the funds are being misdirected and are not reaching the disadvantaged contemplated under Title I ESEA. Your brief comments on these contentions would be appreciated.

Comment: We will be able to utilize extra funds in the correct legal manner and for those students that are intended to receive the benefits from the law. Also, we would invite an inspection by any fair-minded person.

RESPONSE OF WILLIAM C. KELLY, SCHOOL DISTRICT No. 1, SUPERIOR, WIS.

How many children in your district are benefitting from education programs funded under Title I of ESEA?

Answer: 1,004.

What is the ADA in your school district grades K-12?

Answer: 7,736.

What was the amount of your ESEA Title I grant in each of the following fiscal years?

Answer: 1968 \$146,569, 1969 \$153,701, 1970 \$115,000. We have only been allotted \$95,864 to date.

What additional funds, if any, could you effectively apply to your Title I programs in fiscal year 1970 over and above the present level of funding? In fiscal year 1971?

Answer: 1970 \$160,000 or \$45,000 over the present \$115,000, 1971 \$200,000.

In your judgment, do you believe that the Title I programs are needed to meet the special needs of educationally disadvantaged children?

Answer: Yes.

Do you regard your present Title I programs as effective in meeting special education needs of educationally disadvantaged children?

Answer: No.

Recent hearings in Washington disclosed that inadequate funding was the greatest obstacle in the path of more effectively reaching the disadvantaged. Others now contend that we cannot effectively utilize extra funds contained in the HEW Appropriation Bill because the funds are being misdirected and are not reaching the disadvantaged contemplated under Title I ESEA. Your brief comments on these contentions would be appreciated.

Comment: A greater percentage of the school districts are trying to do the best job possible for the disadvantaged than are not. Look at the total picture not just isolated cases.

RESPONSE OF L. C. COZZENS, SUPERINTENDENT, PORTALES MUNICIPAL SCHOOLS, NEW MEXICO

How many children in your district are benefitting from education programs funded under Title I of ESEA?

Answer: 1,327.

What is the ADA in your school district grades K-12?

Answer: 2,860.

What was the amount of your ESEA Title I grant in each of the following fiscal years?

Answer: 1968 \$128,141, 1969 \$133,128, 1970 \$110,137, plus \$25,794 expected in February.

What additional funds, if any, could you effectively apply to your Title I programs in fiscal year 1970 over and above the present level of funding? In fiscal year 1971?

Answer: 1970 \$40,000, 1971 \$50,000.

In your judgment, do you believe that the Title I programs are needed to meet the special needs of educationally disadvantaged children?

Answer: Yes.

Do you regard your present Title I programs as effective in meeting special education needs of educationally disadvantaged children?

Answer: Yes. With additional funds we could provide better programs to meet the needs of the educationally disadvantaged.

Recent hearings in Washington disclosed that inadequate funding was the greatest obstacle in the path of more effectively reaching the disadvantaged. Others now contend that we cannot effectively utilize extra funds contained in the HEW Appropriation Bill because the funds are being misdirected and are not reaching the disadvantaged contemplated under Title I ESEA. Your brief comments on these contentions would be appreciated.

Comment: Our programs are directed toward meeting the needs of the disadvantaged. Additional funding is necessary. Earlier funding is necessary to effectively plan and reach the needs of the disadvantaged.

RESPONSE OF WALLACE L. NORGROVE, DIRECTOR SPECIAL PROGRAMS, GRAND RAPIDS PUBLIC SCHOOLS, GRAND RAPIDS, MICH., JANUARY 20, 1970

How many children in your district are benefitting from education programs funded under Title I of ESEA?

Answer 2650 students.

What is the ADA in your school district grades K-12?

Answer: 31,280.

What was the amount of your ESEA Title I grant in each of the following fiscal years?

Answer: 1968 \$696,409, 1969 \$710,618, 1970 \$647,488 tentative.

What additional funds, if any, could you effectively apply to your Title I programs in fiscal year 1970 over and above the present level of funding? In fiscal year 1971?

Answer: 1970 \$70,000, for summer pro-

grams, dropout programs and special education programs, health services, 1971 \$74,000.

In your judgment, do you believe that the Title I programs are needed to meet the special needs of educationally disadvantaged children?

Answer: Yes, no question about it.

Do you regard your present Title I programs as effective in meeting special educationally disadvantaged children?

Answer: In most cases all components of our title I program are effective. Of course experimental or pilot programs must be evaluated at the end of the year for effectiveness.

Recent hearings in Washington disclosed that inadequate funding was the greatest obstacle in the path of more effectively reaching the disadvantaged. Others now contend that we cannot effectively utilize extra funds contained in the HEW Appropriation Bill because the funds are being misdirected and are not reaching the disadvantaged contemplated under Title I ESEA. Your brief comments on these contentions would be appreciated.

Comment: I believe inadequate funding, combined with uncertain and hate funding are really the biggest problems in title I or any of the other ESEA titles. It is very difficult to plan ahead, work with community groups, hire people, purchase materials etc; when one does not know what resources are available.

RESPONSE OF SAM STORALL, SAN MARCOS, TEX.

How many children in your district are benefitting from education programs funded under Title I of ESEA?

Answer: 1,800.

What is the ADA in your school district grades K-12?

Answer: 4,000.

What was the amount of your ESEA Title I grant in each of the following fiscal years?

Answer: 1968 \$193,000, 1969 \$187,000, 1970 \$178,000.

What additional funds, if any, could you effectively apply to your Title I programs in fiscal year 1970 over and above the present level of funding? In fiscal year 1971?

Answer: 1970 \$50,000, 1971 \$50,000.

In your judgment, do you believe that the Title I programs are needed to meet the special needs of educationally disadvantaged children?

Answer: Yes.

Do you regard your present Title I programs as effective in meeting special education needs of educationally disadvantaged children?

Answer: Yes.

Recent hearings in Washington disclosed that inadequate funding was the greatest obstacle in the path of more effectively reaching the disadvantaged. Others now contend that we cannot effectively utilize extra funds contained in the HEW Appropriation Bill because the funds are being misdirected and are not reaching the disadvantaged contemplated under Title I ESEA. Your brief comments on these contentions would be appreciated.

RESPONSE OF PAUL H. BLAIR, SUPERINTENDENT, OF EAST LIVERPOOL CITY, EAST LIVERPOOL, OHIO

How many children in your district are benefitting from education programs funded under Title I of ESEA?

Answer: Approximately 600 each year since its inception in our district in fiscal 1966.

What is the ADA in your school district grades K-12?

Answer: 5,900.

What was the amount of your ESEA Title I grant in each of the following fiscal years?

Answer: 1968 \$62,114, 1969 \$57,154, 1970 \$49,345.

What additional funds, if any, could you effectively apply to your Title I programs in fiscal year 1970 over and above the present level of funding? In fiscal year 1971?

Answer: 1970 \$50,000, 1971 \$70,000.

In your judgment, do you believe that the Title I programs are needed to meet the special needs of educationally disadvantaged children?

Answer: Yes! Specific programs for disadvantaged youth are sorely needed so that educational and cultural deprivation may be reduced.

Do you regard your present Title I programs as effective in meeting special education needs of educationally disadvantaged children?

Answer: Yes! However, more financial aid is needed to expand and improve present and proposed Title I projects.

Recent hearings in Washington disclosed that inadequate funding was the greatest obstacle in the path of more effectively reaching the disadvantaged. Others now contend that we cannot effectively utilize extra funds contained in the HEW Appropriation Bill because the funds are being misdirected and are not reaching the disadvantaged contemplated under Title I ESEA. Your brief comments on these contentions would be appreciated.

Comment: Since most school districts are apparently complying with Title I regulations, it seems unwise and unfair to penalize all school districts because of a few who misuse or misdirect Title I funds. Extra funds can certainly be utilized and to the intent of the law.

RESPONSE OF M. E. ACOCKS, PORT CLINTON, PORT CLINTON, OHIO

How many children in your district are benefitting from education programs funded under Title I of ESEA?

Answer: 140.

What is the ADA in your school district grades K-12?

Answer: 3400.

What was the amount of your ESEA Title I grant in each of the following fiscal years?

Answer: 1968 \$31,872, pupil helped, 325. 1969 \$27,819, pupil helped, 157. 1970 \$24,298, pupil helped, 140.

What additional funds, if any, could you effectively apply to your Title I programs in fiscal year 1970 over and above the present level of funding? In fiscal year 1971?

Answer: 1970, \$15,000; 1971, \$20,000.

In your judgment, do you believe that the Title I programs are needed to meet the special needs of educationally disadvantaged children?

Answer: Yes.

Do you regard your present Title I programs as effective in meeting special education needs of educationally disadvantaged children?

Answer: Yes. Weakness is lack of adequate funds.

Recent hearings in Washington disclosed that inadequate funding was the greatest obstacle in the path of more effectively reaching the disadvantaged. Others now contend that we cannot effectively utilize extra funds contained in the HEW Appropriation Bill because the funds are being misdirected and are not reaching the disadvantaged contemplated under Title I ESEA. Your brief comments on these contentions would be appreciated.

Comment: Total enrollment grows—more pupils that qualify but less funds each year. We can't do the job without help!

RESPONSE OF DR. JACK HORNBACK, SUPERINTENDENT, SAN DIEGO UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT, SAN DIEGO, CALIF.

How many children in your district are benefitting from education programs funded under Title I of ESEA?

Answer: Compensatory Education, 9,761;

Neglected Children, 70; total benefitting, 9,831.

What is the ADA in your school district grades K-12?

Answer: 123,702.98.

What was the amount of your ESEA Title I grant in each of the following fiscal years?

Answer: 1968, \$2,227,688; 1969, \$2,065,084; 1970, \$1,867,667 (includes neglected and delinquent).

What additional funds, if any, could you effectively apply to your Title I programs in fiscal year 1970 over and above the present level of funding? In fiscal year 1971?

Answer: 1970, Restore to the level of 1968, i.e., \$2,227,688; 1971, \$2,450,456.

In your judgment, do you believe that the Title I programs are needed to meet the special needs of educationally disadvantaged children?

Answer: Yes.

Do you regard your present Title I programs as effective in meeting special education needs of educationally disadvantaged children?

Answer: Yes.

Recent hearings in Washington disclosed that inadequate funding was the greatest obstacle in the path of more effectively reaching the disadvantaged. Others now contend that we cannot effectively utilize extra funds contained in the HEW Appropriation Bill because the funds are being misdirected and are not reaching the disadvantaged contemplated under Title I ESEA. Your brief comments on these contentions would be appreciated.

Comment: Above comments not applicable to this district.

RESPONSE OF M. D. NEELY, COORDINATOR OF SPECIAL PROJECTS, METROPOLITAN PUBLIC SCHOOLS, NASHVILLE-DAVIDSON COUNTY, TENN.

How many children in your district are benefitting from education programs funded under Title I of ESEA?

Answer: 10,989.

What is the ADA in your school district grades K-12?

Answer: 88,216.47 (June, 1969).

What was the amount of your ESEA Title I grant in each of the following fiscal years?

Answer: 1968 1,577,915.12, 1969 1,433,949.76, 1970 1,301,363.00 (Initial 1969-70 grant).

What additional funds, if any, could you effectively apply to your Title I programs in fiscal year 1970 over and above the present level of funding? In fiscal year 1971?

Answer: 1970 \$250,000, 1971 500,000.

In your judgment, do you believe that the Title I programs are needed to meet the special needs of educationally disadvantaged children?

Answer: Definitely: for teacher training, parent involvement, program innovations and revisions, and instruction materials designed to raise the achievement level and social adjustment of disadvantaged pupils.

Do you regard your present Title I programs as effective in meeting special education needs of educationally disadvantaged children?

Answer: The program is only partially effective. An expanded program in language arts and social development is needed to further meet the needs of the disadvantaged children.

Recent hearings in Washington disclosed that inadequate funding was the greatest obstacle in the path of more effectively reaching the disadvantaged. Others now contend that we cannot effectively utilize extra funds contained in the HEW Appropriation Bill because the funds are being misdirected and are not reaching the disadvantaged contemplated under Title I ESEA. Your brief comments on these contentions would be appreciated.

Comment I support the first sentence in the above paragraph. The Metropolitan Board

of Education aspires the philosophy of compensatory education and would encourage the use of additional funds for disadvantaged children.

RESPONSE OF CLIFFORD LOWDENBACK, GREENUP COUNTY, KY., JANUARY 20, 1970

How many children in your district are benefitting from education programs funded under Title I of ESEA?

Answer: 1,420.

What is the ADA in your school district grades K-12?

Answer: \$4,497.46.

What was the amount of your ESEA Title I grant in each of the following fiscal years?

Answer: 1968 \$253,031, 1969 \$229,345, 1970 \$217,898.

What additional funds, if any, could you effectively apply to your Title I programs in fiscal year 1970 over and above the present level of funding? In fiscal year 1971?

Answer: 1970 \$125,000, 1971, 125,000.

In your judgment, do you believe that the Title I programs are needed to meet the special needs of educationally disadvantaged children?

Answer: Yes. Without Title I funds our program for these children would be almost nil.

Do you regard your present Title I programs as effective in meeting special education needs of educationally disadvantaged children?

Answer: Yes, especially in the areas of reading, health, and science.

Recent hearings in Washington disclosed that inadequate funding was the greatest obstacle in the path of more effectively reaching the disadvantaged. Others now contend that we cannot effectively utilize extra funds contained in the HEW Appropriation Bill because the funds are being misdirected and are not reaching the disadvantaged contemplated under Title I ESEA. Your brief comments on these contentions would be appreciated.

Comment: More funds are needed to expand present programs and add new ones. Present funds enable us to provide the disadvantaged with food, clothing, medicine, and increased interest and accomplishment in education.

RESPONSE OF LEON HARRIS, JR., CLARENDON DISTRICT NO. 2, MANNING, S.C., JANUARY 20, 1970

How many children in your district are benefitting from education programs funded under Title I of ESEA?

Answer: 2,739.

What is the ADA in your school district grades K-12?

Answer: \$3,481.

What was the amount of your ESEA Title I grant in each of the following fiscal years?

Answer: 1968, \$410,618; 1969, \$442,817; 1970, \$398,004.

What additional funds, if any, could you effectively apply to your Title I programs in fiscal year 1970 over and above the present level of funding? In fiscal year 1971?

Answer: 1970, none; 1971, none.

In your judgment, do you believe that the Title I programs are needed to meet the special needs of educationally disadvantaged children?

Answer: Yes.

Do you regard your present Title I programs as effective in meeting special education needs of educationally disadvantaged children?

Answer: Yes.

Recent hearings in Washington disclosed that inadequate funding was the greatest obstacle in the path of more effectively reaching the disadvantaged. Others now contend that we cannot effectively utilize extra funds contained in the HEW Appropriation Bill because the funds are being

misdirected and are not reaching the disadvantaged contemplated under Title I ESEA. Your brief comments on these contentions would be appreciated.

Comment: Our district has never spent all the Title I money allotted to it. The reason is that we cannot secure all of the competent personnel that we need. We have limited our Title I activities to those areas in which we can find capable personnel. In other words, we are not spending the money just to be spending it.

RESPONSE OF WM. A. CHEEK, LAWRENCE COUNTY, LOUISA, KY., JANUARY 20, 1970

How many children in your district are benefitting from education programs funded under Title I of ESEA?

Answer: 1,157.

What is the ADA in your school district grades K-12?

Answer: \$2,586.

What was the amount of your ESEA Title I grant in each of the following fiscal years?

Answer: 1968, \$266,324; 1969, \$237,767; 1970, \$212,068.

What additional funds, if any, could you effectively apply to your Title I programs in fiscal year 1970 over and above the present level of funding? In fiscal year 1971?

Answer: 1970, \$425,000; 1971, \$425,000, plus \$1,500,000 for construction.

In your judgment, do you believe that the Title I programs are needed to meet the special needs of educationally disadvantaged children?

Answer: Yes.

Do you regard your present Title I programs as effective in meeting special education needs of educationally disadvantaged children?

Answer: Yes.

Recent hearings in Washington disclosed that inadequate funding was the greatest obstacle in the path of more effectively reaching the disadvantaged. Others now contend that we cannot effectively utilize extra funds contained in the HEW Appropriation Bill because the funds are being misdirected and are not reaching the disadvantaged contemplated under Title I ESEA. Your brief comments on these contentions would be appreciated.

Comment: All the money from Title I does reach the economically and educationally deprived children in the Lawrence County School District; however, more than twice the appropriated amount could be used advantageously for our children.

RESPONSE OF C. W. HANCHEY, CALCASTEV PARISH SCHOOL BOARD, LAKE CHARLES, LA., JANUARY 20, 1970

How many children in your district are benefitting from education programs funded under Title I of ESEA?

Answer: 2,517.

What is the ADA in your school district grades K-12?

Answer: \$37,838.1.

What was the amount of your ESEA Title I grant in each of the following fiscal years?

Answer: 1968 \$762,549.65, 1969 \$692,461.83, 1970 \$561,030.

What additional funds, if any, could you effectively apply to your Title I programs in fiscal year 1970 over and above the present level of funding? In fiscal year 1971?

Answer: 1970 \$180,000, 1971 \$530,000.

In your judgment, do you believe that the Title I programs are needed to meet the special needs of educationally disadvantaged children?

Answer: Yes.

Do you regard your present Title I programs as effective in meeting special education needs of educationally disadvantaged children?

Answer: Yes, within limitations of limited and late funding.

Recent hearings in Washington disclosed

that inadequate funding was the greatest obstacle in the path of more effectively reaching the disadvantaged. Others now contend that we cannot effectively utilize extra funds contained in the HEW Appropriation Bill because the funds are being misdirected and are not reaching the disadvantaged contemplated under Title I ESEA. Your brief comments on these contentions would be appreciated.

Comment:

(1) Inadequate funding is definitely the greatest obstacle in the path of more effectively reaching the disadvantaged.

(2) Allegations of misdirection of funds might be true in isolated cases, but it is our contention that such charges are unwarranted against the total program.

RESPONSE OF ALICE M. NEILAN, ASSISTANT SUPERINTENDENT OF SCHOOLS, NEW LONDON PUBLIC SCHOOLS, NEW LONDON, CONN., JANUARY 20, 1970

How many children in your district are benefitting from education programs funded under Title I of ESEA?

Answer: 300.

What is the ADA in your school district grades K-12?

Answer: 4,865.

What was the amount of your ESEA Title I grant in each of the following fiscal years?

Answer: 1968 \$108,094.84, 1969 \$117,519, 1970 \$112,032.

What additional funds, if any, could you effectively apply to your Title I programs in fiscal year 1970 over and above the present level of funding? In fiscal year 1971?

Answer: 1970 \$25,000, 1971 \$25,000.

In your judgment, do you believe that the Title I programs are needed to meet the special needs of educational disadvantaged children?

Answer: I absolutely recommend the Title I programs as vital if schools are to meet the special needs of educationally disadvantaged children.

Do you regard your present Title I programs as effective in meeting special education needs of educationally disadvantaged children?

Answer: Without question.

Recent hearings in Washington disclosed that inadequate funding was the greatest obstacles in the path of more effectively reaching the disadvantaged. Others now contend that we cannot effectively utilize extra funds contained in the HEW Appropriation Bill because the funds are being misdirected and are not reaching the disadvantaged contemplated under Title I ESEA. Your brief comments on these contentions would be appreciated.

Comment: We feel that the funds are going to the disadvantaged children in our district, for there has been careful identification of students. We could use extra funds.

RESPONSE OF JAMES T. BURCH, CHARLOTTE-MECKLENBURG, CHARLOTTE, N.C., JANUARY 20, 1970.

How many children in your district are benefitting from education programs funded under Title I of ESEA?

Answer: 3,542.

What is the ADA in your school district grades K-12?

Answer: \$82,971.

What was the amount of your ESEA Title I grant in each of the following fiscal years?

Answer: 1968 \$992,920, 1969 \$1,228,787, 1970 \$1,139,147, includes funds allocated for children in institutions for the neglected.

What additional funds, if any, could you effectively apply to your Title I programs in fiscal year 1970 over and above the present level of funding? In fiscal year 1971?

Answer: 1970 \$150,000, 1971 \$150,000.

In your judgment, do you believe that the

Title I programs are needed to meet the special needs of educationally disadvantaged children?

Answer: Yes.

Do you regard your present Title I programs as effective in meeting special education needs of educationally disadvantaged children?

Answer: Yes.

Recent hearings in Washington disclosed that inadequate funding was the greatest obstacle in the path of more effectively reaching the disadvantaged. Others now contend that we cannot effectively utilize extra funds contained in the HEW Appropriation Bill because the funds are being misdirected and are not reaching the disadvantaged contemplated under Title I ESEA. Your brief comments on these contentions would be appreciated.

Comment: If the accusations are true, then a better job of Federal supervision should be instituted. Additional funds are needed to better serve the added number of children who could benefit from the services.

RESPONSE OF MR. HARRY B. SINGER, PITTSBURGH, PA., JANUARY 20, 1970

How many children in your district are benefitting from education programs funded under Title I of ESEA?

Answer: There is an additional group of children who benefit to a lesser degree by virtue of their attendance in the schools in which the program is operating. This additional number of children equals 27,470. Therefore, the total number of children participating is 54,005.

What is the ADA in your school district grades K-12?

Answer: \$65,211—as of November 25, 1969.

What was the amount of your ESEA Title I grant in each of the following fiscal years?

Answer: 1968 \$3,263,959.82—Final entitlement, 1969 \$3,384,937.59—Final entitlement, 1970 \$3,193,028.19—Tentative entitlement.

What additional funds, if any, could you effectively apply to your Title I programs in fiscal year 1970 over and above the present level of funding? In fiscal year 1971?

Answer: 1970 \$3½ million, 1971 \$5 million.

In your judgment, do you believe that the Title I programs are needed to meet the special needs of educationally disadvantaged children?

Answer: Yes.

Do you regard your present Title I programs as effective in meeting special education needs of educationally disadvantaged children?

Answer: Yes, however, constant evaluation requires to continually change the design and operation of our programs.

Recent hearings in Washington disclosed that inadequate funding was the greatest obstacle in the path of more effectively reaching the disadvantaged. Others now contend that we cannot effectively utilize extra funds contained in the HEW Appropriation Bill because the funds are being misdirected and are not reaching the disadvantaged contemplated under Title I ESEA. Your brief comments on these contentions would be appreciated.

Comment: Our present operations based upon experience since the Title I Law was enacted has provided us with greater knowledge to develop programs which meet the needs of most disadvantaged children. Our present operations include an emphasis on: (1) programs for the Early Childhood Years; (2) dropout prevention; (3) greater emphasis on fewer children; and (4) increasing involvement of parents in the evaluation and development of programs. Delay in receiving approval of total allocation is detrimental to effective planning prior to program implementation.

RESPONSE OF DR. ROBERT L. CHISHOLM, SUPERINTENDENT, ARLINGTON COUNTY PUBLIC SCHOOLS, ARLINGTON, VA., JANUARY 20, 1970

How many children in your district are benefitting from education programs funded under Title I or ESEA?

Answer: 1,335.

What is the ADA in your school district grades K-12?

Answer: \$24,191.

What was the amount of your ESEA Title I grant in each of the following fiscal years?

Answer: 1968 \$187,636.30, 1969 \$175,185, 1970 \$142,694.08.

What additional funds, if any, could you effectively apply to your Title I programs in fiscal year 1970 over and above the present level of funding? In fiscal year 1971?

Answer: 1970 \$67,000, 1971 \$70,000.

In your judgment, do you believe that the Title I programs are needed to meet the special needs of educationally disadvantaged children?

Answer: Yes, definitely. The problems which disadvantaged children pose to school systems can only be resolved by special programs designed to cope intensively with them and funded separately so that they are justified as unusual additional expenditures.

Do you regard your present Title I programs as effective in meeting special education needs of educationally disadvantaged children?

Answer: The programs which we have in operation presently are achieving positive results. Unfortunately because of limited funding we are only reaching 54% of the children eligible for help under Title I guidelines.

Recent hearings in Washington disclosed that inadequate funding was the greatest obstacle in the path of more effectively reaching the disadvantaged. Others now contend that we cannot effectively utilize extra funds contained in the HEW Appropriation Bill because the funds are being misdirected and are not reaching the disadvantaged contemplated under Title I ESEA. Your brief comments on these contentions would be appreciated.

Comment: —

RESPONSE OF DR. M. T. ANDERSON, THE SCHOOL DISTRICT OF GREENVILLE COUNTY, GREENVILLE, S.C., JANUARY 20, 1970

How many children in your district are benefitting from education programs funded under Title I of ESEA?

Answer: 11,500.

What is the ADA in your school district grades K-12?

Answer: \$54,114.

What was the amount of your ESEA Title I grant in each of the following fiscal years?

Answer: 1968 \$1,088,047, 1969 \$1,030,302, 1970 \$889,811.

What additional funds, if any, could you effectively apply to your Title I programs in fiscal year 1970 over and above the present level of funding? In fiscal year 1971?

Answer: 1970 \$100,000, 1971 \$500,000.

In your judgment, do you believe that the Title I programs are needed to meet the special needs of educationally disadvantaged children?

Answer: Yes.

Do you regard your present Title I programs as effective in meeting special education needs of educationally disadvantaged children?

Answer: Yes.

Recent hearings in Washington disclosed that inadequate funding was the greatest obstacle in the path of more effectively reaching the disadvantaged. Others now contend that we cannot effectively utilize extra funds contained in the HEW Appropriation Bill because the funds are being misdirected and are not reaching the disadvantaged contemplated under Title I ESEA. Your brief

comments on these contentions would be appreciated.

Comment: Concur that inadequate funding is an obstacle. The total program could be planned and executed more effectively with long range (5 year) program assurance, early annual funding advice (90 days preceding fiscal year) and annual one-year advance funding.

RESPONSE OF CHARLES L. DAVIS, ASSISTANT SUPERINTENDENT, KINSTON CITY SCHOOLS, KINSTON, N.C., JANUARY 20, 1970

How many children in your district are benefitting from education programs funded under Title I of ESEA?

Answer: 2,107.

What is the ADA in your school district grades K-12?

Answer: \$6,016.

What was the amount of your ESEA Title I grant in each of the following fiscal years?

Answer: 1968 \$282,330.36, 1969 \$265,014, 1970 \$237,389.

What additional funds, if any, could you effectively apply to your Title I programs in fiscal year 1970 over and above the present level of funding? In fiscal year 1971?

Answer: 1970 \$100,000, 1971 \$100,000.

In your judgment, do you believe that the Title I programs are needed to meet the special needs of educationally disadvantaged children?

Answer: Yes.

Do you regard your present Title I programs as effective in meeting special education needs of educationally disadvantaged children?

Answer: Yes.

Recent hearings in Washington disclosed that inadequate funding was the greatest obstacle in the path of more effectively reaching the disadvantaged. Others now contend that we cannot effectively utilize extra funds contained in the HEW Appropriation Bill because the funds are being misdirected and are not reaching the disadvantaged contemplated under Title I ESEA. Your brief comments on these contentions would be appreciated.

Comment: Kinston City Schools' Title I funds are not being misdirected. I am sure you realize that the first year of Title I was confusing to everyone on a local, State, and National level. Funds were permitted to be used unwisely during this period. I feel that most school systems have realized the problem and have readjusted to place Title I funds in specific disadvantaged categories. May we keep in mind that Title I is only five years old. The first year or two was confusing to everyone from the "grass roots" to Washington because of the interpretation and communication problems that developed as we tried to organize.

The problems related to the educationally disadvantaged child are many and complex to the point that we should not expect immediate results. Medical doctors have worked years on the prevention and cure of diseases such as cancer. Do we start cutting the program after a few years because the cure is not found? The same is true of the disadvantaged child. He has been neglected for many years and we do not have the immediate cure. I think most educators will readily admit that it will be detrimental to the progress already made if future funding of Title I is cut. I see a definite need for increasing Title I funds and for specific guidelines demanding concentration on the disadvantaged student in areas that have not adhered to this part of the Title I guidelines.

RESPONSE OF SYLVAN THOMAS, INSTRUCTIONAL LEADER, TITLE I, ROSEVILLE SCHOOL DISTRICT, ROSEVILLE, MICH., JANUARY 20, 1970

1. How many children in your district are benefitting from education programs funded under Title I of ESEA?

Answer: 332 benefitting.

2. What is the ADA in your school district grades K-12?

Answer: \$13,572.

3. What was the amount of your ESEA Title I grant in each of the following fiscal years?

Answer: 1968 \$132,493, 1969 \$109,786, 1970 \$104,859.

4. What additional funds, if any, could you effectively apply to your Title I programs in fiscal year 1970 over and above the present level of funding? In fiscal year 1971?

Answer: 1970 \$30,000, to maintain current restricted program, 1971 \$80,000, to strengthen successful programs and extra personnel.

5. In your judgment, do you believe that the Title I programs are needed to meet the special needs of educationally disadvantaged children?

Yes, statistics in our district, show that 30% of our students are educationally disadvantaged, i.e. they either perform poorly in elementary schools or in later grades of education, drop from school. Partly because most programs are accented toward the college bound students. North Central Association takes care to provide accreditive criteria in high schools but Title I programs have focused on this kind of need for quality in elementary grades and for those students who eventually drop from school before high school graduation.

6. Do you regard your present Title I programs as effective in meeting special education needs of educationally disadvantaged children?

Yes, and they are the single hope that has emerged for many of these children. Our program has been effective to the extent that colleges and universities have provided the kinds of trained personnel needed in these programs and the federal agencies have provided the means to pursue them locally. At the present time we have only five kinds of general education personnel available that have a competence in dealing with this problem and around which such programs can be structured, especially in elementary schools. They are the academic teacher, the child guidance teacher (counselor) the remedial reading teacher and the social worker and perhaps teachers' aids. There are also very few facilities designed for these students.

7A. Recent hearings in Washington disclosed that inadequate funding was the greatest obstacle in the path of more effectively reaching the disadvantaged.

Yes, I do. We have three phases, (1) elementary counseling, that is very effective, (2) remedial reading and (3) summer activities programs that has replaced unsupervised yard and street activities of students in our communities.

7B. Others now contend that we cannot effectively utilize extra funds contained in the HEW Appropriation Bill because the funds are being misdirected and are not reaching the disadvantaged contemplated under Title I ESEA. Your brief comments on these contentions would be appreciated.

I would not agree. Inadequate funding has prevented us from extending our present programs in areas of strength and prevented us from implementing a summer phase that is so strongly supported by the parents of the disadvantaged in our district.

RESPONSE OF DR. MICHAEL V. WOODALL, CHARLESTON COUNTY, CHARLESTON, S.C., JANUARY 20, 1970

How many children in your district are benefitting from education programs funded under Title I of ESEA?

Answer: 14,943.

What is the ADA in your school district grades K-12?

Answer: \$54,536.

What was the amount of your ESEA Title I grant in each of the following fiscal years?

Answer: 1968 \$2,170,638, 1969 \$2,054,094, 1970 \$1,792,773.

What additional funds, if any, could you effectively apply to your Title I programs in fiscal year 1970 over and above the present level of funding? In fiscal year 1971?

Answer: 1970 \$300,000, 1971 \$300,000.

In your judgment, do you believe that the Title I programs are needed to meet the special needs of educationally disadvantaged children?

Answer: At the present, yes.

Do you regard your present Title I programs as effective in meeting special education needs of educationally disadvantaged children?

Answer: Yes, however there are other areas not covered under our present program which could and should be developed.

Recent hearings in Washington disclosed that inadequate funding was the greatest obstacle in the path of more effectively reaching the disadvantaged. Others now contend that we cannot effectively utilize extra funds contained in the HEW Appropriation Bill because the funds are being misdirected and are not reaching the disadvantaged contemplated under Title I ESEA. Your brief comments on these contentions would be appreciated.

Comment: Inadequate advanced funding is the greatest obstacle in the path of a more effective program. Educational programs cannot be developed over a short period of time. Effective programs require several years of planning and developing. Title I has just reached the point where an evaluation would be a true picture of its success. Talk of a reduction in Title I funding is disturbing to those of us who have first-hand knowledge of the good it is doing.

RESPONSE OF DR. LOUIS D. MONACEL FOR SUPERINTENDENT NORMAN DRACHLER, DETROIT PUBLIC SCHOOLS, DETROIT, MICH., JANUARY 20, 1970

How many children in your district are benefitting from education programs funded under Title I of ESEA?

Answer: 27,641. (This is based on high concentration of effort within schools that have greatest saturation of eligibility.)

What is the ADA in your school district grades K-12?

Answer: Approximately \$280,000.

What was the amount of your ESEA Title I grant in each of the following fiscal years?

Answer: 1968 \$11,281,162, 1969, \$10,460,289, 1970 \$9,470,929 (pending).

What additional funds, if any, could you effectively apply to your Title I programs in fiscal year 1970 over and above the present level of funding? In fiscal year 1971?

Answer: 1970 \$30,000,000, 1971 \$50,000,000.

In your judgment, do you believe that the Title I programs are needed to meet the special needs of educationally disadvantaged children?

Answer: Yes. Title I is of critical importance and requires enormous expansion.

Do you regard your present Title I programs as effective in meeting special education needs of educationally disadvantaged children?

Answer: Yes. However, funds are so minimal that we exist only with models of what must be done.

Recent hearings in Washington disclosed that inadequate funding was the greatest obstacle in the path of more effectively reaching the disadvantaged. Others now contend that we cannot effectively utilize extra funds contained in the HEW Appropriation Bill because the funds are being misdirected and are not reaching the disadvantaged contemplated under Title I ESEA. Your brief comments on these contentions would be appreciated.

Comment: Inadequate funding is the obstacle in the path of more effectively reaching the disadvantaged. The contention that funds are misdirected and are not reaching the disadvantaged are false in the case of

this school district. We now know what to do for the disadvantaged, given a proper funding base. Inadequate funding remains the source of our problem. Legislative aspirations made clear by authorization levels have never been met via appropriations.

**THEATER: A HISTORIAN TAKES A HARD LOOK AT "WILSON AND THE PROMISE LAND"**

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

Mr. TIERNAN. Mr. Speaker, recently an article appeared in the Sunday New York Times which praises the work of the Trinity Square Repertory Co., in Providence, R.I. This company has received numerous acclaims in the past, including being the first American resident company to perform at the Edinburgh International Festival in Scotland.

I believe that the National Council on the Arts made a grave mistake in refusing to give Federal funds to Trinity Square last year. Mr. Clive Barnes, in his article in the Times, states that "its record of producing new plays, often by new authors, is exemplary." Such a record certainly deserves recognition by the National Council on the Arts. It is my hope that this year the council will see fit to reward such excellence with a Federal grant.

At this point in the RECORD, I would like to insert a copy of Mr. Barnes' article:

[From the New York Times, Jan. 11, 1970]

**THEATER: A HISTORIAN TAKES A HARD LOOK AT "WILSON AND THE PROMISE LAND"**

(By Clive Barnes)

The Trinity Square Repertory Company in Providence, R.I., can lay claim to being one of the best and the most adventurous in the country. Its standards of acting and staging are very high indeed, it has already enjoyed a remarkable international success at the Edinburgh Festival, and its record of producing new plays, often by new authors, is exemplary.

It was a new play, "Wilson in the Promise Land," that took me to Providence last week, and it proved an exceedingly worthwhile journey. The play, written by a historian, Roland Van Zandt, and staged by the Trinity Square director, Adrian Hall, is a tendentious portrait of Woodrow Wilson and a highly controversial glance at what has made American foreign policy tick over the years from Washington to Franklin D. Roosevelt and, by implication, until our present day.

The style of the play is boldly and successfully theatrical. It starts with Wilson in his final years at the White House—his health is broken by a thrombosis, the 14th of various breakdowns that punctuated his life, his commitment to his dream of a League of Nations has been frustrated, and the country is drifting along with no firm hand at the helm.

From here we move into a dream fantasy where Wilson is accused by a symbolic son representing the young America and by a group of hippies of placing his personal ambitions, his religious convictions and his masochistic desire for sacrifice above the best interests of the nation.

The author is totally unsparing of Wilson—he is depicted as a paranoid religious fanatic, totally obsessed with himself and totally unfit to govern. His life, seen in vignettes often acted out by the hippie troupe,

is traced from the years of the revolution, the firm influence of father, a strict Presbyterian minister in Augusta, Ga., to the time when he leads America into the first World War.

The elements that made his life are symbolized by the bell of the church and the cannon of the Revolution. We see him at his beloved Princeton finding his vocation not, as he had first hoped, as a minister of God but as an orator and statesman, God's chosen instrument of government on earth.

The author's judgment on Wilson is uncompromisingly harsh, and although it makes for fascinating theater, the dialectic of its very evidently slanted propaganda will not only stimulate, it may well also annoy. Wilson never gets an even break. For example, America's entry into the war is seen as almost a personal whim on the President's part, quite ignoring the German U-boat campaign of the time and the mounting sense of outrage in country and government alike.

Nor is Wilson the only President exposed to the author's baleful eye and scornful tongue. As part judges, part witnesses and part fellow-accused to this fantasy of a President and his lost promises (the play is called, revealingly, "Wilson in the Promise Land" not "Wilson in the Promised Land" six other Presidents stand in the same phantasmagorical courtroom—Washington, Jefferson, Jackson, Lincoln, Theodore Roosevelt and Franklin D. Roosevelt.

Mr. Van Zandt seems to have two main contentions. The first is that all political leaders are led to their position of power by overweening ambition and are at their most dangerous when at their most self-righteous. He accuses all of these Presidents of making war—including Lincoln and the second Roosevelt.

His second contention is that all war is bad—and be particularly wary when men lead you forward to what they claim is a morally justified war. Well, of course, all war is bad, but there are many, including myself, who, while pacifist by nature, believe that at certain points the best interests of one's beliefs must be defended. The author seems to think that Lincoln and F.D.R. led us into unnecessary bloodshed—but one wonders whether without that bloodshed Mr. Van Zandt would today be in a position to present his interesting, if debatable views.

He links this with the war in Vietnam—at one point the cast re-enacts the candle ritual of the Washington moratorium—but one wonders whether such blanket pacifism does much to further the present cause of peace. Also, the author does protest too much. Is there never a sincere politician—is every statesman an empty demagogue? When, by deliberate anachronism, the author melds one of Wilson's more highly flown rhetorical speeches with phrases from President John F. Kennedy and Martin Luther King Jr., I detected the chill of easy cynicism lowering the fervor of genuine political passion.

In a way, it is greatly to Mr. Van Zandt's credit that he forces you to discuss his philosophy before discussing his play. He is superbly controversial, magnificently annoying. You agree with some of his points, you snort with indignation at his political special pleading, but the debate—or manifesto if you prefer—is carried out in splendidly gripping dramatic terms. Not for a moment does he lose your interest, and not for an instant does his historical insight become less than arresting and brilliant.

It is a play that deserves to be seen in New York, in, if possible, the present staging. Mr. Hall and his designer, Eugene Lee, have set the play in a chapel (one is so used to having chapels converted into theaters, it seems almost like sacrilege to have a theater converted into a chapel) and Mr. Hall's free-style staging is absolutely right for the play. The acting has a perfect ensemble edge

to it, as well as containing many individual performances of great quality.

William Cain's Wilson is a tour de force, beautifully calculated and projected. George Martin as Teddy Roosevelt and Ronald Frazier as F.D.R. also contribute perfect character studies, but the entire company works its way surefootedly through the maze of Mr. Van Zandt's vision. I cannot always agree with Mr. Van Zandt's view of America, but I admire the way he puts it.

**INTERNATIONAL COMMUNISM ON TRIAL**

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

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, the enemy of free people is international communism.

While Americans are dying in Vietnam—and Korea—fighting the Vietnamese and Korean puppets of international bolshevism, our leaders are busily engaged in attempting to improve relations with the enemy.

There is but one enemy and it was clearly exposed to world public opinion in a trial held right here in Washington, D.C., in 1968.

International communism was accorded every constitutional safeguard guaranteed any defendant under our judicial system in an adversary proceeding.

The uncontroverted evidence adduced at the trial is damning and proved the case against international communism beyond all shadow of doubt:

I submit a summary of the proceedings and evidence following my remarks:

**BACKGROUND MEMORANDUM**

International Communism on Trial was conceived January 1967 by a group of distinguished Americans concerned about the one-sided glowing propaganda of the Communist apparatus about the 50th anniversary of the Bolshevik Revolution. These Americans, who included author Eugene Lyons, Fr. Daniel Lyons, S.J., editor and lecturer, David Jones, Executive Secretary of YAF, Herbert Philbrick and Richard Lindmark, St. Thomas College, noted that the Communists made much of the various scientific and material "achievements" of communism while neglecting to mention the costs of communism in such areas as freedom of speech, freedom of religion and national self-determination. They decided that an educational antidote was urgently needed to counteract that massive doses of Communist propaganda, particularly among young Americans.

They agreed that a moot trial was an appropriate format in which to publicize the more serious wrongs and crimes of communism during the last 50 years. *Twin Circle—The National Catholic Press* and Young Americans for Freedom volunteered to serve as the initial coordinators of the moot trial. A steering committee was appointed, a trial date set, a list of witnesses, Tribunal members and prosecuting attorneys drawn up.

On November 7, 1967, a "summons" was served on the Communist Party of the Soviet Union at the Soviet Embassy in Washington, D.C. On January 22, 1968, copies of the "indictment" were sent by registered mail to 15 national Communist Parties, in care of the appropriate embassies. Those Parties with neither diplomatic representation to the U.S. nor the United Nations (East Germany, North Vietnam, Peoples Republic of China, North Korea) were sent care of the Embassy of the USSR, Washington, D.C. No response was re-

ceived except that the Soviet Embassy returned by mail all copies of the "indictment" sent through the USSR, including its own, which had been opened and resealed. On February 2, 1968, telegrams were sent to 12 leading American communists, inviting them to testify and/or to question witnesses of the prosecution (see enclosed news release). Notices were also carried in the *Los Angeles Times* and *International Herald Tribune*. By February 14 no response had been received to the above efforts to obtain defense counsel and, therefore, Leonard Joseph Kelip was appointed as defense counsel by the Court.

The sponsors of International Communism on Trial wish to stress that no fees or honorariums are being paid any of the witnesses, Tribunal members or prosecuting attorneys. The sessions of the moot trial are free and open to the public. The sponsors are deeply indebted to Georgetown University for the use of its Hall of Nations as a locale. However, it should not be concluded that Georgetown University is in any way a sponsor or endorser of International Communism on Trial. The proceedings of International Communism on Trial will be published in paperback book form and a documentary of the proceedings produced.

IN THE COURT OF WORLD PUBLIC OPINION  
DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA DIVISION

*People of the Free World v. The Communist Parties of the Soviet Union, Albania, Bulgaria, Czechoslovakia, the Communist Party of that part of Germany referred to as East Germany, the Communist Parties of Hungary, Poland (also known as the Polish United Workers' Party), Rumania (also known as the Rumanian Workers' Party) Yugoslavia, North Korea, (also known as the Korean Party of Labor), North Vietnam (also known as the Vietnam Workers' Party), the Communist Parties of that part of China referred to as the Peoples Republic of China, Algeria, Cuba (also known as the Popular Socialist Party of Cuba) and the Communist Party of the United States of America.*

Indictment for participation in a conspiracy to commit the following acts: Planning and preparation of overt and covert wars of aggression, invasions and subversive activities as a general policy; participation in the waging of overt and covert wars, invasions and subversive activities; participation in a conspiracy and activities intended to deprive individuals of freedom of religion; participation in a general policy and conspiracy to deprive individuals of freedom of thought and speech; participation in a general policy of promoting slave labor practices; participation in a conspiracy to deprive independent nations the right of national self-determination.

You are hereby summoned to appear before the Court of World Public Opinion for the District of Columbia Division in the Hall of Nations, Georgetown University, in the City of Washington, D.C. on the 19-21 days of February, 1968, at 10 o'clock a.m. to answer to the attached Indictment.

Dated January 19, 1968.

PHILIP WAYNE CRAMER,  
Clerk of the Court of World Public  
Opinion.

The indictment charges:

A. The defendants are the Communist Parties of the Soviet Union, Albania, Bulgaria, Czechoslovakia, the Communist Party of that part of Germany referred to as East Germany, the Communist Parties of Hungary, Poland (also known as the Polish United Workers' Party), Rumania (also known as the Rumanian Workers' Party), Yugoslavia, North Korea (also known as the Korean Party of Labor), North Vietnam (also known as the Vietnam Workers' Party), the Communist Parties of that part of

China referred to as the Peoples Republic of China, Algeria, Cuba (Also known as the Popular Socialist Party of Cuba), and the Communist Party of the United States of America, which with their fellow conspirators, the other national Communist Parties of the Free World Nations, engaged in a joint and several campaigns of espionage, terror, deceit, murder as charged in the counts below. (These defendants have essentially juridical character and occupy the position of international persons existing separate from the national sovereignty of the respective states due to their autonomy in relation to the states in which they are located and due to the political nature of the mission entrusted to them. (Of. Nanni et al v. Pace and the Sovereign Order of Malta; Court of Cession: Italy: March 13, 1935 (1935-37) Am. Dig. 2,4-6 (no. 2).

B. The defendants and their co-conspirators, the aforesaid Communist Parties, have over a period of years preceding November 7, 1967 conspired with each other in common plans and actions and have also singly or jointly planned and acted for the following purposes:

Count I. The defendants and their co-conspirators contrary to the principles of humanity and its peace and dignity have participated singly or collectively over a period of years preceding November 7, 1967, in the planning and preparation of a general policy aimed at overt and covert wars of aggression, invasions and subversive activities against the free countries of the world.

1. The planning and preparation of the aforementioned wars, invasions, and subversive activities referred to above included: the attempted coup in Indonesia during 1965-66, the arming of Arab nations in the Middle East culminating in the Arab-Israeli War of 1967 and the continuing agitation for civil guerrilla warfare in the United States.

2. These acts and conduct of the defendants set forth in this count were committed unlawfully, willfully, knowingly, and constituted violations of international law, treaties, agreements, and assurances.

Count II. The defendants and their co-conspirators contrary to the principles of humanity and its peace and dignity have participated singly or collectively over a period of years preceding November 7, 1967, in the waging of overt and covert wars, invasions and subversive activities.

1. The waging of the overt and covert wars, invasions and subversive activities referred to above included: the invasion of South Korea in 1950, the brutal suppression of the Hungarian Revolution of 1956, the invasion and takeover of Tibet in 1959, and the continuing aggression within South Vietnam.

2. As a result of the aforesaid acts of overt and covert aggressive warfare, invasions and subversive activities, many millions of people were murdered, tortured, starved, enslaved and robbed; countless numbers became diseased; millions of homes were left in ruins; resources for raising the standards of living of people all over the world were destroyed.

3. These acts and conduct of the defendants set forth in this count were committed unlawfully, willfully, knowingly, and constituted violations of international law, treaties, agreements, and assurances.

Count III. The defendants and their co-conspirators contrary to the principles of humanity and its peace and dignity have participated singly or collectively over a period of years preceding November 7, 1967, in their own countries and in the countries of the free world in a general policy of atheism intended to deprive individuals of the right to manifest their religions, their belief, the worship, the teaching, practices and observances thereof.

1. This planning, preparation and execution of the aforementioned general policy

included: the arrest, imprisonment, torture and execution of clergymen of all faiths. The records of the Pontifical Gregorian University in Rome alone show that defendants and their co-conspirators have closed 31,779 churches, 3,334 seminaries, and 1,600 convents.

2. This planning and preparation of the aforementioned general policy included: The State University of Scientific Atheism in Alma Ata was officially designated by *Kazakstansakaia Pravada* on March 3, 1967, as "the School of Those Who Will Never Make Peace."

3. The acts and conduct of the defendants set forth in this count were committed unlawfully, willfully, knowingly, and constituted violations of international law, treaties, agreements and assurances.

Count IV. The defendants and their co-conspirators contrary to the principles of humanity and its peace and dignity have participated singly or collectively over a period of years preceding November 7, 1967, in a general policy to deprive individuals of the freedom of thought and speech.

1. The action of the aforementioned general policy included: the extermination of hundreds of intellectuals and artists during the Stalin era including Alexander Voronsky, Isaac Babel and Pavel Besspalov; the persecution of Boris Pasternak in the 1960's the trial and imprisonment of Andrei Sinyavsky and Yuri Daniel in 1966, and the imprisonment in an insane asylum of Vladimir Butovsky and his subsequent sentence to a Soviet labor camp in 1967.

2. The acts and conduct of the defendants set forth in this count were committed unlawfully, willfully, knowingly, and constituted violations of international law, treaties, agreements, and assurances.

Count V. The defendants and their co-conspirators contrary to the principles of humanity and its peace and dignity have participated singly or collectively over a period of years preceding November 7, 1967, in a general policy of holding individuals in servitude and requiring them to perform forced or compulsory labor.

1. The action of the aforementioned general policy included: the imprisonment of between 10 and 15 million people according to Brooks Atkinson of the *New York Times* under the most inhuman conditions as described by survivors like John Noble of the United States of America, Elinor Lpper of Germany and Fr. Walter J. Clizek, S.J.

2. The acts and conduct of the defendants set forth in this count were committed unlawfully, willfully, knowingly, and constituted violations of an individual's human rights, international law, treaties, agreements, and assurances.

Count VI. The defendants and their co-conspirators contrary to the principles of humanity and its peace and dignity have participated singly or collectively over a period of years preceding November 7, 1967, in acts or conduct depriving the following nations of their freedom and independence: Russia, Ukraine, Georgia, White Ruthenia, Byelorussia, Latvia, Estonia, Lithuania, Poland, Albania, Bulgaria, Rumania, Hungary, East Germany and Czechoslovakia.

All the foregoing acts were willfully committed against the peace and dignity of the peoples of the world.

A true bill.

THE GRAND JURY OF THE WORLD'S  
CONSCIENCE,  
By BRUCE WEINROD,

Foreman.

The following telegram was sent to Gus Hall, Herbert Aptheker, Albert Jason Lima, Mrs. Dorothy Healey, Michael Zagarell, Claude Lightfoot, Carl Winter, and Arnold Johnson of the Communist Party, USA; Carl Bloice of "the Worker" and Hyman Lumer of "Political Affairs", Communist Party USA;

Milton Rosen of the Progressive Labor Party, Fred Halstead of the Socialists Workers Party. Text of telegram:

"As you know from our communication of January 22, a moot trial of International Communism will be held at Georgetown University, Washington D.C., February 19-21. More than 20 experts and eye witnesses will analyze and discuss various aspects of communist history since 1917. Areas include religious freedom, national self-determination, free thought and speech and wars of national liberation.

"The purpose of this three-day symposium in the form of a moot trial is to present the American public with as complete and accurate a picture as possible of communism.

"To that end, we invite you to appear as a witness to discuss any aspect you choose and to submit such exhibits, documents, photographs, etc. as you think pertinent. We also offer you or anyone of your choosing the opportunity to question any of the experts or eye witnesses who will appear.

"The sponsors of the moot trial-symposium are solely interested in obtaining and presenting the truth about communism and solicit your cooperation to achieve that goal.

—LEE EDWARDS,  
"Coordinator."

#### COST OF COMMUNISM QUESTIONED AT INTERNATIONAL COMMUNISM ON TRIAL

WASHINGTON, D.C., February 19, 1968.—More than 45 million people have died at the hands of Soviet Communism in its 50 years of existence, a former American correspondent to Moscow testified today in a moot trial of International Communism.

Eugene Lyons, the first witness at a three-day trial to publicize the more serious wrongs and crimes of Communism, cited his figures in answer to questions on Communism's cost of life.

The trial, held at the Hall of Nations on the campus of Georgetown University in Washington, D.C., is bringing to the witness stand a distinguished list of witnesses that include exiles from communism, professors, journalists, clergymen, and key diplomats.

In his testimony this morning, Mr. Lyons stated that the Soviet Union, still today, has the largest secret police organization in the world made up of its own air force, army, and armored units. He pointed out that Communism's failure in agriculture could be solved by ending collectivization and returning to private ownership.

Mr. Lyons said that while the Soviet Union is recognized as the second largest industrial nation, it ranks around 20th when applied to the status of individuals. He used a food-cost comparison between Russian families and American families what he termed a "food basket." A Russian must work 59 hours for the same quantity of food that an American can buy with 7 hours of work.

The organizers of the trial, of which Eugene Lyons was one, noted that the Communists made much of the various scientific and material achievements of communism while neglecting to mention the costs of communism in such areas as freedom of speech, freedom of religion and national self-determination.

When the trial began this morning no Communist representatives appeared to testify or ask questions.

Five distinguished jurists representing backgrounds in law from several areas of the world compose the Tribunal. The presiding Judge is a prominent Ohio jurist, Dr. D. S. Chen is a distinguished lawyer from both Mainland China and The Republic of China (Taiwan). Dr. Emilio Nunez Portuondo, is a former national leader and diplomat from Cuba and twice President of the United Nations Security Council. Dr. Stefan Osusky is a member of the International Commission of Jurists, Geneva, and a former diplomat

from Czechoslovakia. Dr. Carlos Marquez Sterling is a former two-term Speaker and three-term member of the Cuban House of Representatives, and was Presidential Candidate of the Free People's Party in 1958.

[Highlights, afternoon and evening session, International Communism on Trial, Monday, Feb. 19, 1968]

#### HUNGARIAN FREEDOM FIGHTER DETAILS TORTURE, IMPRISONMENT

In 1949, Josef Szalay refused to sign a confession that his church youth work was a conspiracy against the Communist Party of Hungary. He was immediately tortured and subsequently imprisoned for seven years.

Mr. Szalay was one of nearly a dozen witnesses who testified at a moot court where International Communism was on trial. The trial, held on Georgetown University's campus, brought together educators, journalists and government leaders who described life under Communism.

Mr. Szalay told the court that he was arrested by the Communist authorities during the presentation of a play for which his Catholic youth group had a permit to perform. He was ordered to stop the play and later the Communists ordered him to confess to conspiracy.

He was beaten and endured the most inhumane torture. When he still refused to sign the confession, he was offered the chance to commit suicide. At first he felt it would be better to die today than be tortured tomorrow. Then he changed his mind and decided against giving his tormentors the satisfaction.

Others to participate in the first of three days of testimony included: Dr. You Chan Yang, South Korean Ambassador-at-Large; Dr. Joseph Dunner, a professor of political science and international law at Yeshiva University in New York; Phillip Abbott Luce, a former leader of the Progressive Labor Party; The Rev. Raymond J. De Jaeger, S.J., a former professor at the Major Seminary of Suahwa in China; Major Robert L. Watson, who served in the Army in Vietnam; Major Edgar C. Bundy, executive secretary of the Church League of America; Monika Flihr, a high school teacher in Czechoslovakia, and Dr. Laszlo Varga, a former member of the Hungarian Parliament.

Father de Jaeger described in vivid detail the beheading of 13 young people in China who refused to admit to their Communist rulers that they were traitors to China. He reported that children were forced to watch the executions while singing patriotic songs.

The priest, who spent many years in both China and Vietnam told a court-appointed defense counsel that he had never seen any executions by the Nationalist Government forces in China or by the Diem Government of South Vietnam except for one bandit. But he said he knew of priests that were buried alive in China by the Communists who said they were not worth a bullet.

Ambassador Yang discussed the current status of relations with the North Korean regime. He said that about 2,400 men are trained by that regime as infiltrators and subversives. He pointed out that there were 50 armistice agreement violations in 1966 but that these had increased to 550 in 1967. He said that he once predicted that if a truce were made with North Korea, there would be a bigger war in South Vietnam. "And I predict that if you have a cease fire in Vietnam, there will be a bigger war in Thailand next," he added.

Dr. Dunner, born in Germany but for many years a U.S. citizen, described the persecution of the Jewish community in the Soviet Union as "deliberate cultural genocide." When asked by the Tribunal if there were any other countries that persecuted the Jews, he replied, "The Arab countries." He denied that treatment of the Jews in Spain was

"persecution" despite recognition of Catholicism as the state religion.

The professor said the Soviet Union prohibits the printing of the Hebrew Bible and will not allow the teaching of Judaism and its history. He said there are now only four Rabbis in all of Russia for the 3-4 million Jews.

Major Bundy, an ordained Baptist minister and a veteran of the U.S. Air Force for which he was an intelligence officer, told the tribunal that more than 200 Baptist clergymen had been arrested in the Soviet Union for holding services even in homes. He stated that many of the religious leaders now heading churches in the Soviet Union were not true Christian ministers but rather puppet appointees of the State.

Phillip Abbott Luce admitted to the counsel that he had been a Communist for six years in which time he told college students many glowing things about Communism that he said were untrue. Much of Luce's testimony centered around his activities as one of the "students" that went to Cuba illegally in 1963 and 1964. He described his efforts in setting up a demonstration in New York's Times Square in August 1964. He said his Party was trained in karate and street fighting. They had practiced techniques in disarming police and even dismounting police who attempted to break up their demonstrations from horseback. He also showed the court a poster he had printed to enflame ghetto residents after the shooting of a young boy by police during the Harlem riots of 1964.

[Highlights of Tuesday afternoon session, International Communism on Trial, Feb. 20, 1968]

#### MINISTER SHOWS SCARS OF COMMUNIST BEATINGS

"I brought here the screams of one billion enslaved people." The Reverend Richard Wurmbrand, a Jew ordained as a Rumanian evangelical minister, shouted these words at a moot court at which International Communism was on trial.

As the prisoner of 14 years at the hands of the Communists stood and began to remove his upper garments, the defense counsel appealed to the court, "I object."

Rev. Wurmbrand continued his partial disrobing and replied, "I don't care what anyone objects. I object to what the Communists are doing and to the apathy in America."

At this point the court requested the clergyman to wait for a ruling. "I will not wait," the minister yelled. He said he had waited 14 years to tell the world of the cruelties of the Communists.

The emotional scene came in the afternoon session of the second of three days in which a host of witnesses have described their experiences of life under Communism in the moot court held on Georgetown University campus.

Others that testified this afternoon were: John Noble of Detroit who spent nine years in a Nazi prison and later in a Soviet slave labor camp in Siberia; Luis Gonzales-Grasales, head of the Cuban Resistance Aid Committee; Dr. Lev E. Dobriansky, a professor at Georgetown University, and Manuel E. Alonso, a Cuban survivor of the Bay of Pigs episode and subsequent imprisonment in Cuba.

Mr. Noble gave details of his experiences in the prison camps and then told of the method by which he finally obtained his release from a Soviet camp. He managed to slip a post card past censors to a relative in West Germany, signing it "Your noble nephew." It was the clue that finally reached his parents who recognized his handwriting. After eight State Department notes to the Soviets, Mr. Noble obtained his release through the personal intervention of President Eisenhower.

In his testimony, Mr. Noble stated that the Russians ran Buchenwald even worse than had the Nazis. He said the Soviets' torture involved many sexual varieties—too disgusting to detail—"they really went in for this." More conventional torture included whipping, "not with whips but with copper tubing."

Another witness, Mr. Gonzales, speaking through an interpreter, told the court of anti-Castro feeling among the Negro race of Cuba. He said, however, there is no discrimination in Castro's Cuba and that the government is cruel to whites and Negroes alike. He said he could not reveal some of the sources by which he still obtains information within the Castro Government but did say that some of them are still members of that Government.

Mr. Alonso told the court of the miseries suffered by the prisoners captured in the failure of the Bay of Pigs operation in April 1961.

Dr. Dobriansky, in a statement to the court urged that "in this International Human Rights Year, the United States observe the year with a full-scale Senate review of U.S. policy toward the USSR by concentrating on Soviet Russian genocide and imperio-colonialism in the USSR itself." He also said that popular periodicals that reported the progress made in the past 50 years in the Soviet Union ignored the incredible cost in human life and individual consumption utilities to achieve military and world political power.

[Highlights of morning session, International Communism on Trial, Feb. 20, 1968]

**HUNGARIANS STILL WANT FREE ELECTIONS; COMMUNISTS ONLY BY PROXIMITY TO SOVIET POWER**

"The Hungarians are a romantic people," Dr. Nicholas Nyaradi told a moot court today. "They wanted free elections." Instead the Russians came in "killing, murdering and raping."

Dr. Nyaradi, Tuesday's first witness before the Court of World Opinion where International Communism was on trial, told how he secreted himself from both Nazis and Communists by hiding behind a huge coal pile in the basement of his home in Budapest in 1945.

Dr. Nyaradi, who later became Minister of Finance in the Hungarian Government stated to the court that the Russians ordered the people to vote and 94 percent of them did. But he said 83 percent of the people voted against Communism.

Four other witnesses testified in the morning session. They included: Edward Scannell Butler, executive vice president of the Information Council of the Americas and calls himself a theoretician and consultant in conflict management (the development of practical answers to the techniques of agitation and propaganda); Gerhard A. Buschmann, national chairman of the Legion of Estonian Liberation and a member of the Estonian World Council and the Estonian National Committee in the U.S. Ahmadullah Donto, a student from Tibet and a former interpreter to the Dalai Lama; and Dr. Anthony T. Bouscaren, professor of political science at Le Moyne College in New York and a specialist in the fields of international relations and comparative governments.

Speaking to the second-day audience in the Hall of Nations on Georgetown University campus, Dr. Nyaradi said the Governments of Eastern Europe have become Communist, not by free choice but by the proximity of Soviet forces. He detailed the methods by which the Russians illegally arrested and executed Prime Minister Imre Nagy though he was in fact a Communist.

Dr. Nyaradi denied before cross examination that the United States had assisted in the Communist take over of his native country but admitted that the U.S. armistice

agreement in effect tolerated the regime. He told also of returning to the bank at which he was an official at the end of the war and witnessing the Russian theft of bank securities which he said were carried away in American-made trucks.

The former Hungarian Finance Minister called the Warsaw pact nations of Bulgaria, Hungary, Rumania and Czechoslovakia captive nations which have a record of voting identically to the votes of the Soviet Union in the United Nations.

Dr. Nyaradi said that since the legalization of abortions in Hungary, abortion rates rank with death rates, both exceeding birth rates. He told the court that women no longer want to raise children under the present regime. "In 150 years at this rate, there will be no Hungarian nation."

Mr. Butler told the court of his debate with Lee Harvey Oswald on a radio broadcast in New Orleans 93 days before the assassination of President John F. Kennedy. Mr. Butler refused to budge from his statement that a violent revolution was triggered on the death of President Kennedy and is still in progress.

Mr. Butler said that Oswald never admitted to being a Communist but said he was a Marxist. When asked to explain the difference, Oswald went into what Mr. Butler described as subject expansion in which he used the phraseology of Communist but trailed off into discussions of other subjects.

Mr. Butler said it was an aim of these engaged in psychopolitical warfare in the United States to smash a high figure of national policy, which they did with the assassination of the President. He stated that it has influenced others that they could get away with murder and they have turned to a violent revolution still in progress in the United States.

Mr. Donto, who was forced in live in Communist China from 1955 to 1958 told the court that in Communist family affairs, there are no emotions, no affections, no love. The only love permitted is love with the Communist Party. Children are told to report on their parents and on family life to Communist bosses.

Mr. Donto said there is no freedom of speech but rather everyone is forced to make confessions of any small act which might be against the state. He said stealing an egg was a big crime because an egg could become a chicken and the chicken could lay many eggs which could become many more chickens.

In 1957, Mao Tse-Tung said, "Let 1,000 flowers blossom." This was meant to allow the people to speak freely. But when they did, they soon disappeared, if they said anything against the government, according to Donto.

Mr. Buschmann told the Court of his experiences in Estonia at the time of the Soviet takeover in 1939. He said the Estonian foreign minister was summoned to Moscow ostensibly to sign a trade agreement; but when he arrived, it turned out to be a "mutual defense pact." Under the pact the Soviets established military bases and were then prepared in June 1940 to issue an ultimatum for the creation of governments friendly to Russia in all three of the Baltic states.

Dr. Bouscaren read a statement to the court in which he cited 45 violations of international agreements by Communist countries. He said there were actually more than 93 major violations during the 50 years of Communist government.

[Highlights, morning session, International Communism on Trial, Feb. 21, 1968]

**HERBERT PHILBRICK DETAILS COMMUNIST CONSPIRACY IN UNITED STATES**

It remains fundamental Communist doctrine and teaching Communist victory will

not be complete until they control the world, Herbert Philbrick told the Tribunal at International Communism on Trial today.

Mr. Philbrick, who spent nine years as a Communist counterspy for the FBI, said communism's aim is to create strife between the classes in the United States which would eventually bring about revolution and war between those classes.

Telling of his experiences, Mr. Philbrick said there are about 12,000 members in the Communist Party in the United States. Most of them operate subversively, treasonably and their aim is the violent overthrow of the United States Government, he added.

Mr. Philbrick told the court there was no evidence of lessening or moderation in their activities, but, if anything, they were increasing.

Mr. Philbrick brought to the trial the story of his activities from 1940 to 1949. In 1949, he surfaced from his secret work and contributed to the conviction of 11 top Communists including Gus Hall who served his five year term and is now General Secretary of the Communist Party in the United States.

Through official documents of the Communist Party, he was able to show that the American Communist Party is a part of the world-wide Communist movement of which there are more than 50 million members.

In testimony by another of this morning's five witnesses, Mr. Duane Thorin, an American prisoner of war in North Korea during the Korean War, said that he was interrogated by officers dressed in Russian uniforms.

After the week-long questioning, Mr. Thorin was taken to a slave camp, where he worked unloading supplies, handling gasoline, and working in military target areas.

While riding supply trucks he frequently observed Chinese and Russian uniformed personnel.

During his periods of captivity, he escaped once and was recaptured, was pressured to confess, and finally underwent brainwashing treatment.

Dr. Rorminio Protell-Vila, a former professor, diplomat and journalist from Cuba begin his testimony with the introduction of several documents he obtained while with the Cuban Embassy in Lima, Peru. They suggest methods for promoting revolution in Peru and other Latin American countries, Portell said.

He told the court that it was a general policy of international communism to espouse the destruction of order through revolution and bribery. His documents included blueprints printed by the Castro regime for creating ferment in the United States and urging the people to respond to violence.

Father Daniel Lyons, S.J., Chairman of the Free Pacific Association and director of the East Asian Research Institute said he had examined munitions used by North Viet Nam and related that the most sophisticated weaponry came from Russia and her satellites. He said that 70 per cent of the equipment came through Haiphong Harbor. Father Lyons stated also that Red China has cooperated by allowing Russian rail and air shipments to cross over Red China enroute to North Viet Nam. The Russians, Lyons said, send almost one billion dollars worth of equipment to North Viet Nam each year. Father Lyons said the leaders of free Asia are unanimous in stating that the Communists are cooperating to subvert Asia.

In other testimony, Dr. Roman Smal-Stocki, a former Ambassador of the Ukrainian Democratic Republic in Berlin and Vice Prime Minister in the Ukrainian Exile Government cited the history of the Ukrainians oppression by the Communists. Most of his remarks were in the nature of historical background.

[Highlights of afternoon session, International Communism on Trial, Feb. 21, 1968] SOVIETS AIM FOR NUCLEAR WARFARE TO OVERTHROW UNITED STATES

The Soviet Union cannot achieve world dominion without the overthrow of the United States Government. Dr. Stefan Possony, lecturer and faculty adviser at the National War College and other military war colleges of the United States, said today.

Dr. Possony added that since international Communism is not capable of knocking out the United States by means of peoples wars, it may in the end be forced to subject this country to genocidal attacks with nuclear weapons.

Director of International Studies at the Hoover Institution on War, Revolution and Peace at Stanford University, Dr. Possony pointed out to a moot trial court that Communist objectives range from peoples wars, which include such takeovers as occurred in China, Cuba, and Vietnam, and extend through a mixture of military warfare, national demoralization and nuclear warfare.

During the third afternoon session of the trial of International Communism at Georgetown University, Dr. Possony described the various efforts Communists apply at each level to gain their final goal of world domination.

He began by defining the word "violence" as used by the Communists. To them, he said, it is a means of creating a favorable situation for the seizure of power. This appears in the guise of terror and physical coercion or through psycho, political and economic warfare and subversion, infiltration and finally reach the ultimate of international war. Often these goals are achieved through proxy by non-Communists.

Dr. Possony, who is an expert in Communist strategy went into great detail about the comparable nuclear strengths between the United States and the Soviet Union. He said that the United States is the sole defense of the free world. He said that the United States was not now adding any new missiles to its arsenal, but that the Soviets have engaged in a very rapid expansion of their missile capability during the past 15 months, nearly doubling their number of long range missiles.

Though the United States one year ago signed a treaty banning the use of nuclear weapons in space, Dr. Possony said the Russians have two space weapons. One is a missile capable of orbiting and another is a sub-orbital weapon. These have been acknowledged by the U.S. Defense Department, Possony said. While not presently deployed, they could be in a very short time giving the United States, in some cases, little more than three minutes warning.

The only other afternoon witness at the court's final session was H. T. W. Blockley, the acting head of the Canadian delegation to the International Control Commission in Hanoi in 1956. He told of conversations with both the Red Chinese and the North Vietnamese leaders, as well as of his experiences in Hanoi.

Mr. Blockley reiterated the often heard statement of other witnesses that the Asian Communists use terror, murder, deceit, subversion, and seduction of the national and individual will to achieve their ends, which, he said, is world domination by the Communists.

He described an episode in Hanoi in which 20 university students complained about a certain problem at the school. For this, they were sent out to the countryside and disappeared. In addition, the entire student body was removed and sent to labor in the fields. Included in this body were the final year medical students who were denied graduation. Instead, the university was filled with students from the farms who were more docile.

He stated to the court that he had talked with Chou En-Lai of Red China in the presence of Ho Chi Minh. Chou said that while China is the "elder brother" of North Vietnam in Communism, Ho is the elder brother of Asian Communist individuals. Ho returned to the Far East from Moscow in the early 1920's and was the agent by which Chou and Mao Tse-Tung were both brought to Communism.

#### HUMAN RIGHTS VIOLATIONS IN SOVIET OCCUPIED UKRAINE

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

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, the uncontroverted evidence introduced by Ukrainians in exile before the Court of World Public Opinion at the trial of international communism is a damning indictment of the Soviets tyrannical occupation of the Ukraine.

Not only have the Soviets preempted the Ukrainian people of their culture, religion, and self-determination but they have added insult to injury by exploiting the Ukrainian vote in the General Assembly of the United Nations Organization.

The evidence against international communism is so conclusive, I am introducing a concurrent resolution expressing the sense of Congress that the President, acting through the U.S. Ambassador to the United Nations Organization, take such steps as may be necessary to place the question of Human Rights violations in the Soviet-occupied Ukraine on the agenda of the United Nations Organization.

Mr. Speaker, I urge that all Members who believe in human rights join me in this humanitarian endeavor. The memorandum of the evidence presented on behalf of the people of the Ukraine at this point:

#### MEMORANDUM

(Submitted by American Friends of Antisoviet Bloc of Nations, Washington Metropolitan Chapter, and Organization for the Defense of Four Freedoms for Ukraine, Washington, D.C.)

FEBRUARY 21, 1968.

To: The Court of World Public Opinion, Washington, D.C.

As members of the original delegation which presented the summons and indictment to the Soviet Embassy in Washington, D.C., on November 7th, 1967 but were denied the opportunity to present competent witnesses at the moot trial of International Communism we, the Organization for the Defense of Four Freedoms for Ukraine and the American Friends of Antisoviet Bloc of Nations in Washington, D.C., submit to the court the following evidence of overt and conspiratorial crimes by the Russian Communist Party against Ukrainians and humanity, and plead that this evidence be fully examined by the Court of World Public Opinion and considered in the arrival at a verdict.

We accuse the Russian Communist Party and equally the Russian Communist Government of the following crimes against the Ukrainian people:

#### ARMED AGGRESSION

Armed aggression against the Ukrainian National Republic, an independent and sovereign state, in 1918. (see Exhibits: A; B; C; D, pp. 14-19; O; P.)

#### POLITICAL SUBJUGATION AND PERSECUTION

a. The invasion and occupation of the Ukrainian National Republic by Russian Communist forces in 1918-20 (see Exhibits: A; B; C; D, pp. 7-48; N; O; P.) in full violation of international treaties and solemn agreements as follows:

Treaties of Brest Litovsk (Feb. 9, 1918) and (March 3, 1918). (see Exhibits: A, pp. 80-133, 185-198; B; C; D, pp. 16-17; O.)

De facto recognition of Ukraine by France and Britain. (see Exhibits: A; B, pp. 182-3; C; D.)

De Jure recognition of the Ukrainian National Republic by the Russian Soviet Government, Dec. 17, 1917. (see Exhibits: A, 22-25, 128-133, 158-9, 186-198; B, pp. 184-5; C; D, pp. 14-15; O.)

b. The invasion and occupation of Ukraine in the Second World War in 1939-45. (see Exhibits: B; C; D, pp. 36-42; O; P.)

c. The imposition by force of arms of a puppet Communist Government upon people of Ukraine. (see Exhibits: A; B; C; D, pp. 15-20; G; O; P.)

d. The destruction of democratic political and social forces in Ukraine by forcibly imposing an alien, totalitarian, one party system. The Communist party became the only legal party in the new political structure and non-members of the communist party reduced to second class citizens. (see Exhibits: B; C; D, pp. 19-23; G; O; P.)

#### RELIGIOUS PERSECUTION

a. The destruction of the Ukrainian Autocephalous Orthodox and the Ukrainian Catholic Churches. (see Exhibits: C; D, pp. 111-138; E; F, pp. 5-51; O; P.)

b. The deaths, through brutality, imprisonment or execution, of the Ukrainian Catholic and Orthodox hierarchy and clergy. (see Exhibits: C, pp. 32-3; D, pp. 111-138; E; F, pp. 5-51; O; P.)

c. The closing of substantially all churches in Ukraine. (see Exhibits: C, p. 21; D, pp. 119, 125; I; F, pp. 5-51; G; M; O; P.)

d. The closing of all Ukrainian Seminaries and religious institutions, schools, and publications. (see Exhibits: C; D; E; F; G; O; P.)

e. The stripping of Ukrainian Churches of their religious and art treasures (see Exhibits: D, p. 119; E, pp. 43-45; M; O.)

f. The destruction of many ancient and historical church buildings in Ukraine. (see Exhibits: C, p. 21; D, p. 119, pictures; E; M; O; P.)

g. The persecution of other Ukrainian Christian denominations, Ukrainian Jews and adherents of the Islamic faith; the closing of their houses of prayer; and arrest of religions in Ukraine. (see Exhibits: C; D, pp. 111-138; F, p. 58; G, pp. 23-25; O; P.)

h. The creation of militant atheist institutions for waging a relentless war against all religions in Ukraine. (see Exhibits: C, D, pp. 111-138; E, p. 44; F, pp. 5-51; G.)

#### GENOCIDE

a. Creating a famine in 1932-33 to subdue the entire Ukrainian nation and to force collectivization on the Ukrainian farmers resulting in the deaths by starvation of seven millions Ukrainians. (see Exhibits: C; pp. 17-20; D, pp. 69-84; G, pp. 15-18; H; I; O; P.)

b. The executions of hundreds of thousands of Ukrainians for political dissent by the State Security Police (Cheka, GPU, NKVD, NVD, & KGB). (see Exhibits: C; D, pp. 49-68, 85-110, 139-146, 169-198, 207-450; G; O; P.)

c. The deportation of millions of Ukrainians to Asia (Khrushchev stated at the XXth Communist Party Congress in 1956 that Stalin wanted to "deport all Ukrainians"). (see Exhibits: C; D; F, pp. 52-59; G, pp. 15-22, 65-68; O; P.)

d. The murder of 12,000 Ukrainians in Vinnytsia by NKVD. (see Exhibits: C, pp. 26-28; D, pp. 147-168; J, see The Court—Medical Report on pp. 15-18; G; O; P.)

e. Executions, imprisonment and the de-

portation of members of the Union for the Liberation of Ukraine (SVU), the Association of Ukrainian Youth (SUM), the Ukrainian Military Organization (UVO), the Organization of Ukrainian Nationalists (OUN) and the Ukrainian Insurgent Army (UPA). (see Exhibits: C; D, pp. 49-68, 85-110, 139-146, 169-198, 207-450; G; O; P.)

#### POLITICAL MURDERS

Murders of Ukrainian leaders by the Soviet Security Police operating in the free countries:

a. Simon Petliure, head of the Ukrainian government-in-exile, assassinated on May 25, 1926 in Paris, France. (see Exhibits: D, pp. 451-82; L; O; P.)

b. Col. Eugene Konovalets, head of the OUN, assassinated on May 23, 1938 in Rotterdam, Holland. (see Exhibits: D, pp. 451-466, 483-90; L; O; P.)

c. Dr. Lev R. Rebet, a Ukrainian nationalist writer, assassinated on October 12, 1957 in Munich, Germany. (see Exhibits: D, pp. 451-466; K; L; O; P.)

d. Stepan Bandera, head of the OUN, assassinated on October 15, 1959 in Munich, Germany. (see Exhibits: D, pp. 451-466, 525-8; K; L; O; P.)

#### CULTURAL PERSECUTION AND RUSSIFICATION

a. The waging of a relentless war against Ukrainian cultural and social institutions, and progressively limiting the number of Ukrainian language publications. (see Exhibits: C; D, pp. 49-68, 85-110; G; O; P.)

b. The down-grading of the Ukrainian language. The imposing of the Russian language upon Ukrainian schools, institutions and administration in Ukraine. (see Exhibits: C; D; G; O; P.)

c. Denial of the enjoyment of Ukrainian cultural life to 8 million Ukrainians residing in the Russian Soviet Federal Socialist Republic and other parts of the USSR by prohibiting Ukrainian schools, Ukrainian language publications and the development of Ukrainian institutions. (see Exhibits: C; D; G; O; P.)

d. Conducting a population policy detrimental to the Ukrainians. (see Exhibits: C; D, p. 291; G; O; P.)

e. Conducting purges against Ukrainian intellectuals resulting in the death of thousands of Ukrainian scientists, writers, poets and educators. (see Exhibits: C; D, pp. 49-68, 85-110; 139-146, 280-282; G; O; P.)

f. The deliberate destruction of Ukrainian historical documents and records; archival treasures; and historical and ancient monuments. (see Exhibits: C, p. 21; D, pp. 110-138; E; G; M; O; P.)

#### ECONOMIC EXPLOITATION

a. The economic exploitation of Labor and National resources of Ukraine by the Russian Communist Government and the Russian Communist Party. (see Exhibits: C; D, pp. 119-124, 219-223; G; O; P.)

b. The destruction of a traditional free farming system in Ukraine and imposing collectivization against the will and welfare of the Ukrainian people. (see Exhibits: C; D, pp. 24-29, 69-84; G; O; P.)

c. Taking indiscriminately from Ukraine all industrial and agricultural output with little or no return. (see Exhibits: D; D, pp. 24-29, 69-84, 219-224; G, pp. 15-18; O; P.)

#### SECRET TRIALS IN 1965-67

For conducting illegal secret trials (1965-67) at which hundreds of Ukrainian intellectuals (writers, scientists, and educators) were sentenced to imprisonment or deported to slave labor camps. (See Exhibits Q and R.)

#### VOLODYMYR Y. MAYEWSKY,

Chairman, Organization for the Defense of Four Freedoms for Ukraine, Inc., Washington, D.C., Branch 17.

#### Colonel WILLIAM RYBAK,

Acting Chairman, American Friends of Antifascist Bloc of Nations, Washington Chapter.

#### LIST OF EXHIBITS

Exhibit A: Stachiw, Matthew. *Ukraine and Russia*. New York: The Ukrainian Congress Committee of America, 1967.

Exhibit B: Margolin, Arnold D. *From a Political Diary: Russia, The Ukraine, and America, 1905-1945*. New York: Columbia University Press, 1946.

Exhibit C: U.S. House of Representatives. Select Committee on Communist Aggression. *Communist Takeover and Occupation of Ukraine*. Special Report No. 4. H. Res. 346 and H. Res. 438., 83rd Cong., 2nd Sess Washington: GPO, 1954

Exhibit D: *Russian Oppression in Ukraine: Reports and Documents*. London: Ukrainian Publishers, 1962.

Exhibit E: Luznycky, Gregory. *Persecution and Destruction of the Ukrainian Church by the Russian Bolsheviks*. New York: The Ukrainian Congress Committee of America, 1960.

Exhibit F: "The Destruction of the Ukrainian Catholic Church in the Soviet Union," *Prologue*, New York Vol. IV (Spring-Summer 1960).

Exhibit G: U.S. Senate. Committee on the Judiciary *The Soviet Empire: Prison House of Nations and Races. A study in Genocide Discrimination, and Abuse of Power*. Eighty-Fifth Cong., 2nd Sess., August 18, 1958. Washington: GPO, 1958.

Exhibit H: U.S. House of Representatives. *Famine in Ukraine*; A. H. Res. 399. 73rd Cong., 2nd Sess., May 28, 1934. New York: United Ukrainian Organizations of the United States, 1934.

Exhibit I: Solovey, Dmytro. *On the 30th Anniversary of the Great Man-Made Famine in Ukraine*. Jersey City, N.J.: Svoboda, 1963.

Exhibit J: *The Crime of Moscow in Vynnytsia*. Edinburg: Scottish League for European Freedom, 1952.

Exhibit K: Germany. The German High Court. *Opinion of Federal High Court of West Germany in the Trial of Soviet Agent Bogdan Stashynsky for Murder in Munich, Germany, of Ukrainian Leaders Stepan Bandera and Lev Rebet*. Karlsruhe, October 19, 1962.

Exhibit L: U.S. Senate. Committee on the Judiciary. *Murder International, Inc. Murder and Kidnaping as an Instrument of Soviet Policy*. Hearing before the Subcommittee to Investigate the Administration of the Internal Security Act and Other Internal Security Laws of the Committee on the Judiciary United States Senate, Eighty-Nine Congress, First Session, March 26, 1965. Washington: GPO, 1965.

Exhibit M: Sichynsky, Volodymyr. *Destruction of Ukrainian Monuments of Art and Culture Under the Soviet Russian Administration Between 1917-1957*. New York: The Ukrainian Congress Committee of America, 1958.

Exhibit N: Smal-Stocki, Roman. *The Captive Nations*. New York: Bookman Associates, 1960.

Exhibit O: World Congress of Free Ukrainians. *Captive Ukraine: Challenge to the World's Conscience*. New York, November 16-19, 1967.

Exhibit P: World Congress of Free Ukrainians. *Memorandum*. Submitted to the Secretary General of the United Nations. New York, November 16-19, 1967.

Exhibit Q: Worthington, Peter. "New Russian Injustices." *The Weekend Telegram*, Toronto, January 6, 1968.

Exhibit R: Karavansky, Svyatoslav Y. "To the Council of Nationalities of the USSR," *The New Leader*, New York, Vol. LI, No. 2, January 15, 1968.

#### STARVATION IN BIAFRA

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

Mr. SCHADEBERG. Mr. Speaker, I

have had the occasion in the past 24 hours to meet with several gentlemen who have convinced me that my knowledge of the situation in Biafra is limited. I have become convinced that what we have been reading in the newspapers, what we have seen on the television screens and what our own leaders have told us, is not the full story.

My enlightenment in these matters has come from the experiences of two Catholic priests, brothers by blood and brothers by mission, Fathers Michael and Kevin Doheny. These men have spent a combined total of 29 years working with the men, women, and children of that part of Nigeria which we have come in recent months to call Biafra and which, as of next week, is no more.

I have spent considerable time listening to these two men who fled from that part of the world in the last blazing moments of that revolution. They fled from Biafra on one of the last planes to leave from Uli Airport. Their last effort in serving these people was to feed over 5,000 children their last breakfast before their short-lived revolution failed.

I do not stand before this body today to argue the politics of Biafra and Nigeria. Nor did these men come to me to argue the politics of this internal struggle. These men have come to me with a story that must be told. A story that is so terrifying, that it strikes deeply into the hearts of Christian people throughout the world.

These men have convinced me that strong effort is needed to see that the people of the former State of Biafra are fed and clothed. These men are convinced that the means to feed these starving millions exist, today, only a few miles from the hungry. Yet these quantities of foodstuffs, medical supplies, and material, are being kept from these needy because of the policy of the Nigerian Government which declares this help persona non grata.

These men and women who have served the needy for so long under the direction of the Joint Church Aid, members of the combined faiths which serve in that country as missionaries, are here today in America, in Washington, pleading with Members of Congress to be allowed to finish their God-appointed task. They are willing to work with the Government of Nigeria, yes even willing to give up their quantities of stored and ready foodstuffs to Government-appointed agents, if only they will have the assurance of that Government that those foodstuffs will be used to feed the starving and dying millions.

These men have told me of the 3,000—I repeat, 3,000—feeding centers which this church aid group sponsored every day. They have told me of the airlifts which each night brings over 300 tons of food, every night, into these centers. They have convinced me that there is no way that the Nigerian Government, which boasts of one feeding center, of 40 tons of food, daily, can match this humanitarian output.

I have been privileged to hear these men and hear their story, but I am anxious to have other Members of this body of Representatives of the American people hear of this appeal also.

It is my sincere desire that as many of

you as possible hear a report of these attempts to feed the millions, first hand. A special news conference will be held at 10:30 a.m., on Thursday, called by Senator STROM THURMOND, to question and examine more closely the witnesses to this tragic injustice.

There will be a report from the Princess Cecile deBourbon Parme, the sister of the Spanish pretender to the throne, Don Carlos, who herself worked for over 15 months among the poor and starving of this tragic nation. As her nationwide appearance on television last Friday reported, she was among the last also to leave the former State of Biafra. She will fill in the gaps of fact which I feel has been lacking in the reports of that country's struggle within itself.

She will tell of the 5 million people, located within a 60-mile square area, who have no food whatsoever. She will tell of an attrition rate of 10,000 men, women, and children per day at this stage.

She will tell us that the food, the planes and the pilots are available and are ready to start these errands of mercy. And she will tell us of the frustration of these humanitarians who can do nothing but stand hopelessly by, while these people starve and die.

I hope you will be in the audience tomorrow at this all-important conference. I hope that you will ask questions as I have asked and I hope that this conference will move this body to action and that this action will contribute to the salvation of a nation's people.

#### AFL-CIO PRESIDENT GEORGE MEANY SPEAKS ON PHILADELPHIA PLAN

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

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Speaker, the Nixon administration's so-called Philadelphia plan has been the subject of extensive newspaper, radio, and television coverage and comment. The House had occasion to address itself to the Philadelphia plan recently in connection with its consideration of the supplemental appropriation bill for fiscal 1970.

One can hardly read a newspaper or listen to radio and television comments without realizing that there is considerable misunderstanding as to what the matter is all about. I think the Members of the House would be interested, therefore, in having a clear view of the position of the AFL-CIO with respect to the Philadelphia plan.

Therefore, I insert the text of a speech by the AFL-CIO president, Mr. George Meany, in the Record as part of my remarks. The speech was delivered to the National Press Club here in Washington on January 12, 1970.

#### SPEECH BY AFL-CIO PRESIDENT GEORGE MEANY

Thank you very much, Mr. Heffernan. Mr. Heffernan referred to honorary degrees and that sort of thing and I just can't but help tell you a little story about honorary degrees.

I got an honorary degree from a college up in Philadelphia a few years back and I met a very good friend of mine, also a labor fel-

low with a real keen sense of humor. He said to me, "Did you hear the story about this little college up in the state of New York that had quite a discussion about honorary degrees?" I said, "No." He said, "Well, it seems they had a faculty committee to pass on honorary degrees which they would give out on commencement day. By virtue of seniority, there was a lady professor who was on this committee—a little old lady. And after listening to the discussion of the various names that were bruited about, she said, "Why don't we do something different, something novel this year." So they said to her, "Fine, what?" She said, "Let's give Native Dancer an honorary degree." So they kind of laughed for a minute and they said, "Native Dancer. That is novel, isn't it?" She said, "Oh, yes, we would be the first academic community giving an honorary degree to a whole horse."

I want to talk to you this afternoon generally about the question of civil rights as it relates to labor and, in particular, as it relates to the Building Trades and the so-called Philadelphia Plan.

I have seen more misinformation and confusion about the Philadelphia Plan from columnists, editorial writers and from public officials than anything I have seen or heard in a long time.

One fellow wrote a column that the dispute on the Philadelphia Plan is splitting the civil rights movement—meaning splitting labor away from the civil rights group. Of course, this is not true. We have worked with the civil rights groups for many years—we have worked very closely with them—with the NAACP, the Philip Randolph Institute, with other groups. We have worked here with the Leadership Conference on Civil Rights and we expect to continue that sort of work.

Then there was a reference to the dispute over the rider in regard to the Philadelphia Plan from one Administration official who said that, "this vote is the most important civil rights vote in the history of this country. Nothing that has happened before in the field of civil rights has any meaning unless this particular rider is eliminated."

Another columnist said this is the most dynamic and constructive step taken by any President of the United States over the past 25 years.

Well, that is just plain ordinary bunk. The Philadelphia Plan is a concoction and contrivance of a bureaucrat's imagination. It makes tremendous publicity. It attracted a lot of attention. And, when it gets right down to operating, there is no substance to it whatsoever.

Secretary of Labor Shultz even went so far as to say that the AFL-CIO was engaged in an effort to block affirmative steps to open skilled and high paying jobs to black minority groups. Well, my comment on that is very simple: George knows better. He knows that is not true.

Since the merger of the AFL and CIO, back in 1955, we have been active in the field of civil rights under the Constitution of the AFL-CIO which declares—as a major policy of the combined trade union movement—that there shall be no discrimination in employment, upgrading and so on and so forth.

We have worked with the civil rights group on the Civil Rights Act of 1964, the Voting Rights of 1965, Fair Employment Practices, eliminating discrimination within the trade union movement itself, establishing civil rights committees in all of our large international unions and working in every possible way in this field to bring opportunity to those to whom opportunity is denied.

In 1963 the Kennedy Administration gave up—and I say this advisedly—gave up on the question of including a Fair Employment Practices Clause in the civil rights bill.

The AFL-CIO did not give up. We went ahead on our own, with the cooperation of Clarence Mitchell of the NAACP and we were

able to have this clause included in the bill, despite the fact, as I say, that the Kennedy Administration despaired of getting this clause in. They felt they might jeopardize the bill if they insisted upon it.

Now, we refused to concede and we pushed ahead and got this clause in the bill. The power to issue a cease-and-desist order was eliminated from the bill before it was finally passed. And, at the present time, the AFL-CIO and all of the civil rights groups are fighting side by side to re-establish these powers under the bill and the Nixon Administration, including the Secretary of Labor and the Assistant Secretary of Labor, are opposing these powers.

We cooperated—I, myself, cooperated—as a member of the President's Committee on Equal Opportunities long before the passage of the civil rights bill back in the 1950's during the Eisenhower Administration when the chairman of the committee was the man who is now the President of the United States. We have helped finance the Philip Randolph Institute, the LEAP program of the Urban League and so forth.

Now, on the question of admitting minority groups to the Building Trades, I would like to point out that there seems to be a belief among a large number of people in this country that anybody can be a plumber, anybody can be a sheet metal worker, anybody can be an electrician, with very little preparation or training.

Well, my international union has an apprenticeship training program in cooperation with employers across this country and that apprenticeship training program embraces 900 separate instructors. And my international union spends more money on apprenticeship training in this one industry than does the government of the United States in its whole apprenticeship training program.

The program is a continuing one. It not only brings in apprentices, it upgrades the journeymen. And, believe it or not, these 900 instructors go to the engineering school at Purdue University in the month of August every year so that they may be up-graded in the new techniques of the business.

So anyone who feels that a plumber is just a guy who put washers on faucets or fixes leaks, is just wrong. The plumber is something much beyond that. And this is true of sheet metal workers. People think of a sheet metal worker as a tin smith or a tinker, as we used to call it. Well, the sheet metal worker is something much more than a tin-smith or a tinker.

Let me give you a sample. Here is the manual for instructions for apprentices in the sheet metal industry which has been published for the last 10 years by the industry itself. I am telling you that if you looked at this you would realize that the requirement for skill still prevails in these trades.

If you went down to Cape Kennedy and saw the thousands of electricians, plumbers, machinists, pipe fitters, dealing with electrical and mechanical installations, you would realize that what they are doing bears no comparison to the generally accepted idea as to qualifications for the industry and for these particular skills.

Five or six years ago, the civil rights people in the AFL-CIO came to a consensus of opinion on this question of bringing the minority groups into the so-called skilled building trades. And the consensus was that the only way you could bring these people properly into this job area—into this establishment, if you want to call it that, of mechanics which exist in every city and locality in this country—was by way of the apprenticeship training program. There was no other way to do this. We found out, five or six years ago, that contrary to the opinion of a good many people, we did not have a situation where large numbers of minority

groups were knocking at the door. This was just not so.

Whatever the reason, we found out that very few young Negroes, who could qualify to enter existing apprenticeship programs, were interested in entry. Now what the reasons might be, I don't know. Maybe some of them just didn't believe that the doors were going to be open to them. But this is a fact and this is why we set up this so-called apprenticeship "Outreach Program"—reaching out and bringing these people in. And the AFL-CIO and its affiliates in the Building Trades inaugurated an official apprenticeship "Outreach Program" about 2½ years ago, working with the Building Trades international unions, with their locals and Building Trades local councils and outside groups like the Workers' Defense League, the A. Philip Randolph Educational Fund, the Urban League's LEAP Program and others. We have brought into this field, on an area-wide basis, many, many hundreds of these young men.

Now the Philadelphia Plan has nothing to do with an area-wide basis. It is on a single job basis. This program of the AFL-CIO is accepted completely by all of the international unions in the AFL-CIO, including the Building Trades international unions. And our activity is not directed toward the laborers or the so-called trowel-trades, where there is a large black membership, but it is directed especially to iron workers, plumbers, carpenters, steam fitters, sheet metal workers and electricians.

And I would also like to clear up another erroneous impression that people have in regard to the Building Trades. You hear it said, "Well, you don't let the black boys into the highly skilled trade. They only do the low wage, dirty jobs."

Well, there are no low wage jobs in the building trades.

If you could see the pay scale of the building laborers throughout this country, you would agree that they are way, way ahead of many white collar groups.

And, as far as the dirty jobs are concerned, there are no clean jobs in the building trades. They are all dirty.

In 1967, in December, the Outreach Program had spread to 16 states. The report was made to the AFL-CIO convention and the convention decided to go ahead. Now we have these programs, administered by the AFL-CIO civil rights department, in cooperation with local building trades councils, in cooperation with the building trades international unions, and we have these programs operating in 55 major cities of the country, with the cooperation of the United States Department of Labor.

As of November, 1969, just a short five weeks ago, 5,304 apprentices had been placed by this program—4,998 of those in the building and construction trades and 2910 in the so-called higher skills I mentioned a moment ago. Incidentally, in the regular apprenticeship federally serviced programs, the percentage of minority apprentices is higher in construction than in metal manufacturing, non-metal manufacturing, public utilities and transportation.

The 1960 census showed that in the total United States apprenticeship programs, non-whites comprised 2.5 percent of the total. In 1968, the last half of 1968, the only figures we have up to date, show that this percentage has gone up to 9.4 percent. It has gone up four times in that period.

Now let me give you the official attitude of the Building Trades Department of the AFL-CIO, unanimously endorsed by all of its unions at the convention a few months ago in Atlantic City. They adopted a unanimous policy for increasing employment for minority workers on this basis:

1. Acceleration and extension of the Outreach Program which has been tested and which has succeeded.

2. Invitation to qualified journeymen to apply for membership in locals and acceptance if they meet ordinary and equally administered requirements for membership. This is to bring people in who picked up the trade outside of the unions with the same rights and under the same conditions as anybody else.

3. The development of training programs for the up-grading of minority workers who are not of apprentice age. This would mean minority workers in the various trades who are working as helpers or assistants or laborers and to up-grade them, to train them and bring them in as full-fledged journeymen.

This Building Trades policy is being carried out. The instructions have gone out from the international unions to their local unions to follow this policy and the policy is being followed.

I would like to take note of a particular place where we can say that there has been some definite progress. It was a local union in New York of the sheet metal workers and it was on the front page of the papers for several years. And, to put it very frankly, they did not want any black members. It was as simple as that. And, of course, in this southern city of Washington, we understand that attitude. But as it has changed in Washington so it has changed with regard to this particular local union.

This local union, after the Outreach Program was adopted and started, agreed finally to cooperate, and they now have 109 apprentices in that very local union—109 black apprentices—and a dozen or so have already graduated to journeyman status.

Now let me turn to this so-called Philadelphia Plan. The Plan simply is that where federal money is involved to the extent on one job of over half a million dollars, you get the contractor to make a commitment. And this commitment is made on a percentage basis, arbitrarily arrived at by the Labor Department and the contractor is expected to have a percentage of minorities on the job equal to what his contract calls for.

Before getting into this, I think I should explain, so there will be no misunderstanding, the type of collective bargaining contract that has been traditionally negotiated and signed over the years by the Building Trades. The Building Trades workers work for employers who do not initiate employment. They do not have permanent mechanics on their payrolls.

Yes, they have white collar people. They will have an estimator, a buyer and a bookkeeper and people like that, but they do not have a permanent group of job-site employees. When they bargain with the building trades unions, the contractors are bargaining for what I would call an employment agency type of contract. They lay down the conditions, the wages and so forth. And they say to the union, if we get work we will hire you. And the union says, in return, if you get work we will work for you under these conditions.

So this is the type of contract that they all sign. No contractor, not even the largest in the so-called higher skilled trades, have a permanent job-site labor force. They couldn't possibly have it because it would be economically impossible for them to do that.

As a practical matter, they couldn't afford it. And, also as a practical matter, the contractor knows where he is going to get his labor supply. He doesn't have to have it laying in his backyard on his own payroll. He has got a collective bargaining contract and the labor supply is there.

This Philadelphia Plan was first issued as an order of the Labor Department on June 27, 1969. There was no hearing of any kind prior to the issuance of the order. The order sets up quotas or goals in percentage figures to be a contract requirement on federally-

involved construction to an amount exceeding \$500,000. Subsequent to the issuance of the order, the hearing took place on August 26. The Assistant Secretary of Labor in charge of this activity stated that the hard research on the plan was done after the plan had been announced on June 27th. Later on, another order was issued on September 23, setting up employment ranges for minority workers based on, and this is a quote, "The most reliable data available relating to minority participation in members of the six so-called skilled building trades." The order refers to surveys conducted by the Department on this subject. It refers to testimony that establishes that there were 5,000 to 8,000 prospective minority craftsmen who would be prepared to accept training in the Philadelphia area if they could be assured of jobs.

The order makes the flat statement that a survey by the Manpower Administration of the Department shows, and I quote, "the total membership of the Iron Workers Craft in the Philadelphia area in 1969 was 850, twelve of whom—1.4 percent—are minority group representatives. The order also states that a survey by the Manpower Administration indicated that there were 302 iron workers from minority groups now in the Philadelphia labor market. Nowhere is there any indication that the information presented can be verified by official surveys of any kind. There is none shown by whom the surveys were conducted; no data was presented. We were merely told that these figures were the result of testimony presented.

After careful investigation of one so-called key survey, it was found that the key survey consisted of a memorandum by one government employee quoting the "conservative estimate" of another government employee.

Now, in regard to the union membership in the Philadelphia area of iron workers, which the Department stated as being 850 with 12 from the minorities, our figures from our official union records show a different situation.

We show, for instance, that there is not one iron worker local union in Philadelphia, there are five. The total membership is not 850, it is 3575, of whom 690 or 19 percent are from minority groups.

For instance, in the so-called construction and ornamental local union, there are 20 from the minority groups out of a total of 750. In the ship riggers group, with a total membership of 226 members, 171 are black. In the shopman's group, with a total of 1961, 248 are black and 30 are Spanish-speaking.

Of the rodmen, which is a straight construction local with no other work except construction, out of 448 members there are 140 who are from the so-called minority group.

Construction riggers have 25 out of a total of 190.

Now, in regard to the 302 qualified iron workers which were reported by the Administration's survey in its September 23 order, the president of the Iron Workers International, which has for the last five years been engaged in a campaign to increase minority group representation, wired Secretary Shultz on September 30 requesting specific information relating to the 302 persons, asking for names and addresses and pledging that these persons would be given every assistance in securing employment.

Two weeks later a reply came from Secretary Shultz to the president of the Iron Workers International and I quote from his letter: "Because of the nature of the information-gathering techniques used by the Department of Labor in arriving at specific numbers outlined in section 3B, it would be impractical to provide you with the names, addresses and work experience data which you request."

This is really bureaucracy at its best. And it seems reasonable to suggest that

the Secretary of Labor might look over the fact-finding process that prevails in his department.

Now, the Philadelphia Plan, as outlined by the official documents released by the Department of Labor setting up these quotas or percentage targets, will make no contribution to the overall problem of increasing minority group representation in the total labor force in the area.

A contractor, for instance, could achieve compliance by an arrangement which transfers minority workers, already in the area work force, to the government contractors, because the Philadelphia Plan only covers the government contracts, without in any way increasing minority participation in the trades.

For instance, the first year's quota for iron workers under this plan is 5 percent.

Since the plan went into effect five or six months ago, there has been one government contract and that government contract calls for 5 percent of the iron workers to be minority members. This means this job will take 70 workers, so 5 percent of 70 workers comes to 3½ workers. This job could be manned from the hundreds of iron workers that are available and even if you look to the strictly structural local union, where there are 16 minority workers, they would more than fill the government requirement.

Suppose they were not available. Where would the contractor go to fulfill his commitment under this contract, if they were not available in the field where he is dealing with the union involved. Would he go out in the street and say, to the first young Negro that comes along, "Say, are you a structural iron worker? Would you like to be? Do you think you could be a structural iron worker?" This is complete nonsense.

Of course, he can achieve compliance without putting anybody on the job by making what is called a "good faith effort." Now, a good faith effort could mean a telephone call to some source—maybe to the Urban League, maybe to one of the employment agencies, maybe to one of the groups trying to help minority groups, maybe to the union. And if they fail to come up with a qualified minority group representative, then the contractor has played his part and this would be considered good faith.

The only sound method to bring minority representatives into the skilled construction trade is the comprehensive program outlined by the Building Trades and backed up in every way by the AFL-CIO. That is the apprenticeship program, the inviting into the unions of the qualified journeymen under the same terms as anyone else and upgrading those already employed in the building trades at a lower category. This would take care of those who are above what we call apprenticeship age.

The Philadelphia Plan is directed solely to construction, sponsored and financed in some way by the federal government. It can be applied only on a job basis, which means, in some cases, employment for a few months. It would not bring a single minority worker into the area labor force. If you want to help these minority people get into these jobs, you have got to get them into the area force. In this city there are thousands of building trades mechanics. They are here. The contractors know they are here. The unions know that they are here and there are some non-union people, of course. But they are here and they are available. And this is the establishment, if you want to put it that way. This is where you have got to get the minority workers, into that group, so that they will be available for employment when it comes along just the same as anyone else.

Even Secretary Schultz, after singing the praises of this Plan, recognized its limitations just a few days ago and he strongly endorsed what he called an area-wide multi-employer program. This is what we have,

This is what Outreach is and this is financed by Uncle Sam. The Labor Department is spending the money for this Outreach Program. It is there.

But, it was started under a previous Administration. It started under a different Secretary of Labor and, of course, it doesn't have the attraction of being something that can be attributed to this Administration.

And when we contemplate the record of this Administration in the civil rights field, the softening on Voters' Rights, delayed desegregation of the schools in the South, the attempt to put Strom Thurmond's baby on the Supreme Court, the cutting back of programs that could be helpful to the black community—it would seem that this attempt to use the Building Trades as a whipping boy could be designed to give the Nixon Administration a few brownie points to off-set their short-comings in the civil rights area as a whole.

There is a rather strange contrast in the attitude of the Secretary of Labor as expressed in an interview just about three days ago. He pointed with pride to the increased minority employment in the three big textile giants in the Carolinas—J. P. Stevens, Burlington and Dan River Mills. And they, of course, they have no Philadelphia Plan for them. They have what they call a little persuasion. They got a promise that they would try to do something. So the report came in. In six months, minority employment in the mills of these groups—maybe 40 or 50 but controlled by these three companies—had risen nine tenths of one percent, reaching an overall ratio as of September 30 of 18.3 percent under the pressure of the Labor Department.

Big deal. They came up to 18.3 percent in their employment of minority groups. This could be compared to the employment in Philadelphia of the building trades of over 30 percent of minority groups.

But, this doesn't mean anything because they attacked the Building Trades figures as being meaningless—oh, they are true but they are meaningless—because the ratio is much lower when you make a separate assessment of the highly skilled workers in the upper brackets.

Well, that is what we are talking about and that is true. But it would seem reasonable to expect that the same logic would apply to the textile giants of North and South Carolina; that a survey could be made by the Department to find out how many black faces are to be found in the skilled crafts in the textile industry and to whom the Philadelphia idea could apply because of the huge contracts these people get from the federal government. Well, that isn't done. They don't break down the figures. They take the whole thing en masse and if you took the whole thing en masse, the building trades would be number one in this area in the entire country.

Nobody, nobody would be ahead of them—no manufacturers, no industrial set up, not the auto workers or anyone else. The building trades would be number one.

And what does that mean? That means that the building trades of this country have provided more jobs for more minority people at manual occupations at high wages than any other industry in this country.

Still, they try to make a whipping boy out of them because the percentage of the skilled trades is not as high as they would like to see it. Well, we would like to see it higher. And the unions in the skilled trades are doing what they can to make it higher. But if they take the building trades and say, oh, we don't want to talk about laborers, we don't want to talk about plasterers, we don't want to talk about bricklayers, we don't want to talk about anybody where the percentage is good. We only want to talk about those fellows like the plumber and the iron worker. Well, why not try that on Mr.

J. P. Stevens? Why not try that on Dan River Mills? And Burlington industry? Why not break them down and find out how many white faces are at the top and how many black faces are at the top—among the skilled mechanics and the supervisory help.

No, this would not fit in with the South-ern strategy, I am afraid.

We welcome in the AFL-CIO any plan that will increase the number of minority group people in the highly skilled trades. We could use them. We need them. The Philadelphia Plan, with its individual contract basis, will make no contribution whatsoever toward that end because it is quite possible for a contractor to fully comply with its commitments without bringing a single new employee into the area-wide job pool.

Perhaps the greatest drawback to the plan is that it diverts attention from the real solid task of training and qualifying minority workers for a permanent place in the ranks of skilled workers who are available and qualified for employment on all the construction work in an area, not just the federally-financed work.

So I can say to you we don't like this plan. We feel it is political in nature. We feel that it was set forth on the basis of very poor information. We are quite sure that it served its purpose when it got the Madison-Avenue publicity job that was done on it. We, of course, will have to watch it and see how it goes. We won't get in its way. We know it will fall of its own dead weight.

In the meantime, we expect to move forward on the plan that we have. We make no apology for our attitude and our work in this field. We make no attempt to deny that there was discrimination in unions—lots of unions in this country; that the trade union movement in this country really is a picture of the whole country. We have southern members. We have members with all sorts of prejudices, not just prejudice against the color of a person's skin. And we have unions that have lived in the fear of unemployment; fear of short work all their lives.

You know, my union when I was a young man, discriminated against everybody. It had an even-handed policy of discrimination—they wouldn't take anybody in.

Well, that has been changed. Times change.

And what was the reason? Certainly no prejudice of any kind. They were sharing the work that was available. And the work that was available didn't give them very much work.

If they got laid off in September, at the conclusion of the speculative building year, they didn't go to work until the following March. And they didn't like to see new people coming into the union with whom they would have to share an amount of work that was not sufficient for even those that were, at the time, in the union. So, of course, they discriminated against anyone and everyone.

Well, those unions today have plenty of members in the minority groups. They are training them, training more and they are going to continue to do this. Despite what anyone else may feel, we feel kind of keenly about this Philadelphia Plan. It was promulgated by the Department of Labor under a presidential order. There was never a hearing. There was never an investigation. There was never a complaint. All there was, was an Administration determination of guilt—that the Building Trades unions in Philadelphia were guilty of discrimination.

We resent that.

However, I am not going to worry much about the plan because I know it won't work and I get the impression that insofar as the sponsors are concerned, it has about served its purpose so far—it got on the front page and got a lot of good notice.

We will watch the developments. But, in the meantime, we are going to push forward on the plans that we have to bring new apprentices into this field, to upgrade those who

are already working at the trade at one of these lower-paid jobs—and lower-paid at \$7 an hour, is not too much lower-paid. And we are going to try and upgrade those who have some knowledge and have had some experience and see if we can't bring them in as journeymen.

We are going to push forward with that program and we will just keep a wary eye on the Philadelphia Plan.

Thank you.

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS FOLLOWING THE SPEECH BY AFL-CIO PRESIDENT GEORGE MEANY

Mr. Meany, what if the Philadelphia Plan survives all legal tests? Will the Building Trades then change apprentice plans for all?

A. Of course the Building Trades will not change their apprentice plans. It would be ridiculous to throw out a plan that has brought in 5,000 apprentices in a couple of years and is bringing them in in increasing numbers every month. And bringing them into the mainstream—bringing them into the area groups—available for all jobs. Why should we do away with it? If the Philadelphia Plan works and I don't think it will, it will work alongside of this. It won't displace it by any means. For the Philadelphia Plan only applies to government jobs.

Q. Do you believe that the Administration purposely set up a confrontation setting a 20% black quota at the same time it called for 75% cutback in federal construction? Wouldn't this create job fears among white workers and build false hopes among blacks?

A. Well, I don't know if it was deliberate but, of course, the two definitely go together. I think that the Administration and the Labor Department in particular was playing on this popular misconception about the evils in the Building Trades. I think they had a convenient whipping boy and I'm convinced that this was an attempt to offset the Administration's very, very poor record on civil rights—a very bad record over the last year—by taking a crack at the Building Trades.

Q. Why does it take five years to train a craftsman in the building trades when the Air Force found it can take a boy off the farm and train him to be a bomber and navigator in six months?

A. Well, it takes much more knowledge to be an all around plumber than it takes to be a navigator.

Q. You may have given this answer already, I'm not sure, Mr. Meany—you mentioned the unions' Outreach program started sometime ago. How has it worked out? Any figures?

A. I quoted those figures—5,300 or so as of the end of November with all but 300—4,900 odd from the Building Trades and of those, 2,900 from the so-called high skilled trades. And it is growing every month.

Q. Many liberal, pro-labor senators voted for the Philadelphia Plan, namely Javits, Ribicoff, Hart, McGovern, Griffin, Muskie, Scott—how do you explain their misunderstanding?

A. They had no misunderstanding. They were quite aware of what they were doing. But they were faced with a threat, not only of a Presidential veto, but they were also faced with the threat that they were not going to be allowed to go home for Christmas. That was a very, very strong threat.

Q. If I can change the subject for one moment, Mr. Meany. What ramifications, if any, do you see for organized labor as a result of the Yablonski assassination?

A. Well, I know nothing about the assassination. I regret it. It was a vicious act that I can't understand. But I would say that there will be an investigation of some kind by committees of Congress—not to try to find out anything about Yablonski and the United Mine Workers but to see if there isn't a good excuse to put some new screws to labor.

Q. You mentioned the interview with Mr. Shultz over the weekend. He indicated Mr.

Nixon will prepare an overhaul or elimination of the Railway Labor Act and changes in the Taft-Hartley Act in dealing with major disputes. What were your reactions to these proposals?

A. Well, my reaction is that the three Presidents that preceded Mr. Nixon made the same type of statement sometime in their Administration and we are still here. We will see what comes over to the Hill. We will take a good look at it.

Q. A shipping question. The shipping industry wants many new merchant ships in a hurry. Would American labor unions go along with building some U.S. ships in foreign yards to rebuild the American fleet in a hurry?

A. I think that that question would have to be answered by the unions in the shipping field. I do know that the American fleet needs to be rebuilt. When you talk about building in a hurry, you are talking about building 30 large ships a year. I'm quite sure that the American shipyards could take care of them. I don't see any necessity for going to foreign shipyards for that. Now, I don't know what the unions' attitude would be, but that would be my attitude.

Q. Does George Wallace still appeal to trade union voters as much as in the last Presidential election?

A. Well, I'm hopeful that he appeals to them just about as much as he did when he got to Election Day.

Q. Can you honestly state that the minorities have shared in the great pay raises of construction workers?

A. I can honestly state that the minorities have not shared because they have not been in construction work to the extent that they should be. But those who are in got the same share as anyone else. Now I hope that we get more in so that they can share in these pay raises.

Q. In general terms, what can union leadership do to diminish on-the-job friction between white and Negro laborers?

A. Well, I don't know. That is something you have got to leave to the good, common sense of the people involved. I see no friction in union leadership. We have plenty of people, both blacks and whites, in the offices of unions here—in our own offices. This runs to the conduct and behavior of individuals. All we can do, I suppose, is preach the idea of working together with these people as an official policy of the American trade union movement.

Q. What are the odds that Paul Hall of the Seafarers International will succeed you as head of the AFL-CIO?

A. I'd say they are pretty long.

Q. What is the AFL-CIO policy toward local Building Trades Councils who refuse to cooperate with Outreach programs beyond token acceptance?

A. Well, that will have to be handled by the various internationals. I can say the internationals have made their policies clear and naturally whatever action they take would have to be under their constitutions. I'm quite sure that none of these internationals are going to stand for any local union getting in the way of this program. That is their attitude—that is their sentiment.

Q. A question on the Middle East. You recently made a speech attacking Secretary of State Rogers' new Middle East policy against Israel as being tied to American banking and investments in oil. Can you name names?

A. Well, when I made the statement I named some names. There was a report in the press that there was an interview in the White House in which John McCoy was present and David Rockefeller and that they represented banking interests who had a tremendous stake in Middle East oil. I took the position that our country had a tremendous stake in that area of the world and that if the American producers needed Arabian oil then the Arabian countries also needed American cash. It would be a two-

way street. Now I mentioned Mr. Rockefeller and John McCoy because they had been mentioned in the press and over the radio and there had been no denial. Since I've made that statement, I received a letter from David in which he said that I misunderstood his interest there. Well, I'm going to talk to him—maybe I did. But I do know that we, as a nation, certainly have an interest in that part of the world. We have an interest in the maintenance of some kind of a free society in a part of the world that has known so little of freedom. I certainly object very much to our State Department, in conjunction with the Soviet Union and the British, sitting down to give away something that the Israelis have. I think that this thing has got to be settled by the Israelis and the Arabs sitting down. And I think the best contribution our country could make—not to set up any terms—not to make any unilateral suggestions—but just insist that the big powers of the world tell the Arabs and the Israelis to sit down. I think that is where it has got to be settled.

Q. What can unions do to stem the onrush of inflation?

A. Well, we look at this inflation as a profit inflation. We've got good sound documentation on that. We know that each time our people come up to renew contracts, they merely are trying to restore what has been taken away from them by increased prices since the last contract. I have no solution. I'm no economist. I don't see the present policy doing the job. I think that we're getting to the point where, within a short time, we may see a very strange phenomenon—a recession and inflation at the same time. That's going to take a lot of doing but it looks like Nixon may be able to do it.

Q. Before I ask the final question, sir, I would like to add to your collection of certificates of appreciation, Mr. Meany last had one when he spoke here in June of 1967, but here is another certificate of appreciation, sir, for your appearance here today and for all of you services to correspondents over the years.

A. Thank you.

Q. Someone just asked: does your choice of apparel today indicate your belief that you hold a blue collar job. In case it does, I'm presenting you with a blue tie of the National Press Club.

A. Thank you, very much. Thank you.

Q. And the final question. As an artist, how do you rate Phryne the beautiful Athenian on the wall of the main lounge of the National Press Club?

A. I didn't even see it.

#### UNSUPPORTED ANSWERS TO QUESTIONNAIRES RELATIVE TO TITLE I

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. HAGAN). Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. QUIE) is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. QUIE. Mr. Speaker, yesterday the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. PERKINS) had inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the results of a questionnaire he had sent out to schools across the country. I understand similar questionnaires will be inserted in the RECORD each day as we go along.

I wish to take this time to point out to my colleagues that, as we look through the answers to those questions, we really do not learn very much about the way title I funds have been utilized. The charge is, as the last question indicates, that increased fundings cannot be effectively utilized.

I also have heard the charge many times from the Advisory Committee on

Disadvantaged Children and from some other groups who have looked at title I that we have not seen the kind of results that should have been expected from title I funds.

I have looked over the questions and responses which the gentleman from Kentucky asked me to look at. I should like to speak about some of the answers to those questions which I do not feel adequately answer the charges.

For example, let us consider the response of Orville M. Bailey of Lauderdale County, Florence, Ala., when he was asked the question:

Do you regard your present title I programs as effective in meeting special education needs of educationally disadvantaged children?

His answer was:

Yes. Studies and research data relative to services and activities in our local system indicate great progress of pupils participating in Title I activities, progress to the extent achieved impossible without these supplementary programs and services. Items which are hard to measure such as attitude toward school, a pupil's image of himself and his opportunities, etc., have been emphasized with remarkable progress being achieved.

That is pretty much the answer throughout. Really the answer throughout is "Yes."

However, there does not seem to be any substantiating evidence such as the number of children who are reading at grade level now as compared to those who were reading at grade level before the title I program started, or a report of the general improvement in reading that would indicate what has been achieved.

We should take a look not only at the improvement in children's reading ability but also at their increased knowledge. We should take a look at what has happened to the number of dropouts from the school, and the number who go on to postsecondary education after this program. Also we should have comparisons between those who are counted in order to secure the money and those on whom the money is expended. I note that Frank F. Dixon, coordinator of compensatory education, Las Vegas, Nev., answered:

Students serviced are roughly only 13% of those qualifying according to Title I regulations.

There are no details that I can see in any of these questionnaires as to the results of their programs. We would expect the answers to all these questions to be yes, because I imagine if the answer is no, the superintendent would probably be fired, and they would probably get a superintendent who could produce the answers desired.

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

Mr. QUIE. I yield to the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Speaker, I will say to my distinguished colleague that the title I results, in general, have been significant since the enactment of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act. I am sure the distinguished gentleman will agree that the hearings we conducted last year were extensive and thorough. He sat by my side, and the

hearings disclosed the tremendous educational opportunities the youngsters were getting. The disadvantaged youngsters were benefiting, and sometimes they had gained a half year of extra knowledge within a year's period.

The questionnaires, I feel, speak for themselves. I reiterate my suggestion and call upon Members of this body to closely scrutinize those questionnaires. There is no other group of people to whom we can turn to find out about the progress, no people who would know more than the educators and school superintendents themselves. If we cannot trust the school superintendents and educators who are in charge of the school programs of this country, as to the effectiveness of programs, then there is no one that can provide us with the answers.

But, Mr. Speaker, the important point as I see it is that 98 questionnaires out of 100 that come back from the school superintendents clearly point out how the programs are underfunded. There has been a loss of funds since 1968. The funds dipped in 1969 and dipped again in 1970. If we give them all the money that is at stake in this HEW appropriation bill under title I, we will only be restoring the expenditure to the 1968 level, considering inflation and increased costs of school services. That is all this increased appropriation does.

If the President does veto the bill, I personally feel it is absolutely essential for Members of this body to override the veto. The welfare of millions of students in elementary schools, secondary schools, vocational schools, and colleges in this country is at stake. We are financially strangling all levels of education.

Mr. QUIE. Mr. Speaker, I would say to the gentleman from Kentucky, the chairman of the Education and Labor Committee, that I know he is trying to do his very best. I sat beside him through the long hearings, and we did have many people at the hearings. I say this not as a reflection on the chairman nor as a reflection on the superintendents, but I say this rather because we have not had presented to us the kinds of facts to prove what has been said.

Again, the chairman has said that we heard, from long hearings, there have been tremendous results. I should like to see what those results are. It still bothers me that we find children today, say in the second grade, who do not reach a certain reading level, do not automatically have some remedial programs made available for them. It seems to me we ought to have the second, fourth, and sixth grades as benchmarks. If the children are not at the grade level and do not receive remedial help, they will probably never achieve the education they need.

It is impossible for a young person to get an adequate education if he or she cannot read. If a person learns to read well, he can educate himself. A number of people who never went to school beyond high school, and in fact some who did not finish high school, have educated themselves extremely well.

One of the key advantages is that they learned to read. Few people have made it without learning to read.

I know the other parts of education

are necessary, so that the disadvantaged child will no longer be disadvantaged, but it is difficult to reach them if they cannot read.

I should like to see the results. One of the things has to be how many children are reading at grade level now as compared to before the title I program. If schools cannot show they are doing better, then there is something wrong, despite all the assurances.

It is not whether we might believe the money is well expended. Too many people are saying it was not well expended, as the questionnaire implies.

I want to read down through here some of the answers that were given. I am not questioning them as though they were untrue. I just say they have not produced the kinds of facts on which we can make our judgment.

Look at the response of Thomas L. Lee, superintendent, Tucson No. 1, Tucson, Ariz. His answer is, as to whether their title I programs have been effective:

As effective as possible with the limited funds available. Costs continue to rise and funds continue to be cut back.

That does not tell us anything.

Next is George Alice Motley, superintendent, Menifee County Board of Education, Frenchburg, Ky. His answer to the question is just the word "yes," with no elaboration at all.

C. B. Garrison, superintendent, Pine Bluff District No. 3, Pine Bluff, Ark. His answer is:

Yes, within the limit of the present inadequate funding.

Henry R. Evans, Russell Independent School, Russell, Ky. His answer is just "Yes," with no elaboration.

William A. Doyle, San Jose Unified, San Jose, Calif. His answer is:

Yes; and we have test data to prove it.

I should like to see that test data. That is what I am driving at. He says he has it. I believe it is really unfair to the people in education that we have not had presented to us the results of that test data.

I am convinced that with the expenditure of better than a billion dollars a year, schools could not help themselves but do something good. I should like to see the test results as to what good was accomplished.

I am convinced also that school systems have done more than just spend the money where they could not help but do some good. I believe some of them must have some outstanding exemplary programs. If they do, we ought to know about it and to see the results that have been accomplished, so that the Office of Education and the State departments of education and the Congress can point to that with pride, to secure some additional money because they are doing that kind of a job, and also to help publicize around the country, to schools which are still questioning what they ought to do to reach the disadvantaged children, to say, "Here is where great results were produced. How about other schools going out and looking at those programs to see if your money cannot be expended in that way."

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

Mr. QUIE. I yield to the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. PERKINS. I certainly want to request my distinguished colleague to continue to read these questionnaires, as well as our hearings last session, because they require a reading, in my judgment, and disclose many exemplary programs in the local school systems.

If there is anything that our hearings proved last year, it was the fact that this program has tremendously affected the dropout rate. I think the distinguished gentleman from Minnesota—

Mr. QUIE. Could the gentleman present for the record—

Mr. PERKINS. I think the distinguished gentleman from Minnesota will agree—

Mr. QUIE. Could the gentleman present the results of these?

Mr. PERKINS. The gentleman will agree that they have improved considerably percentagewise since we enacted the Elementary and Secondary Education Act. Educator after educator who came before the committee made that statement. I do not know how to get behind the statement of the educator unless we ask him to bring in the books both before and after, the ADA records, and put it down in black and white.

Mr. QUIE. That is why I am asking for it.

Mr. PERKINS. And I do not question the integrity of an educator who makes the statement that this program improved the dropout rate in his school.

Mr. QUIE. Mr. Speaker, I do not yield to the gentleman for a few moments.

I recall back in World War II there were awards given in agriculture, comprising a little banner with a letter A to show that a farm increased production in World War II. I know one individual who got an A because he doubled his production. Previously he had one rooster. Then he got a hen and doubled his production.

So if the statement of the superintendent said that there was a lower dropout rate than they had before, I would like to find out just how much it was. It may not be substantial and then it may.

Mr. PERKINS. The gentleman had all of that data when we conducted the hearings. If he wanted to bring in the superintendent and question him, he had the opportunity, because they had the records which would prove conclusively.

Mr. QUIE. Do you know what the usual reaction to that was? They responded that reading is not the whole thing. That reading is not the only thing that is important. I want to see any specific results, because everybody knows that reading is not the whole answer. Also we know—

Mr. PERKINS. I am talking about it across the board.

Mr. QUIE. Actually if they do read now a little better and tests are being conducted and are available, I would like to see them put in the RECORD.

Mr. PERKINS. They are, and that is what the questionnaires disclose to my good friend.

Mr. QUIE. I would like to have the chairman, if he would, compile some of that data and give it to us, because I have been reading through these questionnaires.

Mr. PERKINS. Let me say to my distinguished friend that I will select some of these questionnaires on my time tomorrow and I request that the gentleman be on the floor and discuss this very point. Let me state here that the educators throughout America and all the groups that came before our committee last year in our lengthy hearings which we held gave testimony to the effect that their chief obstacle was underfunding and the inordinate delay in funding. That is the problem here. We cut back some 20 percent since 1968 and scattered the funds very thinly. The children that you mention migrating to the cities are all there. The questionnaire discloses that. They can only take care of a portion of the disadvantaged. That is the reason why we should work to override this veto.

Mr. QUIE. Mr. Speaker, I will go on to some of the responses and I will look forward to looking over the questionnaires that the gentleman from Kentucky has presented today. John Crowe, the director of grants for Waterbury, Conn., gave an answer of a flat "yes," with no elaboration to the question about the effectiveness of this title I program. Sidney Boswell, superintendent of schools at Brunswick, Ga., gave the answer:

Our title I programs are showing concrete results in meeting the needs of the educationally disadvantaged children in the areas we have funds for implementation for these special programs.

So what I would like to have presented to us are these concrete results. I would like to see what the tests show as to what the concrete results are because our judgment has to be made on the extent of the results.

Now, we go down to the response of Kendall Boggs, superintendent, Letcher County Schools, Whitesburg, Ky.—and if I pronounce any of these names wrong I am sure the gentleman from Kentucky can correct me on them. And in Mr. Boggs answer he says:

Yes, without question in our district. We have received national recognition, by press and other media on doing an outstanding job.

I think that is tremendous. I think that the Congress ought to know this. Evidently I have missed some of the press comments and the comments of other media on the outstanding job. I would like to know what that outstanding job is, because I would like to help distribute that information so that some other schools can do the outstanding job that that Kentucky school did. And what I am doing here is not condemning the program or condemning the money that is being spent. As I said yesterday, so far as spending money for education, I am convinced we do not do enough on the part of the Federal Government, and I have set my goal as to the Federal Government spending at about 25 percent on elementary and secondary educational costs, and we do not even

get up to 10 percent now. So you can see my viewpoint on it.

I should also add that I think we have a serious problem of inflation in this country, and the President has that to bear in mind as well as funding education, and that turns out to be another question.

But let us go on, then, to James T. Akers, superintendent, U.S.D. No. 203, Kansas City, Kans., and his answer is:

Yes, our Title I program has been a real help in providing needs that the District regular budget could not provide for.

But he does not say what they are doing.

We go down to Dr. Alvin E. Morris, Wichita Public Schools, U.S.D. 259, Wichita, Kans. His answer:

Yes. We have had annual evaluations of our Title I program. The results have shown a consistent pattern of progress in regard to the improvement of reading.

So here again they have conducted that evaluation. The results are available. I would like to have somebody present it for the RECORD so that we can see it.

He goes on to say:

About 50 percent is spent in supportive programs and activities that have contributed to pupil educational progress.

This must mean that the other 50 percent was used for some other purpose, but he does not elaborate on it.

Here is the report of Beckham Combs, superintendent, Knott County Schools, Hindman, Ky. His answer is:

Yes, through special reading teachers, equipment, teaching supplies, food and community services.

Well, here we have one from Kentucky who says specifically what they are spending the money on. I would say that this is helpful to us. But, he has not shown us any of the results of the special reading programs, teachers and equipment and teachers' supplies for providing better education, but at least I would say that he has done better than any of the others have done in giving us something meaningful to look at.

Next, Selma W. Black, school projects coordinator, Portland Public School, Portland, Maine. Her answer is:

Very much so. Our only regret is that we cannot extend services to more children or add new programs desperately needed.

I wish she would tell us what they are doing and how effective they have been.

Then we have an interesting response from Lloyd D. Hatfield, South Portland, Maine, and his answer is no surprise but no help:

Absolutely, only we need more funds.

That is all he says.

Then Harding J. Stewart, supervisor of Federal and State projects, Springfield Public Schools, Springfield, Mass. His answer is:

Yes, however, the funding restrictions prevent broader and greater depth in implementation.

In other words, he says he does not have enough money, but he does not tell us what they have accomplished with \$700,000 to \$800,000, which they have received each year under title I.

Next is Joel A. Chapman, Bolivar County School, District III, Shelby, Miss. His answer is "Yes," and no elaboration.

Walton Jones, superintendent, Morgan County, West Liberty, Ky. His answer is:

No, due to insufficient funds. Due to this fact we are unable to enact programs for Fine Arts and Special Programs to enrich the students' educational needs.

So he has a program in mind that he cannot fund. He does not say what he does fund with the money he does have amounting to \$242,000 in 1968, \$221,000 in 1969 and \$195,000 in 1970, or the results of those programs.

Next, Robert Stinson, who is coordinator of Federal activities, St. Joseph School District, St. Joseph, Mo. And his answer is:

Yes, but only to the extent that we can operate under the amount of money allocated, and only within the State's rigid guidelines.

I wish he would elaborate on the problems that they have in Missouri with regard to some of the rigid guidelines that prevent him from doing what he wants to. But again he does not say what he is doing, or the results of that program.

Next is Guy Carter, Independence, Mo. He does not say whether he is the superintendent or the coordinator or what he is. But his answer is:

Yes . . . We see educational growth commensurate with ability and home environment, but as stated above an important factor is the improved attitude toward learning. (See attached comments.)

Those attached comments are not included but those "attached comments" may provide us with the results that the chairman of the committee was alluding to earlier.

However, Mr. Carter indicates that educational growth is only commensurate with ability and home improvement and to me that raises questions: Is not title I expected to raise young people above the level which their home environment holds them and can the schools really know the real ability of the students?

So I think that that is not an adequate answer.

The next is from John Prasch of the Lincoln Public Schools, Lincoln, Nebr.

His answer to the question about the need of title I programs is:

Yes, concentrated educational effort should continue. These programs, difficult to measure objectively, are improving the attitudes of disadvantaged children and their families in my opinion.

His answer to the effectiveness of title I programs is:

Yes, I am convinced we are meeting the special education needs of many of our disadvantaged children. With more funding we could do better, however.

I could read down the rest of these giving similar answers that we see throughout. But my point, and I would like to reiterate, is that we ought to see the results of the use of this money and see where the young people now are achieving higher educational standards in their school system. Just because the superintendents who answered are convinced does not mean we should be con-

vinced without the facts. Too many outside evaluators are not convinced.

I think one of the main keys is reading and if a child learns to read better because of these programs I think then all the other problems of adjustment will be easier for the child. And if anybody wonders, then, saying reading is difficult to test—there are reading tests available now and the results of such tests could be extremely helpful to us.

I also know that some educators are very fearful that if we start producing test results that might lead to national testing—and they are concerned about that.

But I believe that the Congress needs to know some answers about the billions of dollars that we have already expended and what it has achieved. And I doubt that we would ever find out from a superintendent that he thought that a program funded by the Federal Government was not achieving enough and that we should not be spending money any more. I do not think it is surprising to have them say that we need more money—that is nothing new at all. I think that we need to see concrete results before we can say that more money is needed than the administration requested so more children can achieve a better education which would not be possible without the additional title I money. If we could have that I think then that we could expect to see substantially increased funding in future years.

I yield to the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. PERKINS) if he desires me to do so.

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Speaker, I would like to say to our distinguished colleague who has contributed so much in behalf of educational programs on the statute books that the questionnaires are satisfying me as to the result obtained and that the achievements in the administration under title I have been outstanding.

I think that if the Members in this body will carefully read the questionnaires they will find that the responses are accurately reporting on the true facts. The answers to those questionnaires are certainly authoritative conclusions, pointing out the real necessity for additional funds.

Now, I do not know how, in the time available, to go behind 98 favorable responses that came back out of 100 educators. I, myself, am satisfied, and I think the vast majority of the Members of this body will be satisfied, with these responses. But I wish to say to my distinguished colleague, who likes to explore every viewpoint so thoroughly, that we will conduct hearings and let the distinguished gentleman call any of these educators he wishes to call, and ask the educators to bring with them the attendance records before and after to show how the dropout rate has been affected and the tests that have been given to measure these results. And, so far as I am concerned, I will go day after day with the distinguished gentleman from Minnesota to get that technical material that he raises a question about presently. In fact the gentleman knows full well he had this opportunity and the committee

in fact did extensively study these matters in our hearings last year.

But the real point in issue here is providing additional funds to really make more effective these special educational programs throughout America. I do not think that we can afford to be swayed by vague doubts when we have in the Record already conclusive proof that the achievements and the results obtained have been tremendous. But I do wish to give my distinguished colleague assurance that I shall continue to look into all educational programs over which our committee has jurisdiction and see that the gentleman has an opportunity to the 7th degree to get any testimony necessary to satisfy his own mind. I am sure that 98 out of 100 educators that the gentleman from Minnesota calls will verify the statement that the chief obstacle to more progress under title I is the lack of funds and, above everything else, we should restore these funds to the 1968 level. That is all we are doing here.

Mr. QUIE. I will say to the gentleman that I have been in Congress now for 12 years, and we heard educators say that 12 years ago, and to that extent I agree. But the amount expended for education in the last 12 years from all sources has doubled. Yet we hear that same statement being made. So I would like to see what the facts are, the results of studies, and determine what has been accomplished with a billion dollars a year from title I. I would like to know that so I could then help secure money in the areas where it will do the greatest amount of good. Otherwise this is only general aid and it would then have to be justified as such.

#### HAIL TO THE KANSAS CITY CHIEFS

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

Mr. RANDALL. Mr. Speaker, on Monday, January 19, when the House convened after the holiday recess, you were good enough to recognize me among the first under the 1-minute rule which gave me the exceptional opportunity to remind my colleagues that the Kansas City Chiefs, a portion of whose home city it is my honor and privilege to represent, are the new champions of the football world.

Then, yesterday, under a special order, speaking on the floor of the House, I recounted for the benefit of the membership and to perpetuate for the Record the consensus of what constituted the highlights of the Chiefs-Vikings contest and what the experts have concluded were the key plays of that great game. Perhaps my own analysis may have been somewhat slanted in favor of the Chiefs but I honestly tried to be as objective as humanly possible under trying circumstances.

Today, Mr. Speaker, I am asking to perpetuate for the Record some accounts of that great championship game in New Orleans as written by the members of the Kansas City Star sports staff and other newspapers in our congressional district which are published in metro-

politan Kansas City and its adjoining area.

On Monday morning, January 12, the Kansas City Times, which is the morning edition of the Kansas City Star, with headlines 2 inches high all the way across the top of the paper proclaimed "Chiefs Champions of the World," and as a second headline, "Sing: 'We're No. 1 in Celebration.'" There was an excellent résumé of the game by Bill Richardson, a member of the Star's sports staff and then a story of the jubilant Kansas City fans celebrating Sunday night in the French Quarter of New Orleans.

In the regular sports section the big headline was "Super Chiefs Ambush Minnesota." Our distinguished Joe McGuff, the Star's sports editor, writing from New Orleans, told the story that Hank Stram had found vindication for his football system. On the same page, Gary D. Warner, a member of the Star's sports staff, authored a story entitled "Chief's Happy for Selves and Len Dawson," and on the same page was an article by the Associated Press entitled "Stenerud Was Tense." Actually, the only real Viking on the field was the Chief's Jan Stenerud, a native of Norway.

Over on another page was an article by Joe McGuff whose headline certainly portrayed the really big story of the game, headed "Len Dawson Triumphs Despite Adversity." And, then, an article by Dick Wade, associate sports editor for the Star, entitled "Vikings Give Full Credit to the Chiefs."

While every one of these well-written articles mentioned above are deserving of inclusion in this permanent RECORD, I shall not include their content verbatim. Instead, at this point I shall briefly describe some of the very excellent cartoons which appeared in the Kansas City Star and the Kansas City Times preceding the game and following the game. One cartoon by Chapman preceding the game was headlined "Victory just a stone's throw away." In that cartoon there was a huge Viking standing in the Super Bowl with his horned helmet. He had reached down and grabbed the tommyhawk from the tiny Kansas City Chief pictured standing in front of him. But the diminutive Kansas City Chief had managed to find a little stone, and like David, threw the rock directly at the temple of the huge Viking, causing the huge creature to collapse backward. Truly, as this cartoon depicted the victory by the underdog Kansas City Chiefs was a kind of replay of the David and Goliath battle of Biblical times.

Then, again following the game, a cartoon writer for the Kansas City Star on the Monday following the game depicts three players, No. 16, Len Dawson, in the position of holding a ball for No. 3, Jan Stenerud, who is making a kick. But, instead of kicking the ball he is kicking at one of the Purple Gang, as the Minnesota Vikings have been sometimes described. And, the third player that is being kicked high in the air, has across the back of his jersey, "National Football League Mystique." Like the cartoon shows it, the mystique of the supremacy of the NFL now has been completely shattered following the victory of the

New York Jets in the Super Bowl last year, repeated by the Kansas City Chiefs in the 1970 Super Bowl game.

To have lived in the Greater Kansas City area Sunday night, January 11 after the game and on that following triumphant Monday, January 12 when the Chiefs returned to Kansas City is to have had the privilege to listen to many comments of loyal fans and to see and observe some of the things that happened at that great reception at the Liberty Memorial Mall preceded by the parade from Mid-Continent International Airport.

Sunday night the land of mid-America was jubilant. A sort of delirium prevailed. The reason the victory was so sweet is that Kansas City had to win over Oakland in the playoffs after being previously defeated by Oakland. Kansas City just had to make their second chance work.

Just about everybody you passed on the street would raise the index finger of his right hand signifying we are "No. 1." The reason for this great enthusiasm was that the Kansas City Chiefs had to play the Jets in New York and proceeded to defeat the world's champions of 1969. Then, our Chiefs had to play in Oakland, not once but twice, recalling that of the last eight times Kansas City had played Oakland the west coast team had been victorious seven times. That was why the game that led to the American Football League championship played on January 4 was so sweet a victory over Oakland. When it was all said and done Kansas City had defeated the world's champions of 1969, the Jets; the champions of the American Football League of 1969, the Raiders; and finally in the Super Bowl game the champions of the National Football League of 1969, the Vikings. While it was a point of pride it was also a substantive fact that after these three triumphs, the Kansas City Chiefs were in truth and in fact No. 1 in the football world.

Because of our national basketball tournaments and great indoor track meets as well as important football contests played in the area surrounding Kansas City, our prairie town now grown big, meaning Metropolitan Kansas City has for years been referred to by some as the sports capital of the world. On Sunday night, January 11 this description came true. Ours was the first great sports story of the decade.

It was a satisfying conclusion to 10 years of the Kansas City Chiefs who in their first year or two of existence had been known as the Dallas Texans. Everyone agreed the Chiefs were true champions because they had defeated all the other champions. Len Dawson had performed under adversity. Hank Stram had been an ingenious coach but perhaps one of the finest things that happened was when Lamar Hunt, the owner of the Chiefs, modestly disclaimed any personal credit for the victory or for bringing the Chiefs to Kansas City several years ago. He was most humble and unpretentious when he said "the world championship trophy belongs not to me but to all the people of Kansas City."

In Kansas City on that memorable Sunday night one could hear such com-

ments as "Dawson proved his personal fortitude." Some of his fellow-teammates later said it was their opinion, that after the rumor of his involvement in the Detroit grand jury investigation he appeared to them to age somewhat in the 2 or 3 days preceding the game. But in the Sugar Bowl, during all the 60 minutes of the Super Bowl game playing for the championship of the world, Len Dawson cleared himself and proved his greatness.

I can report how that several loyal fans approached their Congressman and said they would be glad to contribute \$100 each to finance a lawsuit against Huntley and Brinkley to establish once and for all the innocence of Len Dawson.

Then on Monday about 2:30 p.m. the Chiefs came home. It was my personal misfortune that I could not be at the airport when they arrived but I was able to reach the Liberty Memorial Mall for the public reception. I shall never forget the placards carried by the enthusiastic fans and the signs mounted on cars and trucks. I made some notes late that Monday afternoon and I list them as a part of these remarks to share with my colleagues and to perpetuate for the RECORD as follows:

Kansas City Capped Joe Kapp.  
The Underdog Bites Back.  
Chiefs Scalp the Vikings.  
The Men Who Made the Odds Could Not Play.

What Does Vince Lombardi Think Now?  
If Only Lombardi Was Coaching the Vikings.

We Beat the Best.  
Ya' Done It 'Good Guys'.  
We Love 'Um Chiefs.  
How Sweet It Is.  
Happiness Is Trusting Len Dawson.  
Too Many Chiefs, Not Enough Vikings.  
They Said It Couldn't Be Done.  
Lennie We Love You.  
NFL, What Is That?  
Lennie's No. 1 Guy, No. 1 Quarterback,  
Dawson for President.

Then on the Sunday 1 week after the game the Kansas City Star printed a souvenir special edition about the Chiefs.

Because of this outstanding journalistic effort by the Star's sports editor and his staff I have asked unanimous consent to include such extraneous matter as a part of these remarks. The souvenir edition of Sunday, January 18, contained two outstanding articles. The lead article was by Bill Richardson, a member of the Star's sports staff entitled "The Chiefs: No. 1 . . . The Hard Way" which follows:

THE CHIEFS: NO. 1—THE HARD WAY  
(By Bill Richardson)

Always before it was something that happened to other teams.

Then on January 11, 1970, everything changed for the Kansas City Chiefs. That was the day they went out and slammed the Minnesota Vikings, 23-7, to win the world championship of professional football.

They did it with such workmanlike finality that the expiring American Football League earned a new measure of respect for its membership, and the Chiefs' way of operation gained acceptance as the system by which winning teams should be built.

How did it all happen? Was it inspiration rising from the adversity of the previous months or was it a continuing link in a building program begun a decade before and nourished to maturity through the organizational genius of Hank Stram?

Probably some of the former, but a lot more of the latter went into the success story that was climaxed on Super Sunday in the Sugar Bowl Stadium in New Orleans.

#### INJURIES TAKE A TOLL

For inspiration this year, the Chiefs fought a running battle with adversity. Len Dawson, the 34-year-old quarterback who knows how to run a pro offense, was an almost continual victim of injury and traumatic experiences.

Dawson suffered an injury to his left knee against Boston in the second game of the season and his availability to the Chiefs the rest of the year hung in doubt.

One noted orthopedic surgeon recommended an operation. Another said Dawson might be able to avoid an operation through a process of rehabilitative treatment. Dawson chose the latter course. He returned to action in November after an absence of five games, replacing young Mike Livingston who had provided the leadership inspiration as the Chiefs moved to the top of the A.F.L.'s Western Division.

Dawson sparked a comeback victory over Buffalo and a convincing triumph over San Diego. He led the Chiefs to a 34-16 victory over New York only two days after the death of his father.

On Thanksgiving Day Dawson staked the Chiefs to a lead over Denver and then was forced out of the game when he reinjured his knee in the second quarter. He returned when the Chiefs played Oakland for the Western Division Championship. Dawson was restricted in maneuverability and the Chiefs lost, 10-6, although a ground-oriented attack almost pulled the game out for them. Oakland won the Western Division title but the Chiefs had the play-offs to fall back on.

#### A SUPER DETERMINATION

On the plane ride home from Oakland, Stram set the theme for the post-season surge. He emphasized the loss to the Raiders did not deter the Chiefs from their original goals.

"Back in training camp I said our ambition was to win the American Football League championship and return to the Super Bowl. We can still accomplish this."

With renewed hope, the Chiefs rode a magnificent defensive effort, two big pass plays by Dawson and the kicking of Jan Stenerud and Punter Jerrel Wilson to a 13-6 triumph over the Jets. It was an inspiring victory, one in which New York was stopped on the one-yard line. Joe Namath didn't produce a touchdown.

But the greatest inspiration may have been supplied by the Oakland rivalry. The Chiefs had lost seven of their previous eight games to the Raiders, a discouraging trend that gnawed at the pride of the players and the entire organization.

As the club flew west on December 29 for a week of training in the mild climate of Santa Barbara, Calif., the players took with them a different kind of feeling toward the Raiders. In the past, the Chiefs had felt they were superior, and Oakland had won only because it was given the ball too often on mistakes. There was an undertone of animosity toward the black-shirted division rivals.

But after the 10-6 loss, and a look at the Oakland record (four losses in three years) the Chiefs developed a new attitude toward the Raiders. They concluded that Oakland had a great football team, and the Raiders were winning on hitting, execution and ability rather than on an unending chain of fortunate bounces.

#### SECOND-HALF VICTORY

With these thoughts in mind, the Chiefs moved into the bay area the weekend of January 4 prepared for an afternoon of inspirational football . . . determined that mistakes would not be costly. Not only would they swipe the Raiders' motto of pride and poise, they would throw it back at them.

Kansas City won, 17-7, coming back from

a first half that was so much Oakland dominated it appeared the Raiders should be taking a 21-0 advantage to the dressing room. Just before the half, the Chiefs struck on a 42-yard pass from Dawson to Frank Pitts and Wendell Hayes crashed into the end zone for a score.

In the second half, Robert Holmes swept left end for five yards and a touchdown, and although their 14-7 lead was periled by three fumbles, the Chiefs held on and secured the victory when Stenerud kicked a field goal.

The strong front four exerted tremendous pressure on Daryle Lamonica and the secondary intercepted four Oakland passes.

The Oakland jinx had been broken, an event not to be paled by the realization the Chiefs had won their way into the super bowl.

"There was a lot of inspiration in that game," said Jerry Mays, who with Aaron Brown used inside rushes to harass Lamonica. Brown called it the end of a frustrating period for the Chiefs. "If we had lost, it would have been unbearable," Brown said.

The feeling that beating Oakland was a pinnacle itself in pro football was reflected by Chiefs' players in private conversations before and after the super bowl game.

"Really, we should be playing Oakland again in New Orleans for the world championship," one player confided.

#### NEW CONFIDENCE ARISES

The inspiration built up for the Oakland game subsided slowly, and out of it was born a new confidence for the meeting with Minnesota.

Another crisis involving Dawson developed during super bowl week. A story broke that the quarterback might be called as a witness in a gambling probe because of a casual acquaintanceship with Donald Dawson, no relation, of Detroit.

Chiefs players came out strong in support of Dawson. Stram, quick to meet the crisis head on and Dawson talked about it with the squad at breakfast, thus clearing the air. By Thursday, with the incident losing its intensity, the players began working toward a new emotional peak for the Super Bowl game.

"We haven't been so terrifically emotional as we were for the Oakland game," linebacker Jim Lynch said on the eve of the New Orleans showdown. "For all the distraction we've had down here we're real relaxed—just the way we want to be."

The Minnesota game was a study in workmanlike football. Coach Stram and his aides did their homework well and the players were ready for the task of shutting off 14-point favorite N.F.L. champions.

There was a source of inspiration obtained from the 13-10 exhibition victory scored over the Vikings in August, 1968. "We felt confident we could take them," tackle Buck Buchanan said the night after the big victory. "After all, we'd beaten them before and they didn't outwit us then."

For some of the older hands, vindication for the loss to Green Bay in the inaugural Super Bowl in January, 1967, was important. But generally the game followed a theory advocated by Stram that the upcoming game was the most important.

#### LEVEL EMOTIONS SOUGHT

Hank's effort to eliminate the peaks and valleys had met with notable success during the season. Unlike 1968 when the Chiefs had been routed twice by Oakland, there were no pulverizing losses in 1969. The three Chiefs' defeats had been by a total of 12 points.

This brings up the second important factor in the rise to the world championship—the formulation of a strong defense, a unit that would keep the Chiefs in every game, and no matter what offensive misfortune might befall the club, there would be a defensive unit that could be counted on for resiliency and clutch plays.

It was written long ago that the offense sells tickets, the defense wins games. Stram,

an innovator par excellence on offense, began moving toward defensive excellence in 1965. But the real push came the year after the loss to Green Bay.

The Packers had riddled the Kansas City defense for four touchdowns. Age had crept into the defensive unit, and Stram sought to rebuild through the draft.

His most fantastic stroke came in the 1967 draft. Although the club was low in the selection order, and college scouts said it was a poor year for linebackers, the Chiefs came up with a pair of gems in the second round. They picked Willie Lanier, a hard-hitting middle linebacker from Morgan State of Maryland and Jim Lynch from Notre Dame. Both were to become regulars at the start of the 1968 season, a campaign that saw Stram engineer eight key positional switches. These moves were to be the keystone upon which a championship was to be built the following year.

E. J. Holub, whose knees had been in surgery a total of seven times, moved from outside linebacker to center in 1968 and won the starting job.

#### VITAL JOB FOR BROWN

Aaron Brown, the talented athlete from the University of Minnesota who had played only one full game in two years as a defensive tackle, then saw a trial at running back ended by a training camp injury was placed at defensive right end. "Brown is the key to our season," Stram said when discussing 1968 prospects. Brown adapted well to the position, and by the end of the 1969 season, Sid Gillman of San Diego flatly stated that Brown was the best defensive right end in the league.

Stram had used Buck Buchanan at defensive end during the latter part of the 1967 season, but when 1968 rolled around, Buck returned to tackle, a position where he had won all-league honors.

Emmitt Thomas, a gifted study in versatility as a free agent rookie in 1966, was entrenched at the right cornerback spot after playing both sides on a continuing emergency basis in 1967.

Jim Kearney, a quarterback in college picked up as a free agent when released by Philadelphia in 1967, was placed at strong safety. He had a brief run as a cornerback in the final three games of 1967. With all the switches it appeared the Chiefs would spend a year of trial and error waiting for the revamped defensive unit to jell. It came through sooner than expected. The club set a league record by allowing only 170 points in the 1968 season.

But there was the matter of a 41-6 loss to Oakland in a playoff for the western division championship. The Raiders struck through the air with such proficiency that Stram dedicated 1969 toward improving the secondary.

#### MARSALIS IS NO. 1 CHOICE

The No. 1 draft selection was James Marsalis, who unlike the majority of collegians entering the pros was well trained at cornerback in college. He played the position all four years at Tennessee State. "Marsalis will have to play himself out of the position" somebody remarked. Needless to say, he stayed in it all the way surrendering only three touchdown passes in the regular season.

Another solid link in the defense was built with the development of Curley Culp, a tackle. Culp was acquired the previous year from Denver in exchange for a draft choice. Stram stationed him at tackle, and when Ed Lothamer was injured in an exhibition game in St. Louis, Culp took over as a starter, never to yield his starting position again.

The defensive starters were set with Mays and Brown at ends; Buchanan and Culp at tackles; All-Leaguer Bobby Bell, Lanier and Lynch at linebackers; Marsalis and Thomas on the corners; Kearney at strong safety, and

John Robinson, a heady veteran completing a full-time second season at free safety.

Beginning with the exhibition finale against Atlanta, the starting defensive unit remained intact. Injuries crept up here and there, but always on Sunday the same 11 familiar faces answered the starting bell.

Stram, meanwhile, strengthened his offensive unit with the addition of Mo Moorman at right guard. The rugged dedicated Kentuckian, a No. 1 draft choice after the 1967 season, became a regular as a rookie, and many believe he will become a pro great.

Holub's switch to center solidified that position. Even though his knees were drained twice a week, he came to play every weekend. The offensive line had a cast of sturdy veterans in tackles Dave Hill and Jim Tyrer and guard Ed Budde, along with Fred Arbanas, who returned to tight end for an entire season after an early training camp switch to tackle. Arbanas had another top year at the position he had dominated in recent seasons in the league.

With Dawson, Jacky Lee and Livingston at quarterback, the Chiefs operated their versatile offense, featuring the tight end-I. Stram used Mike Garrett's effectiveness at running out of the I as a key in the attack, and worked two other 5-foot-9 backs, Robert Holmes and Warren McVea, into the system of concealment—and swish!

Wendell Hayes, an effective blocker and slashing runner, was the other running back and he became more valuable as Stram balanced out the size in his backfield in the stretch run.

Otis Taylor, the club's premier receiver who streaked for the knock-out touchdown in the Super Bowl, finished strong after an injury sidelined him for several games during the season. Frank Pitts and Gloster Richardson added to the versatility of the receiving corps with clutch catches in post-season competition.

The Chiefs were fortunate in having a good bench. Specialty performers Ceaser, Belsler, Chuck Hurston, Remi Prudhomme, George Daney, Curtis McClinton, Ed Podolak, Bob Stein, Tom Flores, Goldie Sellers, Willie Mitchell, Gene Trosch and Lothamer were capable of filling in for the starters.

Since Stram stresses the kicking game, the Chiefs carried two specialists and both were valuable. Stenerud, the Norwegian soccer stylist, led the club in scoring and at one stretch booted 16 consecutive field goals while Wilson came through in numerous clutch situations where his punts meant vital field position.

It was a well-balanced club, one capable of overcoming adversity and reaching the heights. The victory over Minnesota last Sunday was a combination of inspiration, organization and determination. On such was a world championship built.

Then Mr. Speaker, the popular sports editor of the Star, Joe McGuff, authored as another lead story his recapitulation of how Len Dawson overcame adversity. His article follows:

#### LEN DAWSON'S CAREER—ADVERSITY MOLDS A HERO

(By Joe McGuff)

It was a scene that left its imprint on the mind just as a flash of white light burns itself into the eye.

The Super Bowl game between Kansas City and Minnesota had been over for 30 minutes or so. Len Dawson stood on a rubbing table in the trainer's room with reporters around him. His son, Len Dawson, Jr., 11, was at his side. A reporter asked Len, Jr., what he thought of his dad.

"He's good" the boy replied with that great gift of candor that only the young possess.

This was the moment that Len Dawson, Sr., had lived and worked for since he was a scrawny high school quarterback in Al-

liance, O. He was the quarterback of a world championship professional football team. Only he, the members of his family and a few close friends could be fully aware of the disappointments, sufferings, and personal slights he had endured to achieve his goal.

"He may not look like it," one of his friends observed earlier in the week, "but Lord is he tough inside."

#### A FIGHT FOR ACHIEVEMENT

Were it not for that quite inner toughness Dawson would never have been standing on that rubbing table explaining how the Chiefs won the Super Bowl game. He is a man to whom nothing has come easily.

In high school he had to overcome the handicap of size. After he was graduated from Purdue University he spent two seasons with the Pittsburgh Steelers and three with the Cleveland Browns. In those five seasons he started only two games, including exhibitions. Never did he start and finish a game.

At this point it appeared he might be finished as a professional football player but his career was rescued when he got an opportunity to go with the Dallas Texans, who were later to become the Chiefs.

He soon developed into an outstanding pro quarterback but he was unable to achieve the recognition to which he was entitled. His critics sneered at him as an N.F.L. cast-off. Even within the A.F.L. he suffered slights. A year ago just ahead of the A.F.L. All-Star game Joe Namath made some comments about the outstanding quarterbacks in the A.F.L. He mentioned Daryle Lamonica, John Hadl and by implication himself but he ignored Dawson.

At the start of the 1969 season Dawson was third on the all-time A.F.L.-N.F.L. list in percentage of completions. He led all quarterbacks in touchdowns per passing attempt. He also led in most touchdowns per completion. He was tied for third place with Bart Starr and Johnny Unitas in the category of average gain per attempt. He ranked seventh in career touchdown passes and 18th in all-time passing yardage despite sitting on the bench for five years at Pittsburgh and Cleveland.

Regardless of his accomplishments Dawson's image was still that of an N.F.L. cast-off. His only chance of changing it was to play on a Super Bowl champion.

#### TEAM SENSES YEAR OF FAME

When the Chiefs reported for the start of practice at William Jewell College in July Dawson and most of his teammates had a feeling that this was going to be their year. Athletic teams seem to have a sixth sense about such things. Sometimes it comes early in the season and sometimes it comes late. With the Chiefs it was there all season.

In the end the Chiefs' premonition was right but little did Dawson realize how difficult his year of vindication was going to be. Seldom if ever has an athlete had to endure what Dawson did.

In the Chiefs' final exhibition game Dawson injured his right hand diving for a fumble. The injury was painful and made it difficult for Dawson to grip the ball but even so he started the season opener against San Diego and led the Chiefs to victory.

The hand slowly improved but against Boston in the second game of the season Dawson was hit while throwing a pass and suffered a knee injury. The knee did not appear to be unusually sore at the time and Dawson did not think too much about it.

The team flew back to Kansas City immediately after the game and it was during the plane trip that the knee began to swell. The pain became severe after Dawson arrived home and he slept fitfully that night.

He was examined the following morning by Dr. Joseph Lichtor, the team orthopedist, who said it appeared Dawson had suffered damage to a tendon. Dr. Lichtor recom-

mended that another opinion be obtained before a decision was made regarding surgery.

Dawson and his wife Jackie, flew to Oklahoma City where he was examined by Dr. Don O'Donoghue, one of the Nation's foremost orthopedic surgeons. Dr. O'Donoghue said the medical collateral ligament, which is located on the inner side of the knee was partly torn and recommended immediate surgery.

#### THIRD OPINION IS SOUGHT

A third examination was performed in Kansas City by Dr. Fred Reynolds of St. Louis, another noted orthopedist. Dr. Reynolds said in his opinion the knee did not require surgery, at least for the time being. He said that if all went well Dawson would be able to play again in five to six weeks. That was what Dawson wanted to hear.

"I wanted to play," Dawson explained near the end of the season. "I had never been out before except for a game or two and I couldn't believe the injury was that bad."

"When you play football you have to live with injuries. I've had a lot of things wrong with me and they have always responded. I felt this injury would react the same way. I've had several injuries that were more painful. I got kicked in the calf of my leg once. It hemorrhaged and I couldn't walk for five days. Last season I bruised my thigh when I was thrown into a goal post. It hemorrhaged, too, and I had a lot of pain with it. I've played with broken ribs and my hands so jammed that I couldn't take the snap from center."

"Since the knee wasn't as painful as those injuries I couldn't register in my mind that it wasn't going to respond. Besides that I don't think anybody likes to be operated on. Football players are no tougher than anyone else when it comes to going under the knife."

Dawson also was influenced by the Chiefs' chances for a winning season.

"I had worked awfully hard this year and things were going well," Dawson explained. "I had a jammed hand earlier but the pain was clearing up. We were going so well as a football team that I couldn't stand the thought of being out an entire season."

"In making my decision I thought it would be better to be out five or six weeks rather than an entire season. I asked myself, if I take five weeks and the knee doesn't respond how much worse am I going to be? Medically I knew it was best to have surgery immediately, but I wasn't 24—I was 34—and I knew I wouldn't be playing this game much longer. If I laid out an entire season I would be a 35-year-old quarterback with a knee operation and that's not a very good position to be in. In the end I guess my strongest motivation was the possibility of us winning and going to the Super Bowl."

#### TO ACTION IN WINTER

Dawson missed five games. He returned to action November 2 against Buffalo, entering the game just before half time. He played the entire second half and led the Chiefs to a 29-7 victory. Dawson went on to start against San Diego, New York, Oakland and Denver.

Dawson suffered a personal tragedy two days before the Jet game when his father passed away. Dawson played one of his greatest games against the Jets and then flew to Alliance, Ohio, for the funeral.

He reinjured his knee in the Denver game and was held out of a December 7 game with Buffalo. The Chiefs ended the season against Oakland in the now famous three-yards and a cloud of controversy game. Dawson went all the way but threw only six times. He went into the game with his knee aching.

The Chiefs met the New York Jets in the first round of the A.F.L. playoffs. The game was played in New York on a cold windy afternoon. Dawson took one of his worst physical beatings, but he outpassed Joe

Namath in the churning winds and the Chiefs played brilliant defense to win, 13-6. Asked afterward if his knee ached Dawson said, "My whole body aches."

Then it was back to Oakland for the A.F.L. championship. By this time Dawson's knee was improved. Oakland scored first but the Chiefs won 17-7, and were back in the Super Bowl.

Just as Dawson was beginning preparations for what was to be the most important game of his life NBC News carried an unsubstantiated story that he and four other professional football players would be called to testify before a Detroit grand jury that was conducting a gambling investigation.

"I was shocked," Dawson said later when asked to give his reaction. "I didn't know what it was all about. I'll bet 90 per cent of the people don't know what it means to be subpoenaed. I wasn't sure myself. As I understand it anyone who has information of any type can be called before a grand jury. The names of most people who are to appear before a grand jury are never made public."

#### MAINTAINS HIS COMPOSURE

Dawson issued a statement in which he said he was innocent of any wrongdoing. Commissioner Pete Rozelle came to his defense. The public lined up solidly behind him. Before the Super Bowl game President Nixon called Hank Stram to say that he knew the rumors involving Dawson were unfounded.

The night before the Super Bowl Dawson came down with the 24-hour virus. He had little or no sleep. Prior to the game he was able to eat a bowl of milk with crackers and a candy bar.

Despite the illness, his lack of sleep and the pressure he played one of his finest games as the Chiefs defeated the Vikings, 23-7. Dawson completed 12 of 17 passes for 172 yards, threw for one touchdown and had only one interception. Dawson was named the game's most valuable player and was awarded a car by Sport Magazine.

This was the same Len Dawson who was so light his sophomore year in high school he wanted to give up football.

"I didn't even want to go out but all of my brothers played football so I did," Dawson recalls. "I was nothing more than a dummy. I held the bag and I was so light they knocked me down and the bag too. The line averaged 200 pounds. I weighed 125. I didn't feel like going on."

This was the same Len Dawson who seldom got off the bench in Pittsburgh and Cleveland.

"I blame myself more than Buddy Parker or Paul Brown for not getting a chance to play with the Steelers and Browns," Dawson explains. "It was a matter of not being aggressive enough. Bobby Layne was at Pittsburgh when I first went there. He had won a championship for Parker. Brown had Milt Plum and he was successful. Both Parker and Brown are one-quarterback coaches. How could I expect them to start me over Layne or Plum."

This was the same Len Dawson who, after establishing himself in the A.F.L. answered N.F.L. people who criticized him by saying, "How can they tell. They haven't seen me play."

Through courage and perseverance Dawson has made it to the top but it has been a long trip for the kid from Alliance who got knocked over with the blocking dummies.

Not to be outdone by our great metropolitan daily, the Kansas City Star, the paper of my home city of Independence, Mo., the Examiner, on its editorial page on Thursday, January 15, carried a well-written editorial bearing the title, "There's No Doubt: Chiefs Are No. 1," which follows:

#### THERE'S NO DOUBT; CHIEFS ARE NO. 1

Those magnificent Chiefs earned the right to say "We're No. 1."

Hank Stram's Warriors went into the Sugar Bowl Sunday and took command of the game against the Vikings right from the start. The Chiefs' deeds on the Sugar Bowl gridiron were all the more fantastic because they were, in effect, playing on the Vikings' home field.

New Orleans has a team in the National Football League and it is only natural that local sentiment there would lie with the NFL representative.

The word coming back from New Orleans indicates that the New Orleans city officials and promoters of the Super Bowl were more than prejudiced toward the Vikings.

It seems that only the Chiefs and the people supporting them from Kansas City expected the Chiefs to win. This may have been an important factor in the outcome of the game.

The Chiefs beat the Jets in New York and the Raiders in Oakland during the playoffs. The American Football League went out of existence in a blaze of glory by the Chiefs trouncing the NFL champions.

Last year, the Jets won the Super Bowl game, but the feats of Joe Namath were seized by the news media and emphasized during subsequent accounts of the game.

This year, the Chiefs' victory was a gigantic team effort which apparently caused the eastern and southern sportswriters and announcers to falter when it came around to writing about a 40-man star.

Let there be no doubt about what all of us out here in the "sticks" know—the Chiefs are No. 1.

In another county of our congressional district which it is my privilege to represent, Bates County, Mo., there is an excellent paper published in Butler, Mo., named the Bates County Democrat. In its editorial of January 15, 1970, headed "It's All Been Said," the editor agreed that after the deluge of accolades there is very little more that can be said except to say congratulations to the Chiefs for a devastating win over the Vikes. That editorial as it appeared in the Bates County Democrat is as follows:

#### IT'S ALL BEEN SAID

The Kansas City Chiefs—world champions of professional football—have been deluged with accolades since their Super Bowl victory until it seems there is little that can be said.

Yet we join the thousands of fans from the Midwest in saluting the mighty Chiefs for an outstanding season, capped, of course, by their 23-7 shellacking of the Minnesota Vikings Sunday.

Throughout most of the fall they performed like the champions they are despite numerous injuries and other adversities. We hope the odds makers, Eastern sportswriters and those who tried to implicate Len Dawson in a gambling scandal, are eating a generous portion of crow, for Hank Stram's crew made chumps out of the lot of them.

Sunday's devastating win over the Vikes unquestionably shows that the AFL's finale was loud and right on tune.

Congratulations, Chiefs, for a tremendous showing!

Over in one of the eastern counties of our district at Warrensburg in Johnson County, Mo., there is published the Daily Star-Journal. This paper has received many honors and recognitions in the past. In my opinion the paper's journalistic excellence was shown again by its editorial of January 12 entitled "Hail to the Chiefs" which appeared in that paper as follows:

#### HAIL TO THE CHIEFS

The Kansas City football Chiefs defeat of the Minnesota Vikings in Super Bowl action yesterday was a victory for all Missouri.

Winning the classic play-off for the world championship of professional football was more than bringing home the title to Kansas City. It was bringing it to Missouri, it was winning for all of us . . . and for that reason we can all well afford to be justly proud.

Perhaps more important than the title, the Chiefs brought to Missouri no small amount of attention. Long considered an underdog in many other aspects, Missouri, through the Chiefs, proved that fighting spirit can and does come through.

The Daily Star-Journal believes that the fighting spirit displayed in the Sunday football game by the Kansas City Chiefs was indicative of the same spirit of the State of Missouri.

Perhaps we are not the most populous state in the Nation, nor even the most affluent in financial or natural resources . . . but we use what we have, fighting hard to achieve success even against difficult odds.

Perhaps what Hank Stram, head coach of the Chiefs, said about the team holds true of Missouri. He said that it was adversity which had molded the character of the team, that had made it strong.

Perhaps adversity too, will continue to keep Missouri strong, keep it pitched to a winning fever in many ways.

Before I conclude these remarks it should be observed again that football is the king of sports in the Kansas City area. Other sports have their place. Baseball, ice hockey, and even soccer flourish in Kansas City. Someone has said it was because of Hank Stram, Dawson, and the great Chiefs' organization that it is possible for all Kansas City to bask in the assurance that the 1970 Super Bowl champions represent a city that has elevated sports from a pastime to something close to a religious experience. There is a strong relationship in our area between the team and the fans. Each relies upon the other to gain strength. I feel certain our great team would have been given a warm reception had they returned to Kansas City not as champions but as gallant losers.

The Chiefs of Kansas City on Sunday, January 11, reached the peak of the pro-football world. Let us hope that years from now as the historians look into the archives they will take a close look at the events of Sunday, January 11, 1970, in the city of New Orleans. The careful historian will record that the second Sunday in January of the first month of the new decade will forever be known in the hearts and minds of everyone in Mid-America as Super-Sunday 1970.

#### ENVIRONMENTAL POLLUTION

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

Mr. PRICE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, my active interest in environmental pollution is a matter of public record. As I stated in the first session of this Congress—

Pollution is a lethal menace to all mankind, and its eradication can best be accomplished if the world works together. Pollution cannot be stopped on a nation-by-nation trial and error basis. The nations of the world

must work together; the stakes are too high for any other approach.

The responsibility of the United States for environmental control is great. As a nation and as people, we have carelessly and thoughtlessly set in motion forces that threaten to ruin the air we breathe and the water we drink.

Fortunately for mankind, the Nation and the world is awakening to the menace that pollution poses to our very existence. Through the worldwide activities of the international biological program, which the United States supports, more than 50 concerned nations are striving to provide a truly international basis for managing the environment and preventing its further deterioration.

On the domestic front there are certain encouraging signs that the pollution problem is being upgraded in terms of national priorities. While Congress was in recess President Nixon, in his first official act of 1970, signed into law legislation to establish a three-member Council on Environmental Quality. The Council will pursue and recommend policies and programs designed to improve the quality of our environment. During the same period Secretary of State William Rogers announced the creation of an Office of Environmental Affairs in the State Department. The Secretary also urged all American ambassadors to watch for opportunities for the United States to take the initiative in both conserving the natural resources of the world and enhancing the environment.

These actions mark but the beginning of a series of administration attacks on pollution. In this connection, the President's impending state of the Union message should provide the Nation with more of an idea how the Federal Government plans to cope in the seventies with this growing menace.

Our citizens are looking to the Congress and their elected officials for guidance and initiative on this issue. Unfortunately, the Congress has not responded with adequate speed or diligence. One of the chief reasons for this failure lies in the fact that in the House, responsibility for environmental legislation is shared among the Committees on the Interior, Public Works, Merchant Marine and Fisheries, Government Operations, and Science and Astronautics. Given this congressional fragmentation, there is small wonder that the legislative attack on pollution is in such a state of disarray.

In an effort to rectify this condition, I propose that congressional responsibility on the House side be focused in a new Standing Committee on the Environment. As I conceive it, and I know my view is shared by a number of my colleagues, this committee would have jurisdiction over key environmental problems which presently beset the Nation and the world. Within its jurisdiction, the committee would investigate causes and consequences of environmental pollution and would be charged with recommending legislation designed to combat this growing menace.

I believe that the establishment of a House Committee on the Environment would constitute a significant step toward combating the problems caused by

environmental pollution. For this reason, I am today introducing, for appropriate reference, legislation which would establish such a committee in the House of Representatives. I urge the House Rules Committee to hold early hearings on this proposal as well as those submitted by other concerned Members of Congress. We must set our legislative house in order if we expect to save our environment for the use and benefit of ourselves and our posterity.

The legislation referred to follows:

H. RES. —

A resolution to amend the Rules of the House of Representatives to create a standing committee to be known as the Committee on the Environment

Resolved, That clause 1 of Rule X of the Rules of the House of Representatives is amended by redesignating paragraphs (g) through (u) as paragraphs (h) through (v), respectively, and by inserting immediately after paragraph (f) the following new paragraph:

"(g) Committee on the Environment, to consist of twenty-five members."

Sec. 2. Rule XI of the Rules of the House of Representatives is amended by redesignating clauses (7) through (31) as clauses (8) through (32), respectively, and by inserting immediately after clause (6) the following:

"7. Committee on the Environment.

"(a) All measures relating to the quality of the physical environment of the United States and its possessions, including—

"(A) Water quality,

"(B) Air quality,

"(C) Weather modification,

"(D) Waste disposal,

"(E) Pesticides and herbicides, and

"(F) Acoustic problems."

Sec. 3. Redesignated clause 17 of Rule XI of the Rules of the House of Representatives is amended by striking out paragraph (f) and redesignating paragraphs (g) through (j) as paragraphs (f) through (i), respectively.

Sec. 4. (a) Redesignated clause 28(j) of Rule XI of the Rules of the House of Representatives is amended by striking out "clause 27" and inserting in lieu thereof "clause 28".

(b) Clause 2 of Rule XIII of the Rules of the House of Representatives is amended by striking out "clause 22 of Rule XI" and inserting in lieu thereof "clause 23 of Rule XI."

#### GENERAL ELECTRIC CORP. LABOR DISPUTE

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

Mr. DENT. Mr. Speaker, many of the workers in my area are very much disturbed over the reported position of the General Electric Corp., in the present labor dispute between the workers and their employer.

As an indication of their attitude, they refuse to accept a proposal made by Senator JAVITS of New York, approved by the workers, whereby a disinterested outside factfinding group would try to lay the basis for an early settlement.

When a situation becomes as stalemated as this dispute has, something must be done before severe and adverse conditions set in which may cost many jobs due to a declining market for American made goods at this moment. There is a growing suspicion that the administration is not disturbed over this long

shutdown by GE since it apparently falls into the President's plan for what is called a "slight recession." What the President, or his economic advisers do not seem to understand is that while General Electric, as a company, will not suffer too much, workers who have no other source of income can be pushed to the brink of financial difficulty since the products they would normally produce can be, and in many instances are, produced by foreign workers, and are distributed in the United States without any restraint.

The dispute is no longer between two parties, labor and industry, for there is an unseen man at the bargaining table, and that is the low-waged worker whose goods are tumbling over our custom walls at an unrestricted volume.

Unless something along the lines of Senator JAVITS' proposal is put to work in the interest of a solution to this long drawn out dispute, it is feared that other corporations in the same area of production and activity will follow the GE workers and a complete shutdown of this particular industry may come about shortly.

Congress may be forced, if this situation becomes more acute, into passing legislation forbidding any corporation, or any production facility engaged in a labor dispute, from importing from foreign countries, or from American industries domiciled abroad, products to meet their consumer demands.

A strike has long been recognized as a legitimate, legal endeavor by workers to better their working conditions, and to maintain their cost of living income. A strike, however, to be effective must have within it ingredients of solution, namely the desire by the industry to expedite the settlement, and to work out the differences at the grievance and bargaining table.

In the worldwide trade economy, however, this normal procedure is no longer obtainable, especially so when so many companies like GE have foreign sources of product supply while the unions have no tools at their command to compel foreign workers to join in their efforts, and to protect their work rights and job rights during a labor dispute. In fact, foreign workers would take advantage of labor disputes in this country to encroach upon the American marketplace, and it is well known that once establishing its place of supply the American businessman is reluctant to let go of the high selling price of low waged foreign imports.

It is interesting to note that in the first months of 1969, television sets, one of GE's major consumer items, reached a dangerous level of low sales because of Japanese penetration into the American marketplace. The first 10 months of 1969 importation of colored and black and white television sets, from Japan, reached an astonishing volume. The total U.S. television sales of domestic TV sets for the first 10 months of 1969 was 8,690,000, which was a decrease of 3.2 percent of that same period in 1968. While these sets are of a domestic level they include many thousands of sets, made, entirely or in part, in Japan, Taiwan, and so

forth. This gives some clue to what happened to the American TV and TV components industry, and why there are only six large and two small plants left making TV sets and tubes.

During these same 10 months Japan exported to us 2,700,000 sets and increased their sales by 32.8 percent.

Those of us who live in the Westinghouse valley realize that the GE strike has cast a long shadow. I would ask that GE, at this time, look at the Javits proposal, or some similar arrangement whereby an outside factor could establish a basis for settlement in which both sides could reach a mutual agreement. The longer it goes the more dangerous and more costly it will become to the American economy.

The Government's own figures, just released, shows a letdown in production of 3.2 percent in the last quarter of 1969, and attributed over one-half of the letdown in production to the strike.

While it may serve the Nixon administration to cool off the economy by letting the workers walk the streets, and to spend millions of dollars to retrain workers for jobs that may not be there when the job training is over, it is not equitable to the worker. For example: the Department of Labor gave grants to 11 cities, to train 426 persons, totaling \$871,000. One of the contracts went to three firms in Washington, D.C., for a total of \$130,000 to train 53 hard-core jobless persons. Most of these people are receiving training in electrical supplies, and expect to work for electric supply companies, the very product that GE is not making at the moment. With the cutback of this type of supply, where will these people go when they finish their training?

If this GE strike continues, labor may find itself in a position where they may have to review their longstanding position on free trade.

The right to strike is useless if the company prospers while the workingman starves, and the worker realizes that he has to pay for any advance he makes in his working conditions. If the GE strike continues, other American industries, with foreign affiliations, will follow the GE pattern; and labor negotiations, as we have known them to be in this country, will disappear and instead we will have unemployment and a depression that can shake the very foundation of our democracy. Unless this situation is resolved, and an attempt is made along the lines of Senator JAVITS' proposal, I intend to propose to Chairman PERKINS, of our committee, that he hold hearings on the matter to see what type of legislation is needed to protect a worker's job in a labor dispute.

#### NINE BLIND MEN

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

Mr. BRINKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I wish to quote one famous man and paraphrase another in an advocacy for justice in the field of education.

Robert E. Lee once said:

True patriotism sometimes requires of men to act exactly contrary, at one period, to

that which it does at another, and the motive which impels them—the desire to do right—is precisely the same. The circumstances which govern their actions change; and their conduct must conform to the new order of things.

Many of you, on an earlier day, were involved in the fight to end the dual system concept of schools. Today, when opposite extremes are sought to be achieved through quotas and busing, will you—motivated by a desire to do right—join in ending social experiment and reform in the classroom?

*Rightness* requires judicial equity within the Union of the States; *rightness* requires uniform decrees under a nationwide standard; *rightness* requires one set of rules, rather than two.

My appeal, first, is for the right of choice; or in the alternative, my appeal is for neighborhood schools—for every child the right to attend the school nearest his home.

Earlier this week I introduced a joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution. It would provide as follows:

#### ARTICLE —

SECTION 1. The involuntary busing of any student to a school or the required attendance of any student at a school outside the student's local school zone for the purpose of achieving racial balances or quotas is prohibited.

SECTION 2. For the purposes of this article, the term 'local school zone' shall mean the area within which a student resides.

Would you consider supporting this resolution? It would prevent our schools from becoming laboratories for social experiment and reform. It would retain educational institutions as places for the pursuit of scholastic excellence and achievement. Its goal is quality education.

Reasonable men, men of good will, please take cognizance of nine blind men on a courthouse bench, ought for ought, and in 1970 one last chance for justice!

I would like to quote at this point a column written by me earlier in the session:

#### DATLINE WASHINGTON

(By Jack Brinkley, Third District Representative in Congress)

#### PURSE STRING BILL

On November 5, 1969 I introduced the following bill, Number H.R. 14691, designed to prohibit the use of Federal funds to force busing of students, abolishment of schools, or attendance of students at particular schools. The measure would provide as follows:

"Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That (a) no part of any funds appropriated by any Act of Congress may be used to force busing of students, the abolishment of any school, or to force any student attending any elementary or secondary school to attend a particular school against the choice of his or her parents or parent.

"(b) No part of any funds appropriated by any Act of Congress shall be used to force busing of students, the abolishment of any school, or the attendance of students at a particular school as a condition precedent to obtaining Federal funds otherwise available to any State, school district, or school."

This legislation would make permanent the provisions contained in Sections 408 and 409 of H.R. 13111, as it passed the House, which Bill provides persuasive precedent. Thus, federal agencies such as the Justice

Department and HEW would be prohibited from spending Federal funds to force the busing of students, the abolishment of any school or to force any student to attend a particular school against the choice of his parents.

The bill would in no way affect or question the legality of Supreme Court decisions but as a practical matter it would prevent enforcement by the Executive Branch of decrees conflicting with the Act, since persons receiving compensation from the federal government could not be used for enforcement purposes.

This measure reiterates the Constitutional prerogative of the Legislative Branch of government to provide funding where deemed wise and equitable, and serves to emphasize that the schools of the southern United States are not to be used as laboratories for social experiment and reform.

The thrust of educational institutions should be the pursuit of scholastic excellence for every child. We must never voluntarily permit our schools to become a vehicle for racial balance or for any objective other than quality education.

I would like to include at this point the following news article:

[From the Washington Daily News, Dec. 17, 1969]

#### AMENDMENT ON APPROPRIATION BILL—HEW SCHOOL FUND CONTROL PERILED (By William Stelf)

The Nixon Administration—after months of inaction—was lobbying hard today to stop a Southern-inspired Senate drive aimed at revoking the power of HEW to force school districts to abide by the civil rights act of 1964.

The revocation of HEW's power was contained in a seemingly innocuous amendment to the \$21.5 billion appropriations bill for HEW, the Labor Department and 11 related agencies.

The so-called Whitten amendment—named after Rep. Jamie L. Whitten, D-Miss., and already approved by the House—would forbid HEW from using any of its appropriation "to force any school district to take any actions involving the busing of students, the abolishment of any school, or the assignment" of any grade or high school student to a school against his or his parents' choice. Nor could such actions be forced on a school district "as a condition" to getting federal funds.

Under the 1964 civil rights act, HEW has the power to cut off federal funds to school districts which do not comply with the desegregation law.

Thus, the amendment also would nullify the May, 1968, Supreme Court ruling which said that where "free choice" of schools by pupils did not result in desegregation, further steps would have to be taken. Those steps are busing of students, abolishing black or white schools, or arbitrarily assigning pupils.

HEW Secretary Robert H. Finch sent telegrams and then wrote letters to members of the appropriations sub-committee which handled his money bill about his "deep concern" over the Whitten amendment. HEW has followed this up with an intensive arm-twisting effort by Assistant Secretary Creed C. Black, director Leon Panetta of the Office for Civil Rights, and congressional liaison officials.

But yesterday the full appropriations committee approved the Whitten Amendment, 13-8, according to Sen. John C. Stennis, D-Miss., a committee member who led the floor fight for its adoption by the Senate.

The issue hung in the balance today, as the Senate Republican leader, Sen. Hugh Scott, Pa., fought to hang six simple words in front of the Whitten phraseology in order to negate the amendment's effect.

The six words were: "Except as required by the Constitution."

Sen. Scott explained that "the issue is simply whether or not we will abide by the constitution." He said that "if there were any question in anyone's mind about the propriety" of the Whitten amendment, the Oct. 29 Supreme Court decision—demanding desegregation "at once"—should remove that question.

"If we leave the Whitten amendment intact," Scott added, "we will produce a double standard of law enforcement . . . what HEW will not be able to do, the courts will still be forced to do."

As we now know, the Whitten amendment was not left intact; the Scott amendment was adopted.

King David said:

I have been young, and I have been old, but I have never seen the righteous forsaken.

Will we be forsaken? Will our children be abused? Forbid it, Almighty God!

#### AMEND VETERANS' PATENT EXTENSION ACT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. HAMILTON) is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. HAMILTON. Mr. Speaker, an act to provide for the extension of the term of certain patents of persons who served in the military or naval forces of the United States during World War II was approved June 30, 1950. An act providing similar patent-extension privileges to veterans of World War I was approved May 31, 1928. No similar legislation, either retroactive or prospective in application, has been approved for veterans honorably discharged since World War II. It is only equitable that these privileges now be extended to all veterans.

Hearings were held in the 82d Congress on bills to extend the benefits of this legislation to all veterans, rather than only to those of the two World Wars, as well as to nonveterans who were not able to exploit their patents fully due to wartime controls. Although there was no objection to making the relief provisions available to all veterans, objection was made to extending the privilege to corporations and other individuals, with the result that the legislation was never acted upon.

H.R. 15793, introduced by the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. PORFF) in the last Congress, provided for the extension of the privileges to all veterans honorably discharged while at the same time omitting extension of the privilege to corporations and other individuals. On February 18, 1969, Mr. BAYH introduced a similar bill, S. 1064, in the other body. On November 17, 1969, I introduced H.R. 14833, identical to that introduced by Mr. BAYH. These bills, in my judgment, meet the obligations raised in hearings held by the 82d Congress.

Veterans deserve extensions of time for patents they have not been able to exploit because of military service. They would not gain an advantage over patent holders who have not served in the Armed Forces of their country.

To be eligible, any veteran would have to be honorably discharged and would have to prove, to the satisfaction of the Commissioner of Patents, that his military service had indeed "substantially re-

duced" any benefits he might have been able otherwise to receive from his patent. The ultimate burden of proof rests upon the veteran. There would be no cost to the Government.

Unlike laws extending similar privileges to veterans of the two World Wars, the bill introduced in the 91st Congress includes two new provisions. First, their application would not be limited to those who served during specific years. Rather, all veterans who have not yet benefited from earlier legislation would be eligible in the future. Second, a veteran could count as active service, for the purpose of this bill, all time which elapsed between his initial induction and his final honorable discharge. This second new provision would extend coverage to those unfortunate veterans who, because of erroneous charges and action taken against them, have been forced to live under the shadow of a less-than-honorable discharge until able to have such judgment reversed and an honorable discharge granted.

Rather than considering this question anew following the end of each conflict in which we participate, let us act now to extend the provisions to all veterans who have not benefited from previously enacted legislation.

H.R. 14833, as introduced November 17, 1969, follows:

H.R. 14833

A bill to provide for the extension of the term of certain patents of persons who served in the military forces of the United States

*Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,* That section 1 of the Act entitled "An Act to provide for the extension of the term of certain patents of persons who served in the military or naval forces of the United States during World War II," approved June 30, 1950 (64 Stat. 316), as amended, is amended to read as follows:

"Any person who is the inventor or discoverer of an invention or discovery for which a patent was granted to him during his performance of active service in the military or naval forces of the United States resulting in an honorable discharge and who has not received a patent extension under any previous Act, and who during such service was not receiving income from said patent or patented invention or discovery, or whose income therefrom was substantially reduced as a result of his said service, may obtain an extension of his patent for the term specified herein, upon application to the Commissioner of Patents within one year after the enactment of this Act or within one year after the termination of such service, whichever is later, and upon complying with the provisions of this Act. The period of extension of such patent shall be a further term from the expiration of the original term thereof equaling the length of the said service during which his patent was in force, but in no event shall exceed a period equal to the term of the original patent. Any period of time required following said service to obtain recognition of the right of such a person to an honorable discharge shall be considered part of such service."

Section 5 of said Act is amended by striking out "(a) No" and by striking out subsection (b).

#### WALLACE CIVIC CENTER

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentle-

man from Massachusetts (Mr. PHILBIN) is recognized for 20 minutes.

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, on Sunday night in Fitchburg, Mass., in my district, I attended the first of several programs to be held during this week marking the dedication of the George R. Wallace, Jr., Civic Center and the Alice G. Wallace Planetarium in that beautiful city.

The building which houses the center of which the planetarium is a part, was donated by Mr. George R. Wallace, Jr., an outstanding industrial civic leader of Massachusetts and the Nation, in behalf of his wife and himself, the planetarium to be named in honor of his wife, Alice R. Wallace.

This gift, which would be extraordinary in any event, is all the more so, because in September 1965 Mr. Wallace had donated \$500,000 for the construction of the modern, new Wallace Library and later gave additional sums for both the library and the civic center, so these highly valuable public buildings could be completed for his home city. The gifts totaled several million dollars without Government grants.

George Wallace's colorful business career has been an exceptional success story pinpointed by a series of most generous benefactors and public, charitable donations that are not fully known and, therefore, cannot be accurately reported. His recent gift of the civic center in itself has cost to date \$2,035,000, to which the cost of the library is not added, and the total final cost is at the present time not available. The present final cost may well run into higher figures. The public spirit and wholehearted generosity of this great man and his lovely wife are truly almost incredible.

To one who knows this extraordinary leader in so many fields of endeavors and his charming, delightful wife, who is also a great leader in several fields, particularly as the well-known originator and developer of basic local, State, and National library programs, these benefactions come as no surprise, because George Wallace has been a doer and a giver all his life. He is endowed with a restless spirit with energy and drive that tolerate no delay, and his wife, like himself, is known for the way she has given so much of herself to provide more and better libraries for children, and for the people of Fitchburg, central Massachusetts, and all of the Nation.

I have known these wonderful Americans a large part of my lifetime. They really defy adequate appraisal for the many fine things they have done for humankind, and for their many achievements and many contributions to so many causes immeasurably beneficial to community, State, and Nation, and for many people.

George Wallace never seeks praise and credit for his great work. In fact, he tries to minimize, and even conceal, the great things that he has done, and his wife takes the same attitude.

For example, when he announced his most recent large gifts to the city, he purposely left the city on a trip with his wife rather than face the applause and the praise for his generosity.

His makeup is not only many sided, but in many ways unpredictable, because he moves fast and brooks no de-

lay. He is a master of details as well as broad pictures, and has everything thought out in advance. The library and civic center were rushed to completion in true Wallace style, the latter large building in a little over 200 days.

His astonishing success in business has been a family saga in itself, and his very active life has pressed him into many other various activities.

He is an accomplished musician, and plays the piano and organ with great gusto and expertise. His performance as mystery soloist with the Boston Pops Orchestra led by the great Arthur Fiedler, featuring a routine of lively ragtime, swing-beat music, and other popular hits, brought the large crowd of 4,600 people at the dedication to their feet with wild applause. A conquering hero never received such terrific ovations.

He is an expert photographer; in fact, he may even be considered a professional in this field, because his work has been done on African safaris featuring still and movie productions of highest quality.

George Wallace is a veteran of World War II, decorated for gallantry in battle. He has been a widely known aviation enthusiast. He has owned and flown his own planes and helicopters. At his office building at the Fitchburg Paper Co. he has a heliport on the roof. I had the honor of attending the dedication of that beautiful new building and was present when George came in on one of his helicopters, landed on the roof, and casually walked down the stairway to his business office.

On another occasion, I had lunch with him at the Sterling Inn in Sterling, Mass., with N. V. "Swede" Nelson, a Harvard football great, and some others, and when he arrived by helicopter with some of his guests he landed in the parking space and hurried into the inn. "Swede" Nelson, a noted wit, quietly observed, "A lovely entrance."

George Wallace ranks with the greatest businessmen of the Nation. He is a great American and a great patriot. Indeed, with his truly spiritual faith, and charitable impulses, he sets the finest example for all citizens, because his life has been devoted to getting things done, and giving unselfishly of himself. It is his avowed practice to help his people in every way given him, and to share his good fortune with his community and with people.

His devoted, lovely wife, Alice, is of the same mold. She has not only supported her husband in his great work, but has also pursued a career of her own, which has led her to the path of high achievement for the children and people of her own community and for the Nation. She is recognized as one of the greatest national leaders of library programs and has been an outstanding member of the President's National Commission on Libraries. She has also ably devoted herself to many fine causes in many fields.

I could talk at great length about the extraordinary George Wallace and his lovely wife. I am proud to know such great Americans, and am proud to have them for dear friends, because they rep-

resent a public conscience and an ethic of charity and humane accomplishment for people that cross all barriers and reconcile human problems.

They are concerned, outstanding, generous Americans, truly striving to contribute the substance of their advantages, potentials and wealth to make this a better nation in which to live.

Hail and salute to George and Alice Wallace. They will long be remembered by Fitchburg and its people, and by all those who search and seek in life the opportunity to help others. The Lord will bless them, and the people will always remember them.

The exercises were brilliantly conducted by the very able, distinguished, outstanding young mayor, the Honorable William G. Flynn, of Fitchburg, whose fine introductory speech set the stage for this memorable dedicatory event.

Under unanimous consent, I insert the following material from the Worcester Sunday Telegram, and other publications bearing upon the dedication:

[From the Worcester (Mass.) Sunday Telegram, Jan. 18, 1970]

#### THE GEORGE R. WALLACE CIVIC CENTER: A CULTURAL INJECTION

FITCHBURG.—He's floated 50 feet beneath the surface of the Caribbean and glided over Mt. Washington in a sailplane.

He's raised chinchillas and collected antique cars.

He's an explorer, world traveler . . . a former industrialist and a builder of companies.

And in his spare time he and his wife give away things like money.

His wife has served on former President Johnson's National Advisory Commission on Libraries and was a founder of the Massachusetts Library Trustees Association.

#### IN "WHO'S WHO"

She's listed in "Who's Who of American Women" and has served on road study and beautification committees.

She is an accomplished interior decorator and an extensive traveler.

Like her husband, she enjoys giving away money.

These are the Wallaces—George and Alice—of Fitchburg and their generosity is proving a boon to this community.

Wallace, born in 1889, has been described as "peppery and forthright" and is noted for his freewheeling business style.

#### ENTERED MIT

He entered Massachusetts Institute of Technology in the class of 1913. His stay was short.

"I was the first member of my class to be kicked out," he said. "They couldn't take me for more than a year."

"But I did get in a lot of banjo playing."

Wallace still retains an irrepressible sense of humor and an irreverence for the accepted way of doing things.

He had one urge—"to be first"—and a lifelong concern "with the idea of failure" and those two thoughts have governed his life.

The former owner-president of Fitchburg Paper Co. (now a subsidiary of Litton Industries), Wallace is a fan of airplanes and helicopters and used them both extensively during his years as head of Fitchburg Paper Co.

He enlisted in World War I as a private and even though he "didn't like saluting" he ended up a major in the Field Artillery, receiving the Silver Star for exceptional gallantry in the Meuse-Argonne offensive.

Wallace is also an avid photographer and has thousands of feet of film of African safaris and Arctic Circle crossings with his wife to prove his photographic ability.

#### BUILDING THINGS

And when not traveling or attending board meetings or playing the electric organ in his home, Wallace is building things.

Both he and his wife have spent millions financing construction of a library, aiding in the establishment of a golden age center and now, with the construction of a \$2.35-million combination civic center and planetarium.

In announcing his intention to finance construction of the civic center Wallace had stated, "as we are now penetrating the frontiers of outer space . . . I propose to include in this civic center complex a space transit planetarium."

#### CONDITION FOR GIFT

A condition for the gift was that the planetarium be named for his wife.

"Her tremendous interest in the welfare of the people in this community and her understanding and help to me over the years makes it an extremely rewarding experience for me to offer this gift to the city," he said.

And after he announced that he and his wife were donating the funds to build the center, they left immediately for Florida.

"He gets embarrassed when people thank him for what he does," one city official explained.

A scale model of the \$2.35-million George R. Wallace Civic Center sits on a small table in the outer office of Fitchburg Mayor William G. Flynn.

The model, complete with shrubs and grass and a truck parked at the rear delivery ramp of the center, is protected by a heavy plastic covering.

The plastic is wiped down frequently because of the number of sets of fingerprints left by those who stop and stare at the model complex. The attention lavished upon the civic center is making Mayor Flynn a happy man.

#### CULTURAL INJECTION

"It's almost difficult to comprehend the full meaning of the center," Mayor Flynn said. "The center will give us a cultural injection . . . something which is needed by any older city. It will give us the prodding to stick our heads out of the door and see what the rest of the world looks like."

Mayor Flynn said the civic center should cause a greater cohesiveness within the city than is now apparent.

"We're going to have to reassess our community image, because when the center opens for business, we're going to find ourselves being stared at by many outside groups."

#### MIND-BODY CONCEPT

Flynn added that he was "very excited" about the complex, which will contain a "true mind-body concept."

The multipurpose civic center, financed entirely by the local philanthropist George R. Wallace Jr., contains facilities for skating, ice hockey and basketball. It has a seating capacity of 4,500.

The recreation area is but half of the total mind-body concept. Included in the package is a 150-seat planetarium.

"The educational possibilities offered by the planetarium are staggering," Mayor Flynn said. "We expect many school children from Central Massachusetts will be visiting the planetarium."

A panoramic view of the galaxies—in color and costing some \$10,000—will grace the planetarium dome.

#### GIFTS BY WALLACE

The civic center is a monument to a dapper, white-haired octogenarian whose love of life has never slackened.

About a year ago Wallace called a press conference to announce, "I am donating to the city of Fitchburg the sum of \$1.1 million to build a civic center and planetarium." When bids were submitted and the cost was seen to be more than double the original gift,

Wallace contributed an additional \$1.2 million to cover construction costs.

In the auditorium, across from the Registry of Motor Vehicles, workmen are completing the job in record time. The ladders and shovels will be gone tonight. Missing, too, will be scraps of wood and brushes and cans and carpenters' tools.

In only 13 months an idea was born and a building was erected.

"That has to be some sort of a record," one of the subcontractors said, "when you can plan and put up a thing like this in 13 months."

#### OTHER GIFTS

The complex, about the size of a football field, is not the only contribution of the Wallaces (the planetarium is named the Alice G. Wallace Planetarium after Wallace's wife) to the cultural progress of their community.

In 1964 they had donated \$500,000 for construction of a new library and three years later contributed another quarter-million dollars for improvements in the public library.

[From the Worcester (Mass.) Sunday Telegram, Jan. 18, 1970]

#### WEEK'S ACTIVITIES

##### SUNDAY

Dedication ceremonies at 8 p.m. with a performance by the Boston Pops Orchestra conducted by Arthur Fiedler (sold out).

##### MONDAY

A repeat of the dedication ceremonies at 8 p.m. with a performance by the Pops which will play a new selection. Tickets, \$4, \$5 and \$7, may still be available at the Book Shop and Fitchburg Music Store.

##### WEDNESDAY

A country and western show at 8 p.m. Featured are Loretta Lynn and Faron Young and his Deputies, Carl Smith, Peggy Sue, Sonny Wright and Roy Drusky. Tickets are \$2, \$3 and \$4.

##### SATURDAY

A children's 12:30 p.m. show with Bozo the Clown, a five-piece circus band, Joe Phillips and his dancing horse and wonder dogs, and the Six Amandis, an acrobatic act. Tickets are \$1.50 for adults and 50 cents for children. The Vanilla Fudge and Bacchus will play hard rock starting at 8:30. Master of ceremonies will be Ron Landry of Radio Station WBZ. Tickets are \$3.50, \$4.50 and \$5.50.

##### SUNDAY

Dedication ceremonies at 8:15 p.m. for the Alice G. Wallace Planetarium. Featured will be Richard Gordon, command pilot of the Apollo 12 moon flight. Apollo 12 movies of the moon landing and walk will be shown. Sen. Edward W. Brooke will be present, as will the Kingsmen and the Fitchburg High School Band. There is no admission charge.

#### GEORGE R. WALLACE JR., CIVIC CENTER, ALICE G. WALLACE PLANETARIUM

Tomorrow and the day after have always been uppermost in the mind of George R. Wallace, Jr. He has never been one to sit back and dream of what used to be; instead he has always searched to do that which is unique and unusual.

The history, spirit, and purpose of the George R. Wallace, Jr. Civic Center and the Alice G. Wallace Planetarium reflects in every way the enthusiasm, creativeness, and adventuresome spirit that is George R. Wallace, Jr.

On September 13, 1965, Mr. Wallace donated \$500,000 for construction of the modern new Wallace Library on Main Street. It was during the process of constructing the Wallace Library that a discussion concerning the need for a community facility for general purpose meetings and activities developed. At that time Mr. Wallace donated \$300,000 for a community center. This mon-

ey was to be matched with \$600,000 in federal funds for construction of the facility.

After much work by the Fitchburg Neighborhood Facilities Commission, a general concept of an arena style building was developed. However, federal funds were not available. After a three year delay, it was Mr. Wallace's desire to have construction actually begin on an appropriate Civic Center Complex.

Following discussions with Mayor Flynn, Mr. Wallace announced his desire to have a Civic Center that would serve as a generator of community activity and involvement. Preliminary concepts were prepared for Mr. Wallace by Whitman & Howard, Architects and Engineers of Boston. The original design included only an arena area.

Early in December of 1968, Mr. Wallace related his desire to have a planetarium included as part of the Wallace Library, but when site limitations at the library became obvious the idea was dropped. More recently he felt that a planetarium would be an outstanding addition to the Civic Center Complex and asked that it be named in honor of his wife Alice. Thus the Alice G. Wallace Planetarium is given to the citizens of Fitchburg as a gift from George Wallace to honor his wife Alice.

The Wallace Center Complex, as presently constructed, was conceived in December 1968, designed from January to April 1969, put out for bids from April to May 1969, and constructed from June 1969 to January 1970.

The planning, construction and operation of the building itself is one of the finest examples of community organization and of the cooperation of many dedicated citizens that could be cited today.

In every way the George R. Wallace, Jr. Civic Center and Alice G. Wallace Planetarium has already become a living tribute to the uniqueness, aggressiveness, creativity, enthusiasm, and kind spirit that is George R. Wallace, Jr.

#### TRUSTEES

The trustees of the George R. Wallace, Jr. Civic Center and the Alice G. Wallace Planetarium are Robert A. Shaughnessy, Joseph E. Madonia, Leo J. Bedard, Mayor William G. Flynn, Ronald M. Ansin, Councilor Joseph Albert, Matthias W. Pappas. Back row left to right: James J. Hammond, James M. Moran, Geldert S. Brown, Robert L. Halstead, Robert E. Humphreys, George I. Chatfield, Donald M. Crocker, Andre A. Gelnas. Trustees who were not present when the picture was taken: Walter E. Bennett, Charles J. Sala.

#### LEGISLATIVE INCORPORATION OF THE CIVIC CENTER AUTHORITY

The George R. Wallace, Jr. Civic Center and the Alice G. Wallace Planetarium is an unusual building in many ways. Legally it is the property of the City of Fitchburg. However, unlike other city departments and buildings, the Wallace Center does not operate under the control of the Mayor or City Council, nor does it receive operating funds from the city government.

Under the provisions of Chapter 695, Acts of 1996 of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, the George R. Wallace, Jr. Civic Center and Alice G. Wallace Planetarium Corporation was created. This Act, which was initiated by the Mayor and City Council on April 29, 1969, provides for the Center to be administered by a seventeen member Board of Trustees. The Mayor serves as ex-officio chairman of the Board and the City Council President is an ex-officio member. As a special feature of the act, three members of the Board may be non-residents of Fitchburg. This provision was included to signify the regional character of the Wallace Center.

On September 8, 1969, Mayor William G. Flynn appointed, and the City Council confirmed, the original seventeen member board. Members of the Wallace Center Trustees

may not hold any other appointive or elective position in the City Government. Seven members of the original board resigned positions in the City Government to serve as Trustees of the Wallace Center.

#### GOVERNMENTAL ACTIONS

August 30, 1965: George R. Wallace, Jr. gives first gift for Civic Center.

October 7, 1965: City Council accepts Wallace Gift.

December 18, 1968: Mr. Wallace gives second gift for Civic Center of nearly 757 thousand dollars to bring total to 1.1 million dollars.

January 7, 1969: City Council accepts Wallace second gift.

January 7, 1969: Civic Center Building Authority Created.

January 31, 1969: Whitman and Howard Architects Hired.

March 25, 1969: Park Commission votes to give Coolidge Park Land to City Council for use for Civic Center.

April 29, 1969: Request for Special Legislative Act to Create Board of Trustees for Civic Center and Planetarium.

May 30, 1969: Mr. Wallace gives third gift for Civic Center to bring total to 2.35 million dollars.

June 3, 1969: City Council accepts third Wallace gift.

June 19, 1969: Construction contract signed with P. Madonia Company of Fitchburg.

June 19, 1969: Groundbreaking held at Civic Center site.

June 20, 1969: Special legislative act approved transferring park land for Civic Center.

August 13, 1969: Special legislative act for trustees approved by Governor.

September 8, 1969: Special legislative act for Board of Trustees accepted by City Council.

September 8, 1969: Trustees confirmed by City Council.

December 6, 1969: Fourth gift of \$20,000.00 given by Mr. Wallace.

December 10, 1969: Council accepts fourth Wallace gift.

#### PEACE IN THE MIDDLE EAST

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. PEPPER) is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. Speaker, the recent statements of the Secretary of State relative to peace in the Middle East have created widespread concern in the United States, as well as in Israel, because of the strong suggestion in the Secretary's remarks that the United States is willing to concede to outside powers the right to determine the terms for peace in this explosive area.

I strongly believe that the best interests of peace in the Middle East depend upon the United States making it unmistakably clear that true peace in this area can come only through direct, face-to-face negotiations and honest agreement between the principals—Israel and the Arab States. For this reason, I have proposed the following resolution of the Congress to clarify the stand of the American Government and the American people:

Whereas, deep concern has been aroused by the statement of the Secretary of State of the United States of December 9th, making certain proposals for peace in the Middle East between the State of Israel and the Arab States, and

Whereas, such statement of the Secretary of State has been understood as contrary to the previous policy of the United States in the Middle East and to the expressed sentiment of approximately two-thirds of the Senate and the House of Representatives; Now, therefore, be it

*Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring),* That it is the sense of the Congress that the policy of the United States for the promotion of peace in the Middle East should be to exert its best efforts to arrange for direct face-to-face negotiations between the State of Israel and the Arab States; and, further, that neither the United States nor any other power should attempt to impose a settlement in the Middle East nor attempt to induce a settlement other than through direct face-to-face negotiations between the State of Israel and the Arab States.

I am very pleased that so many of my colleagues agree in the sentiments expressed in this resolution. On initial introduction, on relatively short notice, the following Members have joined in this resolution:

Mr. Howard, Mr. Brasco, Mr. Corman, Mr. Fallon, Mr. Karth, Mr. Macdonald of Massachusetts, Mr. Helstoski, Mr. O'Neill of Massachusetts, Mr. Adams, Mr. Mikva, Mr. Tunney, Mr. Biaggi, Mr. Hicks, Mr. Tiernan, Mr. Baring, Mr. Anderson of California, Mr. Blatnik, Mr. Daddario, Mr. Carey, Mr. Ryan, Mr. Wright, Mr. Stratton, Mr. Conyers, Mr. Hechler, Mr. Flood, Mr. Gray, Mr. Gallagher, Mr. Smith of Iowa, Mr. Waldie, Mr. Dent, Mr. Leggett, Mr. Pike, Mr. Poage, Mr. Farbstein, Mr. Dulski, Mr. Foley, Mr. Gibbons, Mr. Cabell, Mr. Garmatz, Mr. Rosenthal, Mr. Patten, Mr. St Germain, Mr. Ottinger, Mr. Gaydos, Mr. Harrington, and Mr. Lowenstein.

I have been advised that other Members wish to join in this resolution and I regret that time prevented them from being listed today. I intend to reintroduce my resolution as these Members advise me of their support and I invite all of our colleagues to join with us in making clear the support of the American people for a just peace in the Middle East based upon face-to-face negotiations between the parties directly involved.

#### LEGISLATION TO TAX BANK PROFITS FROM HIGH INTEREST RATES

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York (Mr. FARBSTEIN) is recognized for 20 minutes.

Mr. FARBSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, Representative BOB ECKHARDT and I have today introduced H.R. 15487, legislation to tax the excess profits of banks directly attributable to high interest rates. To ease the pressure on mortgage funds, the revenue raised by the tax would go to help low- and moderate-income families obtain mortgages.

The bill will lead to a slowdown in the continual upward spiral of interest rates and ease the especially susceptible home mortgage market.

While most people, especially homebuyers and small businessmen, suffer when interest rates are high, there is one sector of our economy that benefits. This is the banking industry where profits continue to grow at an unparalleled rate.

This is demonstrated by the following recent bank statement of earnings:

Percentage increase in net earnings from 1968 to 1969		Percent
Long Island Trust.....	36.8	
First National of New Jersey.....	29.4	
Mercantile National.....	14.6	
United States Trust.....	21.4	
Suburban Trust.....	20.7	
Northern Trust.....	18.2	
Fidelity Union.....	18.1	
U.S. National of Oregon.....	17.1	
Riggs National.....	15.8	
Security Pacific.....	15.5	
Citizens & Southern National.....	15.3	
Maryland National.....	15.1	
Mercantile National.....	14.6	
Connecticut Bank & Trust.....	14.5	
Manufacturers Hanover.....	12.8	
Virginia National.....	10.8	
Bank of Southwest.....	10.5	
First National City.....	8.4	
J. P. Morgan & Co.....	7.6	
Chase Manhattan.....	2.5	

According to Standard & Poor's "Bank revenues—are at a record level, and they are likely to hold up well, reflecting a high volume of loans, carrying satisfactory interest rates, relative to money costs." The huge rise in earnings is inextricably tied to the growth of the prime interest rate from 6 percent in 1968 to 8½ percent in 1969.

While the high rates of interest are no doubt the result of market pressures and cannot be condemned sweepingly as an explicit effort by the banking industry to raise its profits, this legislation would remove any potential incentive to raise interest rates solely for profits.

The tax, or as we call it, the "interest stabilization fee," applies to anybody that extends credit of at least \$10,000 at an interest rate over 8 percent. The tax will be equal to 1 percent of the annual interest charge for each 0.1 percentage point by which the annual loan interest rate exceeds 8 percent. Thus, a \$10,000 loan at the current 8½ prime interest rate would bring in \$850 per annum in interest which would be taxed \$42.50—5 percent of \$850. The lender in this case would have a net yearly income on this loan of \$807.50, just slightly more than it would have earned at the lower 8 percent rate. The following table demonstrates how this tax would work over a range of interest rates—assuming a loan of \$10,000:

Interest rate (percent)	Total interest payment	Rate of tax (percent)	Bank earnings	Tax
8.....	\$800	0	\$800.00	\$0.00
8½.....	850	5	807.50	42.50
9.....	900	10	810.00	90.00
9½.....	950	15	807.50	142.50
10.....	1,000	20	800.00	200.00
10½.....	1,050	25	787.50	262.50

As you see, the interest earnings cease to grow after a certain point, while Government revenues from the tax rise rapidly. There would be no profit incentive for the banks to raise their rates although there would be nothing to prevent them from doing so if the pressures of the market made such raises expedient.

Several additional points must be emphasized. First, the tax is meant to be operative only in times of extremely high interest rates. Once the rate charge drops below 8 percent there ceases to be

an interest stabilization fee. Second, because so many small loans and loans entailing high risk have traditionally, with good cause, earned higher rates of interest, we have specifically exempted such loans from the tax. We are by no means sanctioning such high interest rates, but we do recognize that there are differences in the structure of the interest rate pattern. Finally, we are talking about the annual effective rate of interest rather than the nominal rate. We have adopted the provisions of the Truth in Lending Act for this purpose.

Perhaps the most important feature of this plan is the ultimate use of the funds raised from the collection of the fee. We have decided to make the Government National Mortgage Association the recipient of these funds and to use these funds to further the objectives of their office. In other words, we have great concern for the housing market and we are most eager to ease the pressure for mortgage funds, especially for low- and moderate-income families. The recent increases in the VA and FHA mortgage rates, another indication of the problem facing our constituents and potential home buyers around the country, emphasizes this point.

The text of the bill follows:

H.R. 15487

A bill to increase the actuarial soundness of the Government National Mortgage Association

*Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,*

SECTION 1. (a) Except as provided in subsection (b) of this section, every person who makes a finance charge for any extension of credit at an annual percentage rate in excess of 8 percent shall pay an annual interest stabilization fee to the Government National Mortgage Association in an amount equal to 1 percent of the amount financed for each 0.1 percentage point by which the annual percentage rate exceeds 8 percent. Where the amount financed varies during the year, or the period of repayment is less than a year, the amount of the fee shall be ratably adjusted. Where the period of repayment is more than a year, the fee shall be paid with respect to each year during which there is at any time an unpaid balance outstanding, but need not be paid in advance of receipt of the finance charge.

(b) The provisions of subsection (a) do not apply to any loan meeting all of the following conditions:

(1) The amount of the loan is under \$10,000, and

(2) the making of the loan is regulated by an agency of a State under a small loan law or similar statute.

SEC. 2. For the purposes of this Act, the terms "finance charge" and "annual percentage rate" shall be defined as in sections 106 and 107 of the Truth in Lending Act, but shall not be restricted to consumer and agricultural transactions.

SEC. 3. The Government National Mortgage Association shall prescribe such regulations as may be necessary or appropriate to carry out the provisions of this Act.

SEC. 4. Any fees paid pursuant to this Act shall be held by the title III of the National Housing Act, as amended, to stabilize and strengthen the national housing market.

#### SURGICENTER

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentle-

man from Arizona (Mr. RHODES) is recognized for 10 minutes.

(Mr. RHODES asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks, and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. RHODES. Mr. Speaker, the skyrocketing cost of medical care has been a cause for serious concern to us all. Most of us, however, have been frustrated and overwhelmed by the magnitude of the problem; so have done nothing.

I have recently learned of a new concept in health facilities which sets forth a positive approach toward reducing the cost of medical care and hospitalization in particular. Significantly, this concept represents an innovative response from the private sector—a task that is all too often thought to rest exclusively with government.

Dr. John L. Ford and Dr. Wallace A. Reed of Phoenix became convinced that something had to be done about the increasing cost of hospitalization. They lamented the fact that, for example, such minor operations as tonsillectomies were costing patients upward of \$200 for hospital care alone. To meet the challenge of a more economical delivery of quality medical care, Drs. Ford and Reed developed the concept of a privately run ambulatory surgical facility—they called it Surgicenter.

Surgicenter is a medical facility designed to provide quality surgical care to the patient whose operation is too demanding for a doctor's office, yet not of such proportion as to require overnight hospitalization.

Construction of a Phoenix Surgicenter facility began on August 8, 1969, in handy proximity to Good Samaritan Hospital and is now nearing completion.

The use of the Surgicenter by patients and their surgeons will, in the opinion of Doctors Reed and Ford, bring about a reduction in the cost of medical care without sacrifice in quality.

In addition, there are these other benefits:

No Government funds, Federal, State or local, are required.

Hospital beds will be freed for use by more seriously ill patients.

The need for requiring additional hospital beds through new construction will be reduced in proportion to the extent the Surgicenter is utilized.

Hospitals will be encouraged to reduce their charges. Four major hospitals in Phoenix, incidentally, have recently announced reduction in the charges to patients using their outpatient surgical facilities.

It was obvious to Drs. Reed and Ford from the outset that in order to have an effective facility they would need approval from major insurance carriers to guarantee that such coverage would include services rendered at the Surgicenter.

Until recently, many insurance companies have required their clients to be hospitalized before benefits for such procedures could be obtained. Now, however, many leaders in the industry are realizing that this requirement is resulting in the unnecessary expenditure of a considerable sum of money. Consequently, as in the case of Aetna Life and

Casualty Co., they are seeing an advantage in covering patients who avail themselves of an in-and-out surgical facility.

Drs. Reed and Ford had hoped to qualify their facility for payment in lieu of hospitalization by Medicare through an administrative liberalization of the provisions of that act pertaining to hospital services.

Unfortunately, I have been informed by the General Counsel of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare that this course of action is not possible. In his words:

The (Medicare) Act authorizes payment for the cost of institutional health care service of the type supplied by Surgicenter only when such service is supplied by a facility which meets the definition of a hospital, as that term is defined in Section 1861(n) of the Act. Surgicenter both in concept and in operation is designed to function as an alternative to hospital care, and does not meet the definitional requirements for hospitals. If Surgicenters are to be given federal assistance, (i.e., qualify for Medicare payments in lieu of hospitalization) legislation will be required.

I think it is an encouraging sign when private citizens take on the job of solving one of this country's most difficult problems—the rising cost of medical care—without immediately calling for the institution of another massive Government program.

This program makes good economic sense as well as improving the quality and availability of first-rate hospital care.

If private insurance companies see it in their best interests to recognize this type of facility as a substitute for hospitalization, I see no reason why the Federal Government should not do likewise—and as soon as possible.

Accordingly, I am introducing legislation today which makes no change in present Medicare coverage except to provide that approved ambulatory surgical centers will, for these specified purposes, be subject to the same provisions relating to hospitals.

This legislation is designed to insure that the quality of medical care to be provided by such centers be of the highest caliber. For example, surgery must be performed by a physician who is also authorized to perform such procedure in an area hospital; anesthesia must be administered by a licensed anesthesiologist; the center must be equipped to perform diagnostic X-ray and laboratory examinations in connection with any surgery as well as to provide for the full-time services of professional registered nurses.

In addition, the center must have the necessary equipment and trained personnel available to handle foreseeable emergencies and must maintain a written agreement with area hospitals for immediate acceptance of patients who develop complications. This legislation also provides for the periodic inspection and review of the center and its operations by a group of impartial physicians. Finally, the Secretary is authorized to establish such other requirements as he finds necessary in the interest of the health and safety of prospective patients.

Mr. Speaker, I strongly urge my col-

leagues who are also interested in the soaring costs of Medicare and hospitalization to join me in support of this needed amendment. For those who are interested in knowing more about the Phoenix facility in particular, I am including an informative article by Drs. Ford and Reed that appeared in the October 1969 issue of *Arizona Medicine* as well as an article that appeared in the December 16 issue of the *Arizona Weekly Gazette*:

THE SURGICENTER: AN INNOVATION IN THE DELIVERY AND COST OF MEDICAL CARE  
(By John L. Ford, M.D., and Wallace A. Reed, M.D.)

"I believe that whether we continue as an honored profession, self-governing and independent, or become a sort of scientific trade under the supervision and domination of others, depends absolutely on the efforts of the medical profession.

"Our future, in other words, will be determined by how fast and how well the medical profession recognizes its responsibilities, and how fast and how well it discharges these responsibilities." So was AMA Past-President Dr. James J. Appel quoted in the June 1969 issue of *Massachusetts Physician*.

"The Modern hospital is rapidly becoming an intensive care unit with all the fantastically expensive equipment and procedures that are required. It costs too much; it costs too much because many who are hospitalized do not need all this and should be cared for in much less expensive surroundings. Thus, the hospital must be surrounded with a number of closely associated special purpose facilities." This is Dr. Russell V. Lee's quotation from *Medical World News* of July 11, 1969.

The Surgicenter is one such special purpose facility, an effort by members of the medical profession, the prime objective of which is to discharge well some of our "responsibilities."

The building to house the Surgicenter is under construction at 1040 East McDowell Road, Phoenix, in handy proximity to Good Samaritan Hospital. The heart of the facility will be the four operating rooms and the large recovery room. Appropriate ancillary equipment and rooms are included in 5240 square feet encompassed in the building.

Among the responsibilities which the authors hope to discharge with the concept of the Surgicenter are these:

To make the "ambulatory patient" a matter of greater concern.

To streamline the delivery of his medical services.

To reduce the cost of his care.

To work for a broadening of his insurance coverage.

Two facilities similar to the Surgicenter are already operational in Los Angeles, California and in Washington, D.C. Each is under the jurisdiction of hospitals maintained by medical schools. In each instance the expense of the delivered care, compared with inpatient cost has been appreciably reduced without sacrifice of quality.<sup>1, 2</sup>

Dr. William Dornette, an authority in the field of health planning, has stated that a Surgicenter type facility can operate independently of a hospital, and the authors subscribe to this view:

"One facility about which little has been written is the outpatient service offering general anesthesia for minor surgical procedures. Such a facility, properly designed,

<sup>1</sup> Cohen, D. D. A. and Dillon, J. B.: Anesthesia for Outpatient Surgery, *J.A.M.* 196:1114-1116.

<sup>2</sup> Levy, Marie-Louise and Coakley, Charles S.: Survey of In and Out Surgery—First Year, in a report made in 1967 by the Department of Anesthesiology of the George Washington University Hospital, Washington, D.C.

staffed, and operated, has several advantages. A significant patient load is removed from the inpatient bed and operating facilities. There is a distinct savings in the cost to the patient or to the patient's hospitalization insurance carrier. The operation of one such facility (at UCLA) as part of a hospital's out-patient department, and the advantages accrued to such operation, are well documented. *But a safe and efficient facility for performance of general anesthesia and minor surgical procedures need not be affiliated either administratively or geographically with a hospital.*<sup>2</sup>

While the concept as suggested by Dr. Dornette is simple in principle, infusing it with life is another matter altogether. There has been no precedent to follow, and many obstacles presented themselves as the project was developed. One thing that was certainly obvious from the outset was that we needed approval from major insurance carriers. Also, we wanted to establish an effective means for quality control. As it turned out, our interest in achieving quality control proved to be the key to a workable formula: We gained the cooperation and approval of the Comprehensive Health Planning Council of Maricopa County; and with their help, developed an "Agreement" which outlines a method for maintaining high standards. Chief among the stipulations is that a Medical Audit Committee consisting of at least three physicians "will regularly review the medical and surgical procedures and practices employed in our facility with the power to recommend and to enforce standards which are on a par with those employed in an accredited community general hospital in the metropolitan-Phoenix area and who will also recommend practices designed to avoid overutilization of our facility. These physicians will receive a nominal fee for serving on this Medical Audit Team and will accept appointment to such team in writing, wherein they will state that they have no economic or other vested interest in the facility. Persons selected for this Medical Audit Team will receive prior endorsement from the appropriate local professional-specialty or general practice society or in its absence the Board of Directors of the Maricopa County Medical Society."<sup>3</sup>

We used the Agreement worked out with the Comprehensive Health Planning Council of Maricopa County as the basis for our discussions with various insurance carriers. We received official recognition from a major carrier in April, as is evident from Figure 1.

Several other carriers have made similar changes in their contracts, and many have indicated their willingness to cooperate when the Surgicenter opens. CHAMPUS (Military Medicare) has endorsed the concept wholeheartedly as evidenced by a Memorandum dated 16 May 1969, the full text of which is shown in Figure 2.

As of this writing, we have not met with the Arizona Blue Cross Board of Directors, which has set a date in September as the time to review the Surgicenter concept. However, it is worthy of note that in the State of Arizona, Blue Cross is the fiscal agent for CHAMPUS, which has approved our proposal. The authors are encouraged to believe that Blue Cross will also endorse the idea, since there are already signs pointing in that direction. One such sign is that in New York, Blue Cross has asked the State Insurance Department to approve a change in benefits in certain policies to encourage use of outpatient facilities and discourage unnecessary use of inpatient beds. In addition, Mr. Walter J. Mc Nerney, President of the

National Blue Cross Plans, has stated in reference to methods of delivery of health care that, "... all laws standing in the way of experimentation should be struck down."<sup>4</sup> He has recognized that, "... we in this country are going to stay with a pluralistic system of providing and financing medical care—a system involving both Government and private operations," and we should "... exploit fully the assets of the private sector."<sup>5</sup>

At its meeting in September, the Arizona Blue Cross Board will consider these features which make the Surgicenter unique:

1. It is more than a doctor's office, yet less than a hospital; and is independently operated. (However, transfer agreements with two major hospitals provide for the patient's continued care if indicated.)

2. It has been designed "from the ground up" to suit the particular requirements of the come-and-go patient, a fact which helps to keep the cost of care at a minimum.

3. With the exception of the physicians' fees, a single, all-inclusive charge will be made for each procedure. While the charge for an infant herniorrhaphy will be greater than for a cystoscopy, there will be a pre-set charge for each. This means that each patient, each surgeon, and each insurance carrier will know in advance of the operation exactly what the cost for a given procedure will be.

Since the Surgicenter is not a hospital in the legal sense, no licensure by the State Department of Health is required. Nevertheless, the authors asked State Health Department officials to review the project, with the result that several excellent suggestions made by them were incorporated into the final plans. The Acting Commissioner, Henry D. Smith, M.D., wrote under date of May 23, 1969, as follows:

"We feel your facility is both structurally and functionally sound. It is indeed refreshing to see new approaches being made in the delivery of health care services."

The above instance is in keeping with the policy of the authors to inform all interested parties of our plans, and invite their questions and comments.

Thus, early in the year, we discussed our ideas with three different hospital administrators, all of whom assured us we can count on their cooperation. On February 11, the Board of Directors of the Maricopa County Medical Society were apprised of our plans. Dwight Wilbur, M.D., when President of the American Medical Association, wrote that he was interested in reading about the plan and wished us success in implementing it. In a recent communication with Mr. Chris N. Theodore, Director of the A.M.A.'s Division of Health Services, we provided him with pertinent information; and a copy of his letter with enclosures was sent to Arizona's A.M.A. delegation.

We have welcomed suggestions from our colleagues, and have discussed with them in detail the ways in which this facility can serve the needs of surgeons and their patients. Their enthusiastic response indicates clearly that, contrary to current popular opinion, doctors are interested in the cost of medical care. Nurses with whom we have discussed the matter have shown a similar interest; and those who are to help us launch the project have spent many hours on the plans and in the selection of the instruments to be made available to surgeons using the facility.

Gerald D. Dorman, M.D., currently President of the American Medical Association, wrote in JAMA of August 11: "... we must

<sup>2</sup> Mc Nerney, Walter J., as quoted in a news release published on p. 3 of "Medical Group News," April, 1969.

<sup>3</sup> Mc Nerney, Walter J., as quoted in a news release published in "U.S. News and World Report," March 24, 1969.

foster innovation in delivery of health care, we must improve our efficiency, and we must develop our highest possible level of ethics and self-discipline... we need local answers to local problems in each area."

We submit the concept of the Surgicenter as a step in the direction pointed out by Dr. Dorman; and emphasize that it is being constructed and will be maintained without cost to the taxpayer, local, state, or federal.

The Surgicenter concept certainly appears to fit into the "basic philosophy" of the current administration, judging from remarks attributed to former HEW Secretary John Gardner. Mr. Gardner is quoted by the *American Medical News* (August 18, 1969) as stating we need more fruitful relationships between the public and private sectors. Forces now at work tend, says Mr. Gardner, "to squeeze out pluralism, and to move us toward one comprehensively articulated system of power. We must work against that trend... As I contemplate that trend, I find myself treasuring every remaining bit of pluralism, everything that stands between us and the one all-embracing system..." Herbert Marcuse favors a more "directed" society, Gardner said. "In doing so, he makes the assumption made by all who fall into authoritarian doctrines—that, in the 'directed' society he envisages, people who shares his values will be calling the tune. So thought the businessmen who supported Hitler."

While the primary function of the Surgicenter is to serve the particular needs of the ambulatory patient and his surgeon, it is not intended to be used as an emergency-care center. Experiences elsewhere indicate that the real emergency belongs in the hospital environment. Nevertheless, it is worth noting that the facility would be readily available and immediately useful to the community in time of a major disaster of any kind.

In summary, the Surgicenter is a response from the private sector to the many urgent appeals from the government, labor, industry, and the medical profession to streamline the delivery of medical care and reduce its cost. It is designed to provide quality surgical care to the patient whose operation is too demanding for the doctor's office, yet not of such proportion as to require hospitalization. Numerous advances in surgical techniques, together with new local and general anesthetic agents, have been utilized successfully at teaching hospitals to treat the come-and-go patient. The authors intend to demonstrate with the Surgicenter that an independently-operated facility can function as successfully with even greater savings to the patient while maintaining high standards of care.

#### FIGURE 1

AETNA LIFE & CASUALTY,

Hartford, Conn., March 21, 1969.

#### To Whom It May Concern:

This is to certify that most of the group medical expense benefit policies issued by Aetna Life Insurance Company provide, among other benefits, payment in whole or in part of hospital charges for ancillary services rendered by the hospital in connection with the performance of a surgical procedure in its out-patient department. It further certifies that for purposes of the above benefit the ambulatory Surgicenter proposed by Drs. Wallace A. Reed and John L. Ford of Phoenix, Arizona, as approved by the Comprehensive Health Planning Council of Maricopa County, will be deemed to be a hospital outpatient department with respect to surgical procedures performed therein that require anesthesia other than by means of local infiltration of the anesthetic. While the Aetna Life Insurance Company expects to so recognize the proposed Surgicenter indefinitely, it reserves the right to discontinue doing so without notice anytime after December 31, 1971.

Sincerely,

D. W. PETTENGILL,  
Vice President, Group Division.

<sup>2</sup> Dornette, William: Planning Tomorrow's Hospital Today, title of a paper given at the A.S.A. meeting in Washington, October, 1968.

<sup>3</sup> Agreement of Conditions for the Establishment of an "Ambulatory Surgicenter" Submitted to the Board of Directors, Comprehensive Health Planning Council (and approved by the Board) March, 1969.

## FIGURE 2

ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF DEFENSE,  
Washington, D.C., May 16, 1969.

Memorandum for: The Surgeon General of the Army; The Surgeon General of the Navy; and The Surgeon General of the Air Force.

Subject: "Surgicenters."

We have recently learned of a new concept in health facilities which is now under development, known as "surgicenters." Under the concept involved, such facilities would be staffed and equipped to do surgery either of the type presently performed in a physician's office or, more importantly, of the type which frequently results in an expensive admission to a hospital for from 12 to 36 hours. In essence, it would be an ambulatory surgical facility.

We think this is an interesting and worthwhile concept. We intend to add it to DoD Directive 6010.4, plus a definition of what a surgicenter shall consist of in order to participate in the CHAMPUS. In this connection, attached is a copy of an agreement between a health planning council in Arizona and two physicians in that State who are now developing a surgicenter. Also attached is a copy of the standards regarding such a facility recently prescribed by a large health insurance company.

For planning purposes we have concluded that while a surgicenter would be neither a hospital nor a physician's office, it is closer to the former and that, therefore, it should be considered as a hospital for cost-sharing purposes under the CHAMPUS.

LOUIS M. ROUSSELOT, M.D.,  
Deputy Assistant Secretary  
(Health and Medical).

NEW INNOVATION DEVELOPED BY LOCAL DOCTORS MAY BRING CHANGE IN HOSPITAL LICENSING ACT

(By Paul Singer)

The astronomical rise in the cost of hospitalization is of great concern not only to the paying public but also to the organizations that underwrite these costs on a prepared basis, such as insurance companies, Medicare and Blue Cross-Blue Shield. It is of little comfort to the premium payers that this great rise is due to the escalation of salaries to the hospital employees and the rising cost of supplies, medications, equipment and food and that the hospitals are justified in raising their daily rates to meet these costs.

One facet of this tremendous cost is seen in the charges made to the non-hospitalized surgical patient who comes to the hospital, has his surgery and goes home after a period of recovery from the anesthesia. Part of this high charge is the pro-rating of the over-all hospital costs to this segment of the hospital function, a pro-rating that from an actuarial basis is fully justified.

In order to make out-patient surgery less costly to the patient as well as the insurers, an innovation was undertaken by two local physicians, Drs. Wallace Reed and John Ford, anesthesiologists, by creating a strictly non-hospitalized surgery, calling it the Phoenix Surgicenter. Since the charges made here will reflect only the strict cost of the service, which includes amortization, operation, and a certain profit (this is not a non-profit but a private enterprise) it will be considerably less than the same service would cost in one of the regular hospitals even though a profit will be made on the charges. The two physicians pledged and invested about a third of a million dollars in this venture, and so interesting is this idea that inquiries have come in from all parts of the country desiring to copy this method of medical care on a reasonable cost basis. Since the inception of the Surgicenter there has been a reduction in the outpatient charges in some of the hospitals in order to meet the competition. In this

way the public is already benefiting from this idea.

The cloud that covers this sunny picture is the problem that Arizona Blue Cross states that it cannot pay for this service, since its charter states that only accredited hospitals can be under contract with it. Some lawyers feel that the charter has sufficient leeway that would permit payment, and others argue against the payment. It must be assumed that Blue Cross would be glad to pay the charges since it would save them a lot of money and would enable them to reduce the premiums.

The only way the Surgicenter will receive Blue Cross funds will be if the legislature amends the hospital licensing act and declares the Surgicenter a short-term-stay hospital. This would not be too formidable a task, provided that the hospital lobby stays out of the matter and does not torpedo the act. It would be a shame to deprive the public of cheaper medical care. It is to be hoped that the legislature will act in the interests of the public, and promptly.

## H.R. 15496

A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to provide coverage under the supplementary medical insurance program for surgical services furnished in certain facilities which are established to perform surgery without inpatient hospitalization

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That (a) section 1861(s) (2) of the Social Security Act is amended—

(1) by striking out "and" at the end of subparagraph (C);

(2) by adding "and" after the semicolon at the end of subparagraph (D); and

(3) by adding at the end thereof the following new subparagraph:

"(E) ambulatory surgical services;"

(b) Section 1861 of such Act is further amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"Ambulatory Surgical Services; Ambulatory Surgical Center

"(z) (1) The term 'ambulatory surgical services' means services and supplies (including drugs and biologicals which cannot, as determined in accordance with regulations, be self-administered), other than physicians' services, which are furnished by an ambulatory surgical center to an individual who is a patient therein, but does not include such services and supplies furnished in connection with surgery which requires anesthesia by means of local infiltration of the anesthetic, except in the case of surgery for cataract removal, rhinoplasty performed for other than cosmetic purposes, first-stage tympanoplasty, and other comparable procedures authorized by the Secretary.

"(2) The term 'ambulatory surgical center' means a public or private institution which—

"(A) is established, equipped, and operated primarily for the purpose of performing surgical procedures;

"(B) is operated under the supervision of a staff of physicians;

"(C) permits a surgical procedure to be performed only by a physician who at the time is legally authorized to perform such procedure and is privileged to perform such procedure in at least one hospital in the area;

"(D) requires (in all cases other than those requiring only local infiltration anesthetics) that a licensed anesthesiologist administer the anesthetics and remain present during the surgical procedure;

"(E) provides at least two operating rooms and at least one post-anesthesia recovery room;

"(F) is equipped to perform diagnostic x-ray and laboratory examinations required

in connection with any surgery to be performed;

"(G) does not provide beds or other accommodations for patients to stay overnight;

"(H) provides full-time services of registered professional nurses for patient care in the operating and post-anesthesia recovery rooms;

"(I) has available the necessary equipment and trained personnel to handle foreseeable emergencies (including a defibrillator for cardiac arrest, a tracheotomy set for airway obstruction, and a blood bank or other blood supply);

"(J) maintains a written agreement with one or more hospitals in the area for immediate acceptance of patients who develop complications or require post-operative confinement;

"(K) provides for the periodic review of the center and its operations by a utilization review or other committee composed of physicians having no financial connection with it;

"(L) maintains adequate medical records for each patient; and

"(M) meets such other requirements as the Secretary finds necessary in the interest of the health and safety of individuals who are furnished services."

SEC. 2. (a) Section 1832(a) of the Social Security Act is amended—

(1) by striking out "paragraph (2)(B)" in paragraph (1) and inserting in lieu thereof "paragraphs (2)(B) and (2)(D)";

(2) by striking out "and" at the end of paragraph (2)(B);

(3) by striking out the period at the end of paragraph (2)(C) and inserting in lieu thereof "; and"; and

(4) by adding at the end of paragraph (2) the following new subparagraph:

"(D) ambulatory surgical services."

(b) (1) Section 1835(a) of such Act is amended—

(A) by striking out "and (D)" in paragraph (2)(B) and inserting in lieu thereof "(D), and (E)";

(B) by striking out "and" at the end of paragraph (2)(B);

(C) by striking out the period at the end of paragraph (2)(C) and inserting in lieu thereof "; and";

(D) by inserting immediately after paragraph (2)(C) (and above the last sentence of paragraph (2)) the following new subparagraph:

"(D) in the case of ambulatory surgical services, (i) such services are or were medically required, and (ii) such services are or were furnished while the individual is or was under the care of a physician;"

(E) by inserting before the period at the end of the last sentence of paragraph (2) the following: ", and shall include an ambulatory surgical center"; and

(F) by striking out "(A) or (B)" in the last sentence and inserting in lieu thereof "(A), (B), or (C)".

(2) Section 1835(b) of such Act is amended—

(A) by striking out "even though such hospital" and inserting in lieu thereof ", or made to any ambulatory surgical center for ambulatory surgical services furnished by it to such an individual, even though such hospital or center";

(B) by inserting "or center" after "hospital" to clause (B) of paragraph (1);

(C) by striking out "such hospital" in clause (C) of paragraph (1) and inserting in lieu thereof "in the case of a hospital, such hospital";

(D) by inserting "or center" after "hospital" in the last sentence of paragraph (1); and

(E) by inserting "furnished by or under arrangements with a hospital as" after "services" where it first appears in paragraph (2).

(3) Section 1835(c) of such act is amended—

(A) by inserting "or ambulatory surgical center" after "hospital" where it first appears;

(B) by inserting "or by such center" after "outpatient";

(C) by inserting "or centers" after "hospitals" in the last sentence; and

(D) by inserting "or center" after "hospital" in the last sentence.

(c) Section 1861 (u) of such Act is amended by striking out "or home health agency" and inserting in lieu thereof "ambulatory surgical center, or home health agency".

(d) Section 1864 (a) of such Act is amended—

(1) by striking out "is a hospital or extended care facility" in the first sentence and inserting in lieu thereof "is a hospital, extended care facility, or ambulatory surgical center";

(2) by striking out "or home health agency" in the second sentence and inserting in lieu thereof "ambulatory surgical center, or home health agency"; and

(3) by striking out "or home health agencies" in the third sentence and inserting in lieu thereof "ambulatory surgical centers, or home health agencies".

(e) Section 1866(e) of such Act is amended by inserting before the period at the end thereof the following: ", and shall include an ambulatory surgical center".

Sec. 3. The amendments made by this Act shall apply with respect to services furnished on and after the first day of the second month which begins more than ten days after the date of the enactment of this Act.

#### CONGRESS MUST UNDO PRIVATE-SCHOOLS RULING

Mr. ABERNETHY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to include at this point in the RECORD an article by James J. Kilpatrick entitled "Congress Must Undo Private-Schools Ruling."

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

The article is as follows:

##### CONGRESS MUST UNDO PRIVATE-SCHOOLS RULING

(By James J. Kilpatrick)

The decision by three federal judges here in Washington, denying tax exemption to certain private schools in Mississippi, comes as one more intolerable judicial usurpation of power. The action cannot be condoned; and it must be swiftly undone by the Congress.

The law could not be more clear. Under Section 501(c) (3) of the Tax Code, a non-profit organization is exempt from federal taxes if it is organized and operated exclusively for religious, charitable, scientific, literary "or educational" purposes, provided only that it stays out of lobbying and politics. Roughly 50,000 such institutions have qualified formally for the cumulative list of exempt organizations maintained by the Internal Revenue Service.

These exempt organizations include institutions that are all black, all white, all Christian, and all Jew. Until the moment of this autocratic court decree, the act of Congress prevailed: It was necessary to ask only if the institution in question met the requirements of law. If so, it qualified automatically, and gifts to such institutions became deductible in computing one's income tax.

The effect of last week's injunction is to elevate the whims, caprices and obsessions of federal judges to a level never contemplated under our form of government. If a drastic change were to be made in the interpretation

of Section 501(c) (3), such a change might first be the prerogative of the commissioner of Internal Revenue. No commissioner ever has sought such power. More precisely, such a change involves a profound question of legislative policy: It is the business of Congress. And in its recent comprehensive revisions of the Tax Code, Congress made no move whatever to limit tax exemptions to racially integrated institutions only.

Why did the three judges rule as they did? I do not challenge their sincerity, integrity or competence. Doubtless they felt they were following dutifully upon the obsessions of their masters, the Supreme Court of the United States. The high court repeatedly has commanded integration now, integration everywhere, integration without regard to law, common sense, or the Constitution.

Make no mistake: This profoundly complex question of public affairs has come fully under the sway of a judicial oligarchy. It might be possible, through ordinary political processes, to remove or to reverse a commissioner of Internal Revenue. It still is possible to elect a House and Senate that will insist upon a "Whitten amendment" positively to prohibit the busing of pupils and the closing of schools under the Civil Rights Act. But the judges are unreachable.

In a free country, it ought to be possible for parents in Mississippi, or anywhere else, to set up any kind of educational institutions they please, and to be entitled to the same privileges, immunities, and benefits of all other parents. If they choose to educate their children in factories, Sunday schools, private homes, or pup tents, subject merely to the general police powers of the state, this is—or was—their right.

No longer. Last week's decree was deliberately punitive, deliberately calculated to achieve a certain sociological end regarded by the judges as desirable. The decree, to repeat, is part of a pattern. In Atlanta, parents by the thousands have petitioned the judges for relief from arbitrary action. In Oklahoma City, a federal judge has threatened to jail a 14-year-old boy and his parents if the boy refuses to attend a certain integrated junior high. The high court itself, in royal disdain for practical problems of the real world, last week insisted on a Feb. 1 deadline for the integration of 300,000 children in five Deep South states.

It is just as Plato said. "The people always have some champion whom they set over them and nurse into greatness. . . . This and no other is the root from which a tyrant springs; when he first appears, he is a protector." So with the high court. An acquiescent people, having surrendered their liberties to the judges in what seemed a good cause, have watered the roots. We harvest tyranny now.

#### LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. BOB WILSON (at the request of Mr. GERALD R. FORD), for today, on account of death in family.

Mr. GROVER (at the request of Mr. GERALD R. FORD), for the balance of the week, on account of death in family.

#### SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. COWGER) and to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous matter:)

Mr. SCHADEBERG, for 15 minutes, today.  
Mr. SCHADEBERG, for 30 minutes, on January 22.

Mr. PRICE of Texas, for 15 minutes, today.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. BRINKLEY); to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous matter:)

Mr. PEPPER, for 10 minutes, today.

Mr. FARBSTEIN, for 20 minutes, today.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. MONTGOMERY) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. DENT, for 30 minutes, today.

Mr. BRINKLEY, for 30 minutes, today.

Mr. HAMILTON, for 10 minutes, today.

Mr. PRYOR of Arkansas, for 60 minutes, on January 28.

Mr. PERKINS, for 60 minutes, January 22, to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous material.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. WEICKER); to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous matter:)

Mr. RHODES, for 10 minutes, today.

Mr. SCHWENDEL, for 1 hour, on January 28.

Mr. PHILBIN, for 20 minutes, today; to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to revise and extend remarks was granted to:

Mr. GROSS in two instances and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. MADDEN and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. RANDALL in two instances and to include extraneous matter.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. COWGER) and to include extraneous material:)

Mr. STEIGER of Wisconsin.

Mr. WAMPLER.

Mr. AYRES.

Mr. PRICE of Texas.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. WEICKER) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. WHITEHURST in two instances.

Mr. DERWINSKI.

Mr. RHODES in five instances.

Mr. EDWARDS of Alabama.

Mr. WYMAN in two instances.

Mr. STEIGER of Arizona in two instances.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. MONTGOMERY) and to include extraneous material:)

Mr. MONAGAN in two instances.

Mr. POWELL in three instances.

Mr. PATMAN.

Mrs. CHISHOLM.

Mr. LONG of Maryland in six instances.

Mr. BIAGGI in 10 instances.

Mr. COHELAN.

Mr. PHILBIN in four instances.

Mr. FASCELL in three instances.

Mr. MAHON in two instances.

Mr. FUQUA in two instances.

Mr. RYAN in two instances.

Mr. HAGAN in two instances.

Mr. GONZALEZ in two instances.

(The following Members (at the re-

quest of Mr. BRINKLEY) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. VANIK in two instances.  
Mr. DANIEL of Virginia.  
Mr. DULSKI in six instances.  
Mr. RARICK in three instances.  
Mr. BINGHAM in four instances.  
Mr. JONES of North Carolina in two instances.  
Mr. GALIFIANAKIS.  
Mr. DENT.  
Mr. HATHAWAY.  
Mr. O'NEAL of Georgia.

#### ADJOURNMENT

Mr. BRINKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 1 o'clock and 45 minutes p.m.), the House adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, January 22, 1970, 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:

1523. A letter from the Secretary of the Air Force, transmitting a report on the progress of the Reserve Officer Training Corps flight training program for the calendar year 1969, pursuant to the provisions of section 2110(b) of title 10, United States Code; to the Committee on Armed Services.

1524. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report on the questionable payment of taxes to other governments on U.S. defense activities overseas, Department of Defense and Department of State; to the Committee on Government Operations.

#### 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. STAGGERS: Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. Activity of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, 91st Congress, first session (Rept. No. 91-795). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

#### PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BENNETT:

H.R. 15479. A bill to provide for uniform and equitable treatment of persons displaced from their homes, businesses, or farms by Federal and federally assisted programs and to establish uniform and equitable land acquisition policies for Federal and federally assisted programs; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. BIAGGI:

H.R. 15480. A bill to clarify and strengthen the cargo-preference laws of the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. BIAGGI (for himself, Mr. BINGHAM, Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN, Mr. DINGELL, Mr. GARMATZ, Mr. HELSTOSKI, Mr. HOSMER, Mr. LUJAN, Mr. MIEVA, Mrs. MINK, Mr. PETTIS, Mr. FODELL, Mr. RODINO, Mr. TIERNAN, Mr. WIDNALL, and Mr. WOLFF):

H.R. 15481. A bill to provide for the protection of children against physical injury caused or threatened by those who are responsible for their care; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BURTON of UTAH:

H.R. 15482. A bill to provide for the apportionment of funds in payment of a judgment in favor of the Shoshone Tribe in consolidated Dockets Nos. 326-D, 326-E, 326-F, 326-G, 326-H 366 and 367 before the Indian Claims Commission, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. BUSH:

H.R. 15483. A bill to revise the Federal election laws, and for other purposes; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. DENT:

H.R. 15484. 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.

H.R. 15485. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide that pensions paid to retired law enforcement officers shall not be subject to the income tax; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DIGGS:

H.R. 15486. 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. ECKHARDT (for himself and Mr. FARBSTEIN):

H.R. 15487. A bill to increase the actuarial soundness of the Government National Mortgage Association; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. FLYNT:

H.R. 15488. A bill to define the application and effective date of court orders effecting desegregation of faculty and students in public school systems; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KOCH:

H.R. 15489. A bill to amend the Military Selective Service Act of 1967 to prohibit the assignment of any person inducted under such act to active duty in Vietnam unless he consents to such assignment; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H.R. 15490. A bill to amend the Urban Mass Transportation Act of 1964 to authorize certain grants to assure adequate commuter service in urban areas, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H.R. 15491. A bill to amend the Clean Air Act to require a State to hold public hearings prior to the adoption by such State of a plan for the implementation, maintenance, and enforcement of air quality standards; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. LATTA:

H.R. 15492. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide an investment credit for small business (including the business of farming) for property constructed or acquired after April 18, 1969; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. PUCINSKI (for himself, Mr. BRADEMANS, Mr. SCHEUER, and Mr. CLAY):

H.R. 15493. A bill to provide a program to improve the opportunity of students in elementary and secondary schools to study cultural heritages of the major ethnic groups in the Nation; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. QUILLEN:

H.R. 15494. A bill to amend the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937 to provide a 15 percentum increase in annuities; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 15495. 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. RHODES:

H.R. 15496. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to provide coverage under the supplementary medical insurance program for surgical services furnished in certain facilities which are established to perform surgery without inpatient hospitalization; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ROONEY of Pennsylvania:

H.R. 15497. A bill to further the general health and welfare by regulating the sale to children and to the general public of candy products portrayed as resembling cigarettes and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. ST. ONGE:

H.R. 15498. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to provide that a chiropractor, naturopath, podiatrist, or other licensed practitioner of the healing arts shall be considered a physician for purposes of health insurance benefits thereunder; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. TIERNAN:

H.R. 15499. A bill to provide an exemption from the draft for persons serving in the Peace Corps or Volunteers in Service to America; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. VAN DEERLIN:

H.R. 15500. A bill to aid in the control of drug abuse by establishing a code for the identification of prescription drugs, to be printed on individual tablets or capsules; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 15501. A bill to amend the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act to impose restrictions upon the exportation of barbiturates and amphetamines; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. WYDLER:

H.R. 15502. A bill to provide that certain employment restrictions on players or teams in professional sports are illegal restraints of trade; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CHAPPELL (for himself, Mr. SIKES, Mr. HALEY, Mr. RIVERS, and Mr. DANIEL of Virginia):

H.J. Res. 1054. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States with respect to freedom of choice in attending public schools; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CHAPPELL (for himself, Mr. SIKES, Mr. HALEY, Mr. RIVERS, and Mr. DANIEL of Virginia):

H.J. Res. 1055. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States with respect to freedom of choice in attending public schools; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CRAMER (for himself, Mr. BURKE of Florida, and Mr. FREY):

H.J. Res. 1056. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relating to the busing or involuntary assignment of students; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ST. ONGE:

H.J. Res. 1057. Joint resolution to provide for the designation of the third week in May of each year as "Municipal Clerk's Week"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SCHERLE:

H.J. Res. 1058. Joint resolution to require the continuation of payments for the 1970 crop of feed grain; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. PEPPER (for himself, Mr. HARRINGTON, Mr. FLOOD, Mr. GRAY, Mr. GALLAGHER, Mr. SMITH of Iowa, Mr. WALDIE, Mr. DENT, Mr. LEGGETT, Mr. PIKE, Mr. POAGE, Mr. FARBSTEIN, Mr. DULSKI, Mr. FOLEY, Mr. GIBBONS,

Mr. CABELL, Mr. GARMATZ, Mr. LOWENSTEIN, Mr. ROSENTHAL, Mr. PATTEN, Mr. ST GERMAIN, Mr. OTTINGER, and Mr. GAYDOS):

H. Con. Res. 479. Concurrent resolution to express the sense of the House with respect to peace in the Middle East; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. PEPPER (for himself, Mr. HOWARD, Mr. BRASCO, Mr. CORMAN, Mr. FALLON, Mr. KARTH, Mr. MACDONALD of Massachusetts, Mr. HELSTOSKI, Mr. O'NEILL of Massachusetts, Mr. ADAMS, Mr. MIKVA, Mr. TUNNEY, Mr. BIAGGI, Mr. HICKS, Mr. TIERNAN, Mr. BARING, Mr. ANDERSON of California, Mr. BLATNIK, Mr. DADDARIO, Mr. CAREY, Mr. RYAN, Mr. WRIGHT, Mr. STRATTON, Mr. CONYERS, and Mr. HECHLER of West Virginia):

H. Con. Res. 480. Concurrent resolution to express the sense of the House with respect to peace in the Middle East; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. ASPINALL:

H. Res. 786. Resolution to provide further funds for the expenses of the investigations authorized by House Resolution 21; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. CRAMER:

H. Res. 787. Resolution to express the sense of the House with respect to peace in the Middle East; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. DERWINSKI (for himself, Mr. CRANE, Mr. BUCHANAN, Mr. BIESTER, Mr. BROCK, Mr. FISH, Mr. GOODLING, Mr. HARVEY, Mr. HASTINGS, Mr. HOGAN, Mr. HORTON, Mr. HUNT, Mr. JOHNSON of Pennsylvania, Mr. JONAS, Mr. KLEPPE, Mr. McCLOREY, Mr. McDONALD of Michigan, Mr. McEWEN, Mr. PETTIS, Mr. RAILSBACK, Mr. SCOTT, Mr. STEIGER of Wisconsin, Mr. WHITEHURST, Mr. WILLIAMS, and Mr. ZION):

H. Res. 788. Resolution to express the sense of the House with respect to peace in the Middle East; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. PERKINS (for himself and Mr. AYRES):

H. Res. 789. Resolution providing for the expenses incurred pursuant to House Resolution 200; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. TAYLOR:

H. Res. 790. Resolution to express the sense

of the House with respect to peace in the Middle East; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

#### PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. CAREY:

H.R. 15503. A bill for the relief of Domenico Marrone, his wife, Luisa Marrone, and their minor child, Luigi Marrone; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RYAN:

H.R. 15504. A bill for the relief of Cynthia Maude Robinson; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. THOMPSON of Georgia:

H.R. 15505. A bill for the relief of Jack B. Smith and Charles N. Martin, Jr.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. UTT:

H.R. 15506. A bill for the relief of Krikor Garabed Ayvasian, Marian Ayvasian (wife), Leon Ayvasian, Sita Ayvasian, Artini Ayvasian, and Tgohi Ayvasian (children); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

## EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

### FANNIN NOTES INDUSTRY PROBLEM

#### HON. SAM STEIGER

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 21, 1970

Mr. STEIGER of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, in the midst of an extremely difficult inflationary situation it is ironic that we are also facing an international trade problem of such burgeoning proportions that it may threaten our domestic economy.

In last Sunday's Arizona Republic, business and financial editor Don Campbell printed an interview with Arizona's Senator PAUL FANNIN outlining the scope of this problem and some of the actions which must be taken if a trade crisis is to be avoided.

Senator FANNIN notes some of the complexities which have gotten us into our current international logjam and puts forth some interesting and innovative ideas on how the problem may be attacked.

Mr. Speaker, I include the article to which I have referred, which appeared in the Arizona Republic on Sunday, January 18, in the RECORD at this point:

INDUSTRY AT THE CROSSROADS?—IMPLACABLE PINNERS OF SOARING COSTS, LOW TARIFFS STRANGLING MANUFACTURERS IN THE MARKETPLACE

(By Don G. Campbell)

With the possible exception of performing brain surgery in the back of a truck camper while negotiating the Coronado Trail, few things come quite so close to sheer impossibility as that of understanding our tariff laws.

And yet, ironically, few international arrangements strike so decisively at the man-in-the-street's pocketbook and arouse so much emotionalism as this complex network of duties that each country erects to protect

its domestic commodities and products from imports.

Ideally, of course, all countries should be so constituted that tariffs wouldn't be necessary and there would be, literally, "free trade" with everyone competing—no strings attached—with everyone else. But life is one thing, art is another, and free trade is an art that is as elusive today as it was when international commerce began.

The fact that the United States is, day by day, getting into an increasingly critical position in its foreign trade is no particular secret, but the very complexity of how we got into our current jam helps to obscure the seriousness of it. As our production costs soar, the fewer goods we sell overseas, the more jobs are lost domestically.

And, at the same time, the more foreign markets we lose, the more American manufacturers are tempted to move some of their operations abroad to compete more evenly. The result: the loss of even more jobs here in the United States.

One of the more vocal advocates of taking action in this area before the damage is irreversible is Arizona's senior U.S. Senator, Paul J. Fannin, whose concern is underscored by the fact that Arizona's role as a foreign exporter is growing by leaps and bounds—up to \$98.2 million in 1966 (the latest year available), exclusive of agricultural items, from \$63 million just six years earlier. It was in 1966 that Arizona finally nosed Colorado out of the No. 1 spot in exports among the Mountain States.

The key to the crisis, Sen. Fannin said this past week in an interview, is the inflationary cycle in the United States and, in particular, the soaring cost of labor—which, since 1965, has risen at twice the rate of output per man hour.

As a case in point, Sen. Fannin cites the disparity between labor costs among the major auto producing countries. In the United States, according to Fannin's figures, labor costs in the industry amount to about \$5.31 an hour as against:

Argentina, \$1.19; Australia, \$1.92; Brazil, \$0.96; Germany, \$2.20; Italy, \$1.99; Japan, \$1.40; Mexico, \$2.04; South Africa, \$1.05; United Kingdom, \$1.57.

Undoubtedly, too, Fannin feels, labor considerations are also the prime factor in the

explosive growth of imports currently crippling the domestic shoe industry. As recently as 1959, for instance, shoe imports equaled only 3.5 per cent of U.S. shoe production but, last year, they equaled 37.5 per cent of it, and the industry estimates that by 1975 one out of every two pairs of shoes sold in the United States will be foreign made.

The industry, Fannin said, also reckons that for every 10 million shoes imported (and there were 200 million of them in 1969), there are roughly 3,000 job opportunities lost for domestic shoe workers.

Hurt even more, of course, is the consumer electronic industry. Of the total market of 12.5 million television sets last year, for instance, a full 4.2 million of them, 33 per cent, came from abroad. The industry estimates that the import share of this will rise to 43 per cent of the market in the current year.

In the case of tape instruments, the battle already has been decisively lost—a full 10.8 million of the 11.9 million tape machines sold last year, 90 per cent—were imported. This year, the industry expects the import share of the market to rise to 92 per cent.

But, while "Cheap foreign labor" is the traditional rallying cry of the protectionists, Fannin said, the whole problem is a bit more complex than that. The disparity in labor costs, is further complicated by unfavorable tariff structures coming out of the "Kennedy Round" of tariff negotiations—a drastic reduction in the tariffs on about 100,000 products involved in world trade and a move that was decidedly overdue.

The negotiations were the result of congressional action in 1963 giving the late President the authority to slash import duties up to 50 per cent across the board. The knotty details of the authorization, however, kept all 46 nations involved in the matter busy clear up until it was finally signed into law on Nov. 13, 1967.

"The trouble is," Sen. Fannin said, "that the tariffs worked out were supposed to even up the productive capacities of the countries involved. Countries like Mexico, with a much lower productive capacity than the United States, were protected from a flood of imports with relatively high tariffs."

The trouble is, the Arizona senator said, the situation changed quickly and, by the time the nonstop negotiations on the Kennedy Round had been completed, the pro-