College at Santa Fe, N. Mex.; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. PODELL:

H.R. 17120. A bill for the relief of Luh Chii Nan; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SCHERLE:

H.R. 17121. A bill for the relief of Jesse Pursell and Sam Corbino; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. STUBBLEFIELD:

H.R. 17122. A bill for the relief of Dr. Camilo C. Balacuit and his wife, Dr. Norma Balacuit; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HALEY:

H. Res. 937. Resolution expressing congratulations to Ringling Brothers and Barnum and Bailey Circus on the 100th anniversary of the Greatest Show on Earth; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

451. By the SPEAKER: Petition of Henry Stoner, York, Pa., relative to the use of plain English in legislation affecting the general public; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

452. Also, petition of the Council of the City of Philadelphia, Pa., relative to wage increases for postal employees; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

453. Petition of the Board of County Commissioners, Union County, Fla., relative to designating Cape Kennedy as the operational base for the space shuttle system; to the Committee on Science and Astronautics.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

PASSOVER—THE JEWISH FESTIVAL OF FREEDOM, AND ITS MEANING FOR JEWS IN THE U.S.S.R.

HON. RICHARD S. SCHWEIKER

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, April 20, 1970

Mr. SCHWEIKER. Mr. President, this evening at sundown Jewish communities throughout the world will begin the yearly observance of Passover, the 8-day festival commemorating the exodus of the Jewish people from Egypt in ancient times.

Passover celebrates a people's escape from slavery and tyranny. It affirms the right of man to live in freedom and human dignity. It tells an ancient story, but as long as tyranny exists anywhere in our world, the Passover story will have a contemporary message for all of us, whether we are Jews or not.

The Jewish exodus from Egypt thousands of years ago to escape persecution was, unfortunately, only the first of a long history of such migrations for the Jewish people. Since Moses first asked the Egyptian Pharaoh to "let my people go," that call has been echoed on behalf of the Jewish people against many tyrants, in many places and in many ages. And today the call, "Let my people go," must be for the Jews living in the Soviet Union, who are forbidden by the Soviet Government to emigrate to Israel and who at the same time cannot fully practice their religion or enjoy their culture in the country where they dwell.

This evening Jewish families will begin Passover in their homes with the traditional Seder meal and service. And many of these families will add to the Seder a special ritual for their more than 3 million brethren in the Soviet Union. A separate matzo—unleavened bread—will be set aside at the Metza of Hope, hope that the Jews of the Soviet Union will soon enjoy not only fairer treatment as Soviet citizens, but also the freedom to emigrate to Israel if they desire.

Passover, then, is an appropriate time for all of us to survey the current status of Jews in the Soviet Union, a topic in which I have long been deeply concerned as both a Member of the House of Representatives and as a Senator.

Earlier this month I wrote to a group of students at the University of Pennsylvania who were arranging for a Soviet Jewry Week at the University from April 6 through 9. In the letter I stated my own personal views of the plight of Soviet Jewry and what responsibilities we as Americans should take on the matter.

I ask unanimous consent that my letter to Jay Blum, chairman of Soviet Jewry Week at the University of Pennsylvania, be printed in the RECORD at this point.

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

U.S. SENATE,
Washington, D.C., April 2, 1970.

Mr. JAY BLUM,
Chairman, Soviet Jewry Week, Hillel Foundation, University of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia, Pa.

DEAR MR. BLUM: I strongly commend and support you and your fellow students at the University of Pennsylvania who have arranged for Soviet Jewry Week at the University, April 6 through 9, 1970. There is a serious need for more public information and discussion of this grave problem, the plight of Jews living in the Soviet Union.

Once again, as throughout Jewish history, a totalitarian government is oppressing the Jews living within its borders. While the Soviet Jews may not be so much in danger of bodily harm, the soul of this community of three million Jews—its culture and its religion—is rapidly being put to death.

Many of these Jews would like to emigrate to Israel, but they cannot.

Many of them would like to practice their religion and see it exist without governmental restraints, but they cannot.

Many of them would like to provide Jewish schools for their children, and enjoy Jewish literature, drama and associations for themselves, but they cannot.

And, as if the denial of all these rights is not enough, Soviet propaganda—especially since the Six-Day War—has been vilifying the Jews as a group and attacking the State of Israel. Jews who express a desire to emigrate to Israel are being intimidated.

Jewish life in the Soviet Union is being successfully stamped out. Only 60 synagogues function today in the country, compared to 500 ten years ago. Altogether the Soviet Union has only three rabbis who function in that capacity. Moscow has not seen a bar mitzvah ceremony in 18 years, even though it has a Jewish population of half a million. A younger Jewish generation has come of age without formal Jewish training, without Bibles and prayerbooks or any religious articles.

Of course, Soviet policy has always been opposed to all religion. But among the religions of the Soviet Union, there is evidence that Judaism is put under unique restrictions. And while the Soviet Union prides itself on the cultural autonomy of diverse nationalities within its borders, somehow this cultural freedom does not extend to Jews, even though the government calls them a nationality.

Since I came to Congress in 1961, as a member of the House of Representatives, I have joined consistently with other Congressmen and Senators in issuing calls for improved treatment of Jews in the Soviet Union. I have personally introduced resolutions on the subject. And we intend to continue, because the issue requires it and because occasionally the Soviet Union shows it can be affected by such pressure.

In 1965, for example, in response to criticism from abroad, the Soviet Government lifted its eight year ban on the making of Passover matzos.

The Soviet Government has permitted what has become an annual occasion of Jewish spirit and solidarity—the Simchas Torah celebration when thousands of young Jews gather outside the Moscow synagogue to dance and sing.

And in 1957, again as a response to world opinion, the Government permitted a rabbinical seminary to open in Moscow. However, it is not now functioning because the housing permits of its students were revoked in 1962.

Can the identity of the Jewish people of the Soviet Union survive this growing suppression, restriction and intimidation? The answer will depend on the Soviet leaders, of course. The answer will depend on the tenacity of the Soviet Jews themselves. But the answer will also depend on people like us.

With the blessings of life in America that we enjoy, we must not be complacent. We must fight against injustice and oppression wherever it exists.

Some thirty years ago, as the world watched, the Nazis brought a holocaust upon the Jewish community of Europe, wiping out six million lives. This tragedy is all too fresh in our minds, and it should be fresh in the minds of the Soviet leaders. So all mankind has a stake in how the Soviet Union treats its Jewish minority.

We must call on the Soviet Union to permit emigration to Israel for all those Jews who desire to leave. We must call on the Soviet Union to improve the religious and cultural climate within the Soviet Union for the Jews that will remain. We must urge the Soviet Union to join us on the side of mankind.

Sincerely,

RICHARD S. SCHWEIKER,
U.S. Senator.

Mr. SCHWEIKER. In addition, Mr. President, a most informative article outlining the up-to-date situation of Jews in the Soviet Union appeared in the ADL Bulletin of February 1970, published by the Anti-Defamation League of B'nai B'rith. The article, entitled "The Agony of Soviet Jews," was by written by Owen S. Rachleff, associate director of the league's European affairs department. I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the RECORD.

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

AUTHENTICATED U.S. GOVERNMENT INFORMATION GPO

THE AGONY OF SOVIET JEWS

(By Owen S. Rachleff)

The year 1969 was a highly significant one in the continuing agony of the 3,000,000 Jews living in the Soviet Union. Not only was there growing evidence of administrative harassment as well as abundant examples of religious and ethnic injustices, but various aspects of the problem confronting Soviet Jewry seemed to crystalize as never before.

The three major aspects can be summarized as follows:

The anti-Zionist, anti-Israel position of the Soviet government began to be used openly as a tool of intimidation against the Jewish minority, especially against the many Jewish citizens who, in their frustration, sought permission to emigrate to Israel;

The USSR repeatedly found itself forced, by world opinion and inquiry, to issue blanket denials of the existence of a Jewish problem (these, however, sounded somewhat hollow against the mounting evidence);

There was noticeable protest from Soviet Jews who, by means of letters to the outside world, to Russian officials and to the United Nations, evidenced a new mood of defiance to persecution.

A survey of the past year in the Soviet Union reveals the continued deterioration of Judaism as a religion. At the time of Stalin's death, there were, according to Soviet sources, some 500 synagogues in the European part of the Soviet Union. By 1969, there were estimated by outside sources to be about 60. This included one each in Leningrad, Kiev and Kishinev—cities with a Jewish population numbering in the tens of thousands—and three in Moscow, with a minimum Jewish population of some 285,000 (based on a 1959 census). All together there are only three functioning rabbis in the entire country.

In its publication, *Anti-Semitism in Eastern Europe*, the Socialist International reported at the beginning of 1969: "Today's situation gives greater cause for alarm than that at any other time since the Stalinist persecution of the Jews in 1948–53."

Hopefully, however, the effects of such alarm are not always inaction and terror. Speaking of the growing defiance of young Jews, Albert I. Chernin, of the Jewish Community Relations Council of Philadelphia, returning from the USSR in the fall of 1969, reported that "young people are doing many things for the sake of preserving their Jewishness. For example, they are literally setting up programs to teach themselves Hebrew."

The Soviet mood in 1969 with respect to Jews was the culmination of an increase in anti-"Zionist" activity since the Six Day War in 1967. Attacks on alleged Zionism, of course, are useful devices for attacking not only Israel but Jews themselves, since such attacks are erroneously regarded separate and apart from outright religious bigotry.

As Rabbi Zev Segal, head of the Rabbinical Council of America, charged early in the year, "The attack on 'Zionist imperialism' merely sets up a strawman to serve as a cover for the repression of all Jewish life in the USSR."

A recent Soviet propaganda line, spelled out in *Sovietskaya Rossiya*, is that every Zionist is actually or potentially an Israeli spy, and that, furthermore, Jews have "two fatherlands and a dual loyalty."

The assumed tie between Zionists and Jews *as Jews* as seen in the eyes of Soviet propagandists was made clear in a Moscow radio broadcast on February 6, 1969, according to which "the big Jewish bourgeoisie" had been aiding "anti-State and anti-peoples activities of the counter-revolutionary forces in Hungary, Poland and Czechoslovakia."

Vicious anti-Semitic caricatures have continued to appear in anti-Israel articles and cartoons in Soviet periodicals, while magazine articles on Israel are often filled with pejorative Yiddishisms and Jewish-sounding nicknames.

Two new anti-Soviet books have found great favor with the Soviet propaganda apparatus over the last twelve months. In essence, the authors of these books have merely written an updated version of the *Protocols of the Learned Elders of Zion*, a forgery that is perhaps the most thoroughly discredited piece of anti-Semitic literature ever conceived.

The first of these writers is Yuri Ivanoz, whose *Beware: Zionism!* was issued early in 1969. Ivanov twists the "chosen people" concept into an ethnic slur, incredibly comparing the Jewish religious concept to the Nazis' master-race theories. As to whether the enemy is merely the political state of Israel, Ivanoz declares: "The ruling circles of Israel are junior partners in the International Jewish Concern (i.e., Conspiracy)." Ivanov's book, incidentally has received the unanimous praise of Moscow Radio and of all Communist Party newspapers and magazines.

The second and more virulent of the diatribe writers is Trofim Kichko, whose previous work, an anti-Semitic item called *Judaism Without Embellishment*, published in 1963, was withdrawn by Soviet authorities as the result of pressures from all over the world. In 1969, however, Kichko was not only re-evaluated and thoroughly reinstated by the authorities, but in August a government-sponsored organization published his latest anti-Semitic attack, *Judaism and Zionism*.

Kichko specifically attacks the Jewish religion, repeating the 19th century canards that it permits its adherents "to take away everything from *goyim*, peoples of other faiths," and that it teaches "that the whole world belongs to the Jews." Kichko further insists that in the absence of a personal disavowal, one must consider that "every Jew is a Judaist (i.e., a Zionist), every Judaist an Israeli." The implications here are obvious; every Soviet Jew is to be considered potentially disloyal.

As a natural consequence of Soviet discrimination against the Jews, both as a nationality and as a religion, and of the growing phenomena of thinly-disguised anti-Semitic propaganda, a great number of Jews residing in the Soviet Union continue to make clear their desire to emigrate to Israel.

The Soviet Union is not opposed in principle to the idea of emigration; the "ingathering of Armenians" has been going on for some years, a campaign through which more than 200,000 persons have been repatriated to Soviet Armenia. Nonetheless, among the thousands of applications by Jews for emigration permits there are included some submitted as long as ten years ago. This backlog results from interminable delays, and in most cases outright refusals, on the part of the OVIR, the Soviet agency through which exit visas would ordinarily be secured.

Such refusals and delays are a direct contravention of Soviet policy as stated on December 3, 1967, by Premier Kosygin. "There will be no problem (concerning emigration)," he said, "the doors will be open."

Despite Kosygin's statement, a pitiful number of Jews are believed to have emigrated from USSR in 1969. OVIR intransigence concerning Jewish emigration requests continues and, as a result, many applicants have decided to present their problems by personal letter to the country's top officials. In August, 1969, for example, a Moscow family of four named Kleizmer wrote to Soviet President Podgorny pleading for exit permits. Citing discrimination and repression as an insult to human dignity, the letter concluded: "For us, it has become intolerable to live in such an atmosphere." The Kleizmers received no reply.

Also in August, eighteen heads of Jewish families in the Soviet Republic of Georgia signed a bold petition made public by Israel's U.N. Ambassador, Yosef Tekoah, asking "that the U.N. Human Rights Commission do everything it can to obtain from the Soviet Government in the shortest possible time permission for us to leave."

The Eighteen Georgians exemplify the agony of their fellow Jews who apparently live in a continuous state of contention with the bureaucracy. However, the classic example is the one involving Boris L. Kochubiyevsky, a 33-year-old Jewish engineer. In August, 1968, shortly after his marriage, Kochubiyevsky applied for permission for himself and his wife to emigrate to Israel. The couple's applications were approved in November, 1968, but on the morning that Kochubiyevsky was to pick up the necessary documents, his apartment was searched and many private papers seized.

A week later Kochubiyevsky was arrested. It was charged that he had "during 1968 systematically disseminated by word of mouth slanderous fabrications, defaming the State and social system . . ."

Kochubiyevsky was brought to trial on May 13, 1969, in a closed courtroom in Kiev. There, a parade of witnesses testified that he had engaged in anti-Soviet agitation and spread "Zionist" propaganda. Kochubiyevsky was sentenced to three years at hard labor.

Perhaps as never before, the Soviet government felt the pressure of world protests against anti-Semitism during 1969. On October 30, the Soviet Embassy in Washington issued an 18-page compilation of purported data on Jews in the USSR. The document painted an incredibly positive picture of Soviet Jewry indicating that educational, cultural and religious opportunities for Jews were high. It claimed that over 100 synagogues were functioning and that Jews "have every opportunity to practice religion"—but noted that "most people in the Soviet Union have long turned away from religion . . . Jews are no exception." It also spoke of the activities of Yiddish theatrical and musical groups, but cited no dates.

What does the future hold? As the eighteen Georgians showed, discouragement is not the mood among many Soviet Jews. Perhaps uncomfortable with this not-so silent rebellion, the USSR reportedly announced that it would allow the eighteen families the right to emigrate—to Canada and the United States—but *not* to Israel, lest the USSR offend "our Arab friends." The eighteen, however, still insist that not only they, but 7,000 Jewish applicants, be granted immediate exit visas to Israel.

More and more it becomes apparent that if the 1970s are to bring a solution, and if Soviet Jewry is to be saved, that solution lies in emigration to Israel, in the restoration of religious and cultural rights, and in world pressure upon the Soviet government to make those acknowledged rights a reality.

THE DISABLED VETERAN AS A MANPOWER RESOURCE IN MY COMMUNITY

HON. CARL ALBERT

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 20, 1970

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, Miss Cathy Dennis, 17-year-old Comanche, Okla., high school senior, recently won second

place in an essay contest sponsored in Oklahoma by the Governor's committee on employment of the handicapped. I include her winning essay:

THE DISABLED VETERAN AS A MANPOWER RESOURCE IN MY COMMUNITY

(By Cathy Dennis)

A mighty nation has been to war. Her proud soldiers victorious, brave, strong, and dedicated, have won.

From 1776 'til 1970, the United States has been the victor of every major conflict because of brave men willing to fight, die, sacrifice, and suffer for what they believe—their way of life, freedom, and America.

As these brave soldiers begin to come home from war, whether it be the Revolutionary War, the Civil War, a World War, or Viet Nam, the same question arises: What does a country do with her soldiers after the war?

Not all soldiers are as fortunate as others. Some suffered more, sacrificed more—a limb, their sight, their hearing, their mind—what of these people?

They should not be excluded from the mainstream of society, written off as simply disabled, handicapped, incapable, useless For those who have suffered most know how to give the most to their country, their friends, their community, and to humanity.

The economy of our nation and community depends on the jobs being filled. Many of the "so-called" veterans could be the manpower reserve to meet the challenge as capable workers in communities such as mine.

There are many things which contribute, affect, encourage, and assist the disabled veteran to start anew and become a worker.

Poverty, charity, pity or generosity, are not reasons to hire the handicapped. Reports show that hiring disabled workers is a sound business policy.[1]

Disabled workers show loyalty, hard work, determination and ability. Their accident rate is no higher, their qualifications are no lower. So disabled people can be considered a man-power resource.

Exactly what must be done to train disabled veterans, find them jobs, and give them the chance to take their rightful place?

Federal agencies, state committees, community organizations, and local groups all play a part in helping a disabled veteran forget the war, his past, his handicap, and look forward.

Many people are wise enough to look beyond the disability, to the inner source, ability, prospect, and capability.

Men such as J. W. McGovern,[2] and George Meany,[3] support the hiring of handicapped people.

Companies such as Sears Roebuck and Company,[4] and General Electric Company,[5] consider ability rather than disability and have through their policy of nondiscrimination, demonstrated that a disabled Veteran can be a manpower resource. With individuals, agencies, organizations, loans, that offer these opportunities, the Veteran is able to find a position, excel, progress, and succeed.

Within my own community there are those with handicaps which are great, small, visible, or invisible, who fill small, large, important, and unimportant jobs. There are some who run businesses, farms, and are self-employed, or become a good employee for others.

There are also disabled veterans who have not taken advantage of the numerous helps offering them a useful place in society. Whether employed, or unemployed, the disabled veteran must be considered a manpower resource, because of opportunities that are available, ready, accessible, and waiting, to give him the chance to hope, dream, progress, and succeed.

He will no longer need to feel alienated from society because of his handicap, but can become a confident and competent employee making his personal contribution to the welfare of his community, the nation, and the world.

FOOTNOTES

[1] "Employment of the handicapped in jobs which they can fulfill is not a work of charity, but a sound business policy." Leo Weisfield, President of Weisfield's, Inc.

[2] "We advocate that no arbitrary limitations to employment be set up on the basis of physical handicap." J. W. McGovern, Pres. of National Assoc. of Manufacturers.

[3] "The Progress of Medical Science has made it possible for almost every victim of a handicap to fill a useful place." George Meany, Pres., AFL–CIO.

[4] "Persons with physical handicaps should be considered for employment on the basis of their capability for a particular job." Sears Roebuck and Company.

[5] "The goal should be full utilization of manpower consistent with the best interest of the worker and the company." The General Electric Company.

FARM SUBSIDY PAYMENTS

HON. JAMES J. HOWARD

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 20, 1970

Mr. HOWARD. Mr. Speaker, as the House Committee on Agriculture completes its work on the authorizations for Department of Agriculture appropriations for fiscal year 1971, we are once again faced with a continuing question of the validity of some of the Department of Agriculture's expenditures. I refer, of course, to the farm subsidy payments, which, as the New York Times has so aptly phrased it, make the "rural rich richer."

My question, Mr. Speaker, is not that some people are getting richer—that is to be expected in a free society. My question concerns two other areas. The first is that because some people are getting richer on these funds, a majority of the farmers, who happen not to have such enormous acreages to keep fallow, are getting poorer and consequently are being forced off their land. The second point is that this is, so I have heard, a government based on the wishes of the majority of the population. Now, when a mere 4 percent of our rural population is receiving a whopping one-third plus of all these subsidy payments—I wonder whether we are really being representative of the majority of the people.

I think we all agree that the current inflationary problems have hurt the citizens of this country, and that the Government has an obligation to cut back on nonessential spending to help solve these problems. I think a cutback on the outrageous farm subsidies paid to millionaire farmers is an excellent place to start.

I happen to be one of those people who consider $20,000 to be a substantial sum of money. Further, I do not believe a limit of $20,000 on these farm subsidies would completely deplete the bank accounts of the large farmers who are currently receiving more than that. I might add that the savings obtained from such a limitation on subsidies could be redirected to provide additional funds for the Department of Agriculture food stamp program—which has been seriously short funded since its inception. In fact, many of the counties which are receiving the most of the subsidy funds are the same counties which have not provided food stamps of food distribution programs in the past. This, despite the fact that many of the poor in those counties are poor because the large landowners are becoming rich on farm subsidies because they do not plant their land, which means there are no jobs for the farm workers in the area.

I should also add that many of those who are being forced to sell their land, or are out of work because so much land is lying fallow, are leaving rural areas and migrating to the large cities. Because they are untrained for any work aside from tilling the soil, they are then adding to the burden of the welfare roles of the urban areas.

Twice before the House has expressed its will on this subject. Twice now we have amended the Agriculture bill to place a ceiling of $20,000 on these payments. Twice, however, the House has refused to insist on retaining this amendment in the final bill—because of pressure by certain members of the Senate, where the amendment has failed.

Passage of this amendment has become even more important now, however, and with it, the importance of retaining this provision in the final bill. During 1969 a total of 7,795 farmers received payments of over $25,000 each from the Federal Government—an increase of 1,881 farmers over the previous year. These farmers divided a total of $93,333,643 more in 1969 than the farmers receiving these huge payments the previous year. This was true despite the fact that the rural population of this country continues to grow smaller.

Mr. Speaker, this particular "welfare" program has also been receiving more widespread publicity, and the American people are being awakened to this waste and misuse of their tax dollars. Last year we heard much about the possibility of a taxpayers' revolt. I contend that we will hear more about such a possibility as the taxpayers become more aware of just where their money is going—they will not support a government which, while consumers are paying higher and higher prices, and our water and air continue to be polluted and cities decay, uses their hard earned tax dollars to make the rich richer and the rural poor, poorer.

ALEXANDER BICKEL ON NIXON SCHOOL DESEGREGATION STATEMENT

HON. WILLIAM A. STEIGER

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 20, 1970

Mr. STEIGER of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, Alexander M. Bickel, Chancel-

lor Kent professor of law and legal history at Yale University, has written an analysis of President Nixon's statement on school desegregation.

Writing in the April 4–11, 1970, issue of New Republic, Professor Bickel rejects the thesis that the President has intentions of putting the brakes on 15 years of progress on eliminating de jure segregation in our Nation's schools. Instead he sees the President's message as "realistic and sensible" saying it "ought to help greatly in keeping the process of desegregation on the rails."

The text of Dr. Bickel's article follows:

REALISTIC, SENSIBLE—II

(By Alexander M. Bickel)

The President's statement on school desegregation cannot have gladdened Senators Stennis and Thurmond, since it dashes their hopes for a regressing and reneging equivalent of the Compromise of 1877. There can be no further Administration support of, or neutrality toward, any Stennis admendment or any freedom-of-choice amendment or bill consistent with the policy that has now been set forth by Mr. Nixon. And yet, to judge by their public expressions, the statement earned no points with the leaders of civil rights organizations, such as Jack Greenberg, director of the NAACP Legal Defense Fund. We have tended, said the President, to place "on the schools and the children too great a share of the burden of eliminating racial disparities throughout our society. A major part of this task falls to the schools. But they cannot do it all or even most of it by themselves." No such candid, public recognition of limits is apparently acceptable to those who have spent 15 years fighting for school desegregation in hundreds upon hundreds of Southern counties, because the struggle is symbolic as well as practical, and because they fear that any admission of limits will lead to backsliding.

As to symbolism, Whitehead has warned us that "the life of humanity can easily be overwhelmed by its symbolic accessories." The warning is apposite.

Fears of backsliding involve a political judgment on which reasonable men differ. At the very least a persuasive argument can be made that the greatest danger of backsliding arises from the failure to acknowledge any limits; that the most favorable climate for getting Stennis or freedom of choice amendments through Congress is a climate of confusion and uncertainty about the reach of the law of school desegregation. In the spring of 1968, again last fall, and in several cases since, the Supreme Court has declared that school desegregation could no longer be permitted to proceed with "deliberate speed." Schools would have to be desegregated *now*, converted *now*, at long last, from dual into unitary systems. The Court, in other words, has told us "when." Yet as Chief Justice Burger pointed out in a recent brief concurring opinion, of which the President's statement takes note, the Court has not in any detail told us "what" or "how." To be sure, it will no longer tolerate tokenism in the guise of freedom of choice, and it will require faculties to be integrated. But the Court has not indicated, one way or the other, whether racial balance must be achieved in each school, or whether zoning which causes residential patterns to be reflected in the schools is unconstitutional as such. The Court has not said whether the persistence of some predominantly or wholly Negro and white schools is unconstitutional.

Lower federal courts have gone further. The main drift of their decisions over the past year and a half has been toward requiring some measure of racial balance. But such decisions are not ultimately authoritative, and they have not been uniform. Even within a single jurisdiction, that of the Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit, covering the deep South, one finds decisions that reject residential zoning, and decisions that accept it.

This is how the cases stand, and the President's statement contains a fair and accurate assessment of them. The lack of uniformity and certainty in the law is nothing novel. It is the condition that has prevailed since *Brown v. Board of Education* was decided in 1954. But the consequences of uncertainty are different today than they were, because the law is at a turning point. It is poised to make—or not make—a transition from the disestablishment of segregation to the imposition, in the South initially and then perhaps elsewhere, of a requirement of racial balance in the schools. In this situation of flux and instability in the law, and the consequent confusion, real and feigned, between segregation and racial imbalance, and between desegregation and racial balance, segregationists have been able to throw doubt on the whole process of desegregation, and to recruit new allies against it.

The distinction between segregation and racial imbalance—the one called *de jure*, the other *de facto*—is sharply drawn by the President. Desegregation, he says, is constitutionally required, is right in "human terms," has worked increasingly well, and will be carried to completion in the South and in places in the North where intentional separation of children by race can be charged to local officials. Integration—the achievement of racial balance in the schools—is in general a desirable goal. But the President is clearer than much public discussion has been about the educational value of racial integration. "The data tell us," he says, "that in educational terms, the significant factor is not race but rather the educational environment in the home . . . [and] that in order for the positive benefits of integration to be achieved, the school must have a majority of children from environments that encourage learning." Hence "providing better education for the disadvantaged requires a more sophisticated approach than mere racial mathematics." The unadorned assumption that the way to improve black children is to associate them with whites carries a suggestion of "smug paternalism." Moreover, a free and open society, which is the proper goal, "does not have to be homogeneous, or even fully integrated. There is room within it for communities . . . [for] group identity and group pride." Finally, any concerted effort to achieve racial balance in the schools faces enormous practical difficulties. Integration, therefore—integration, as distinguished from desegregation—is not in law, and should not be, the first priority.

To assist in the process of desegregation, to support alleviation of "problems associated with *de facto* segregation in the North as well as South," and to equalize black schools in plant and quality with white schools, the President proposes allocating half a billion dollars in the fiscal year starting this summer, and a billion in the following year.

The statement as a whole is realistic and sensible and ought to help greatly in keeping the process of desegregation on the rails. Unhappily, its impact on the general public has been blunted by its length and by its complexity, which makes quotation out of context all too possible and likely. The length and complexity reflect the nature of the problem. But one wishes that the essence of the statement, without the supporting documentation, had been delivered by the President, himself, plainly and directly.

Unhappily, also, there are two ambiguities in the discussion of *de jure* segregation, which it would be well for the White House to clear up, officially. In setting forth the obligation of local school boards to take affirmative measures to desegregate their systems, the President emphasizes, as does the case law, that this is an obligation to be discharged in good faith. Good faith is proved by deeds, but the same deeds may not prove good faith in each instance. A whole history of deeds and attitudes enters into a finding of good faith; it is, therefore, an *additional* criterion, not an absolving one, and it ought to be clear that this is what the President intended to say. Again, he summarized the law of desegregation by saying that a "rule of reason" applies to desegregation plans adopted in good faith. As a summarizing slogan, the phrase is harmless, but it might be read to inject some new element into the practice of desegregation. If so, it is a totally obscure element and, as such, dangerous.

RESULTS OF PUBLIC OPINION SURVEY IN NORTH CAROLINA'S NINTH CONGRESSIONAL DISTRICT

HON. CHARLES RAPER JONAS

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 20, 1970

Mr. JONAS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the results of my annual public opinion survey among residents of North Carolina's Ninth Congressional District.

I was pleased that more than 15,000 individuals returned questionnaires. The fact that so many people would take the time to participate in this survey indicates a high level of concern about the critical problems facing our country at home and abroad.

It was also pleasing that a great majority of those responding added supplementary comments elaborating on their reasons for the views they expressed on the questions listed, or calling my attention to issues of interest not included on the questionnaire. This indicates not only that people are anxious to have their views solicited on specific questions but that they are interested in expressing their views on a wide variety of subjects.

I might add that it is important for a Congressman to keep up with the thinking of his constituents if our system of representative democracy is to be effective. I consider the use of the survey I conduct annually as a good way of keeping posted on the thinking of the people back home.

The answers as tabulated by Data Management, Inc., of Arlington, Va., from my 1969 questionnaire are as follows:

[Answers in percent]

1. Do you approve of the steps President Nixon has taken to get us out of Vietnam including the return home of substantial numbers of combat troops, the elimination of offensive ground operations, and the gradual transfer of the fighting to South Vietnamese troops?

Yes	85.8
No	10.5
No answer	3.7

2. Do you believe these actions and the proposals to negotiate everything except the right of the people of South Vietnam to de-

termine their own future are all the steps the President should take until the Communists indicate a willingness to negotiate a settlement?

Yes	54.6
No	38.4
No answer	7.0

3. If your answer to Question 2 was NO, which of the following courses of action do you recommend:

(a) An official public announcement that we are going to withdraw all U.S. troops from Vietnam by a specified date without any concessions or agreements from the Communists?

Yes	11.1
No	10.9
No answer	78.0

(b) An official public announcement that on a specific date in the near future, the United States and its allies will begin an all-out effort to achieve a military victory unless the Communists begin meaningful peace talks in Paris?

Yes	29.0
No	4.3
No answer	66.7

(c) Maintain the present policy of seeking a negotiated settlement while continuing to defend our position in Vietnam?

Yes	12.8
No	7.4
No answer	79.8

4. Do you believe the current wave of protests and demonstrations (for example, the "Vietnam Moratorium") serves the cause of peace?

Yes	14.9
No	82.1
No answer	3.0

5. Do you support the proposal made by President Nixon to revise the draft law by (a) reducing the period of time during which young Americans are primarily vulnerable to the draft from seven years to one year, and (b) replacing the present system of selection with a system of random selection?

Yes	87.3
No	6.9
No answer	5.8

6. Do you approve President Nixon's recommendations to Congress for reforming the welfare program?

Yes	76.0
No	11.4
No answer	12.6

7. Do you support the President's decision to take the Post Office out of politics and to transfer the operation of the postal service to a government-owned corporation?

Yes	87.1
No	8.0
No answer	4.9

8. Do you favor increasing the amount of money people who receive Social Security benefits can earn without having those benefits reduced?

Yes	92.0
No	5.5
No answer	2.5

9. Do you favor President Nixon's "Revenue Sharing" plan whereby a portion of federal revenues would be set aside and returned to the states for them to use as they see fit?

Yes	84.3
No	10.9
No answer	4.8

10. How do you rate the following *domestic* problems in order of urgency? In the blocks at the right rank these problems from "1" for most urgent through "5" for least urgent of these five domestic problems.

(a) Air and water pollution:

Ranked 1 in order of urgency	10.1
Ranked 2 in order of urgency	13.6
Ranked 3 in order of urgency	27.8
Ranked 4 in order of urgency	21.1
Ranked 5 in order of urgency	23.2
No answer	4.2

(b) Crime:

Ranked 1 in order of urgency	37.4
Ranked 2 in order of urgency	29.2
Ranked 3 in order of urgency	17.8
Ranked 4 in order of urgency	7.5
Ranked 5 in order of urgency	4.0
No answer	4.1

(c) Inflation and cost of living:

Ranked 1 in order of urgency	38.1
Ranked 2 in order of urgency	28.2
Ranked 3 in order of urgency	17.2
Ranked 4 in order of urgency	7.8
Ranked 5 in order of urgency	4.5
No answer	4.2

(d) Poverty:

Ranked 1 in order of urgency	7.2
Ranked 2 in order of urgency	12.3
Ranked 3 in order of urgency	25.6
Ranked 4 in order of urgency	35.0
Ranked 5 in order of urgency	15.5
No answer	4.4

(e) Race relations and integration:

Ranked 1 in order of urgency	6.0
Ranked 2 in order of urgency	9.8
Ranked 3 in order of urgency	16.0
Ranked 4 in order of urgency	19.0
Ranked 5 in order of urgency	44.2
No answer	5.0

GI BILL

HON. JULIA BUTLER HANSEN

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 20, 1970

Mrs. HANSEN of Washington. Mr. Speaker, the University of Washington Veterans Association, like many other organizations serving our fighting men, has written letters of thanks to Members of Congress who helped write and pass legislation improving the GI bill.

I include the letter in the RECORD and that each Member who supported this important legislation share the gratitude of these men:

UNIVERSITY OF WASHINGTON,
April 9, 1970.

Congresswoman JULIA BUTLER HANSEN,
Cannon House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MADAM: On behalf of the University of Washington Veterans' Association and the Washington State Collegiate Veteran's Association, I would like to thank the members of the joint conference committee for the G.I. Educational Benefit Increase bill. I would also extend thank-you to all committee members on this measure and all those who voted for the final version.

By passing this legislation, Congress has shown responsibility for its earlier actions and the future of the United States. Congress has also shown responsiveness to veterans current economic needs as well as helping to insure the continued prosperity and technical development of the action. Congress was very wise to include special incentives for minority groups in this measure. The increase in these benefits should insure that more veterans finish their education, thus generating additional tax revenues to make this measure self-financing as did those of the past.

I hope that the passage of this bill will enable and provide incentive for veteran students to take a greater interest in government. We believe that no education is complete without the knowledge of how to obtain desirable action from government. The experience we gained in our efforts to obtain passage of this measure will be invaluable to us in the future. We hope other student groups will follow our example and participate within the system to obtain desirable ends.

Sincerely,

FRED A. REINKE,
Secretary.

MR. GEORGE HASTINGS HONORED

HON. WILLIAM M. COLMER

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 20, 1970

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, in August of this past year, Hurricane Camille slammed into our Mississippi Gulf Coast causing great damage and destruction. The people of my section of Mississippi were greatly encouraged, however, despite this overwhelming devastation, by the flood of assistance that arrived from individuals, businesses, organizations, and all divisions of the State and Federal Government.

Immediately following the visit of Hurricane Camille, one of the main agencies to appear on the scene was the Office of Emergency Preparedness, represented by their regional director, Mr. George Hastings. Since the OEP was charged with the full responsibility of coordinating all recovery efforts prior to and following the passage of the Federal Disaster Act of 1969, Mr. Hastings has been called on day and night with the many varied problems facing the Mississippi Gulf Coast. Mr. Hastings only recently returned to his home in Texas after spending over 7 months in Mississippi on this special job.

On March 25, the Jackson County Board of Supervisors passed a resolution of commendation for the outstanding service that Mr. George Hastings rendered to the entire Mississippi Gulf Coast and surrounding areas. I would like to take this opportunity on behalf of the Mississippi congressional delegation to insert in the RECORD this resolution commending Mr. Hastings:

RESOLUTION OF THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS OF JACKSON COUNTY, MISS., COMMENDING MR. GEORGE HASTINGS, REGIONAL DIRECTOR OF OEP

Whereas, on August 17 and 18, 1969, the Mississippi Coast was struck by Hurricane Camille, causing a National disaster from the destruction; and

Whereas, Mr. George Hastings, the Regional Director of the Office of Emergency Preparedness, immediately came into the Coast area with his forces at a most difficult time to manage the recovery of the area; and

Whereas, this Board finds and determines that in his position, as Regional Director of OEP, Mr. Hastings was most courageous, cooperative and understanding, and gave effective leadership to the people in the area; and

Whereas, the outstanding actions of Mr. Hastings have helped tremendously in the recovery of the Mississippi Coast area from this National disaster.

Now, therefore, be it resolved by the Board of Supervisors of Jackson County, Mississippi, that this Board does hereby commend Mr. George Hastings, Regional Director of OEP, for his outstanding leadership in the recovery from the Hurricane Camille disaster.

Be it further resolved that a certified copy of this Resolution be presented to Mr. Hastings and to the Senators and Congressmen representing Mississippi in the United States Congress, with the request that this Resolution be entered in The Congressional Record.

The adoption of the above Resolution was moved, seconded, and unanimously adopted by the Board of Supervisors of Jackson County, Mississippi, on this the 25th day of March, A.D., 1970.

EDWARD A. KHAYAT, *President.*
OLIN H. DAVIS, *Member.*
LUM R. CUMBEST, *Member.*
J. C. MAY, *Member.*
W. T. ROBERTS, *Member.*

Attest:

WILBUR G. DEES, *Clerk.*

ANSWERS NEEDED IN REGARD TO FIRING OF WILLIAM WOESTENDIEK OF WETA

HON. E. Y. BERRY

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 20, 1970

Mr. BERRY. Mr. Speaker, freedom of the news media came under assault again Friday. Real assault and real intimidation and retribution this time; not a mild request by the Vice President to the media to search its conscience.

And where did it come from, Mr. Speaker? It came from the unlikeliest place of all: from within the television industry.

We all know the story now, how and why WETA fired a top newsman because his wife works for a public figure.

The question now is: What to do? Does the Congress stand by idly and watch a federally regulated, federally subsidized segment of the news media attack the integrity of the members of that media?

Mr. Speaker, I hope not.

There are many facets to this case, many angles. They should be looked at. Is this an infringement on freedom of speech? Is political discrimination any more defensible than racial or religious discrimination? What is the role of the Ford Foundation in controlling WETA's news content and hiring policies? Does the FCC have a responsibility toward TV newsmen?

Has the first amendment been violated? Should the Federal Government help support this kind of bias?

Mr. Speaker, we need some answers to these questions. I trust those entrusted with supplying them will do so expeditiously.

FOR AMERICANS—PROMISE OF "DECENT HOME" AND "FAIR HOUSING"—LONGEST RUNNING OFFICIAL LIE

HON. WILLIAM (BILL) CLAY

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 20, 1970

Mr. CLAY. Mr. Speaker, on March 17 I submitted to the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a report on fair housing in St. Louis as prepared by the Greater St. Louis Committee for Freedom of Residence. Today, I pursue that concern and call to the attention of my colleagues an editorial depicting the city of St. Louis as a "divided city."

Consistent with the concern expressed in the St. Louis Post-Dispatch editorial of March 11, is a speech I delivered recently before the Webster Groves Fair Housing Committee, Webster Groves, Mo., at a meeting April 2 which was cosponsored by the St. Louis Committee for Freedom of Residence.

In an effort to point up the rising concern and escalating need for attending the problems of providing decent housing for the poor—and for making our expressed intent for fair housing meaningful as law and in practice, I submit now, both the Post-Dispatch editorial and my address of April 2, 1970:

[From the St. Louis Post-Dispatch, Mar. 11, 1970]

ST. LOUIS, A DIVIDED CITY

Two years ago the Kerner commission on violence warned that the nation was moving toward two societies, separate and unequal, and now the chairman of the United States Civil Rights Commission cites St. Louis as an example of that trend.

It should be difficult for any objective observer to quarrel with the remarks of the Rev. Theodore M. Hesburgh, CSC, president of the University of Notre Dame. He noted that the St. Louis suburbs are a white noose around a black core city, and that is apparent. He said that business and banking and real estate practices help to maintain a racially-divided society in housing and employment, and even as he spoke, events bore out what he said.

For one thing, the Justice Department brought suit in federal court here against four of the largest St. Louis real estate firms, accusing them of racial discrimination in both their sales practices and their employment.

For another, the United States Supreme Court unanimously ordered the City of Memphis to proceed at once with public school desegregation—but the Memphis schools seem, on the surface, no more segregated than those in St. Louis and perhaps less. Of 194 Memphis schools, 45 are said to have nearly an even racial mix. Of 165 St. Louis schools, only 15 fit the Civil Rights Commission's definition of "integrated." Since formal desegregation in 1955, the St. Louis school system has been slowly returning to segregation.

But what of progress? There has undoubtedly been progress. After World War II St. Louis was an almost totally segregated city, in a segregated state whose Constitution still nominally proclaims school segregation. In 20 years most public accommodations have been opened to all on an equal basis, and equal rights to housing, jobs and schooling are part of local law and the law of the land.

Yet laws and court decisions do not make it so. They do not eradicate the ghetto or discourage whites from fleeing when schools become half black, and only grudgingly do they make institutions change century-old policies that by intention or neglect discriminate.

Look in Father Hesburgh's mirror. It is a sad picture there: the two St. Louises that live apart, go to school apart and for the most work apart, and do not really know one another. We do not think the picture is going to change quickly until most citizens concede that it is so, and determine that it should not be. Self-recognition would be at least a start.

LONGEST RUNNING OFFICIAL LIE—PUBLIC HOUSING AND FAIR HOUSING

When I was invited to speak to you tonight I was told of your interest in housing. Specifically, I was told of your interest in fair housing. Consequently, when I submitted the topic of my address, I titled it "housing for all." As I prepared my remarks, I decided to give them a new name.

Tonight, I come before you to talk about the "Longest Running Official Lie." It is an appropriate title, I believe, since no lie has been running longer than the one this government made long ago about "a decent home for every American."

In 1949, the Congress of the United States committed this Government to build 810,000 units of public housing in the ensuing six years. Today, more than 20 years later, we still fall 10,000 units short of that goal.

We have gone to the moon. We have been in two more wars. We have built thousands of miles of highways and thousands of weapons and battle machinery which are now obsolete. But we have not yet finished building those 810,000 units of public housing (that we set out to build by 1955).

The record of this country to fulfill its promise of a "decent home for every American"—is also known as the "great American housing hoax." No nation of any stature in the world has compiled a worse record for providing its citizens, particularly its poor citizens, with housing.

The great American hoax began with a Republican conservative President, William H. Taft, who declared that private enterprise could not possibly meet the housing needs of poor people.

We have come full circle since then—through Moderates, Liberals, Democrats, New Deals, Fair Deals, Square Deals—New Frontiers and Great Societies. Now we have another conservative President who remains unconvinced. In fact, Nixon is not convinced that Government is necessary at all.

In the area of housing for the poor, the President is now circulating legislation which proposes that public housing be turned back to slum landlords.

We cannot talk about "fair housing" just in terms of black and white. It is useless for us to talk about putting most black families in the suburbs amidst middle-class white families. Because most black families are poor families.

I want the black doctor who has the money to have his choice of homes—and I will fight for his right to live in Webster Groves if he so chooses. But at this moment, I am most concerned that the poor black who is forced to fight for every right that he gets be given priority.

I don't need to tell you that discrimination rules the housing industry. I don't need to tell you that prejudice dictates the rules in

this country—including who will live in certain neighborhoods.

There are many ways to discover just how bad the housing situation is in this nation. It is not just a crisis of housing—but a tragedy of the human condition in a free nation.

You can take a drive through any central city—and you will see how financial policies and political decisions have determined who will inhabit the slums and under what conditions they will live.

Or, if your interest is specifically housing, ask the average man on the street what problems he is having buying or paying for a home. This is a simple test since it's almost impossible for a man earning less than $15,000 a year to buy a home. Are you aware that the average cost of a home in this country over the past year was $27,000.

The numbers tell us how much priority this Government places on housing the poor. Take the 5-year period, 1962 through 1967. In that period, the United States spent $365.3 billion for national defense, $33.2 billion for stabilizing farm prices and income, $24.2 billion for space exploration, $22.2 billion for Federal highway construction, $8.1 billion for all housing and urban renewal programs and a mere $1.25 billion for Federal housing subsidies.

Bringing the numbers up to date—the Nixon budget for 1971 calls for $73 billion for national defense, $14 billion for commerce and transportation, $9 billion for veterans benefits and services, $6 billion for agriculture and farm payments—and a grand total of $3.8 billion for all Government financed housing programs. Of that amount, only $890 million is specified for low- and moderate-income housing.

When the Nixon budget was released, George Romney boasted that he had cut his department's budget to the bone and was glad of it. And people expressed astonishment—that the record of the past would be carried into the future by a man who expressed enthusiastic conviction that it was right.

Last year, President Johnson's committee on urban housing released its report. Let me relate to you some of their findings:

1. More than 12 percent of American families cannot afford decent housing.

2. In numbers, that means more than 7.8 million American families—or one in every eight, cannot now afford to pay market price for standard housing which would cost no more than 20 percent of their total income.

3. At least 10 percent of the Nation's existing shelters are in substandard condition.

4. The average ratio of housing costs to gross income of the total population is 15 percent. By that, I mean that the average American pays no more than 15 percent of his income for housing.

5. One-half of the 7.8 million families in need of housing are surviving on less than $3,000 a year.

For these people—whose incomes average $3,000 a year, unless they have assistance from somewhere, they have no housing.

For these people—a choice of housing means no choice at all. For the urban poor, it means public housing where it is available and where they can afford it.

In this country, there was no subsidized housing for the poor until passage of the Housing Act in 1937. Other countries, namely England and Sweden, had housing subsidy programs as early as 1919.

In the United States—all we had done prior to 1937 was talk. We had appointed commissions to make reports and to document the problem. The Congress even held hearings on the housing situation in 1890, which were said to have awakened the Nation to the glaring deficiencies for the poor. But still, no law came until 1937.

For the United States, public housing is a program where the development, ownership and management of projects are the responsibilities of local government bodies. Rents in public housing projects are lowered by a combination of Federal and local subsidies. When the law was written, it was intended that fully employed blue-collar and semi-skilled workers would be eligible for occupancy—but occupancy has been restricted, if only by the availability of such housing, to those persons of very low incomes.

At the Federal end, there was the Public Housing Administration responsible for handling Federal relations with local housing authorities. Today, it is the Housing Assistance Administration in the Department of HUD which handles the Federal responsibility.

And that—is the only notable or noteworthy change in the public housing program since 1937. The needs have skyrocketed, the problems have multiplied and the poor have continued to go unhoused and badly housed—but the program of housing subsidies for the poor has not substantially changed.

It has often been a priority of this Government to speak for the poor—and it is a well-established bad habit of this Government not to act on its word. The Congress writes a law and states its intent to act—but when that law comes to the Congress for funds, the Congress changes its mind about the intent it expressed and decides that its responsibility for the purse is more important.

This is the most notorious system for nullifying law and the most ruthless and successful means for alienating American citizens. For the American Government, it is a way of life. No law has been more victimized by this process than public housing.

In 1967, the public housing program included some 650,000 units which housed almost 2.4 million persons. Production of public housing has been erratic—with major spurts of energy coming in 1941 and 1952 when most of the existing public housing structures were built.

Public housing is a rental program. The cost of project development is financed with long-term tax exempt local bonds. This lowers the direct debt retirement costs. Then, the Federal Government makes annual contibutions to the local housing authority to cover all costs of retiring the bonds. Until the last two years, this was the only form of Federal subsidy.

Now, the Federal Government is authorized to pay a local authority an additional $120 per year for the benefit of each family which is elderly, displaced, extremely poor, or which contains four or more children. This has made no difference in the rents charged these people. It merely replaced fund deficits incurred by the housing authority.

Since public housing is exclusively a rental program, tenants have been required to pay the amount necessary to cover all operating, maintenance and payment in lieu of tax costs.

The Federal public housing program is a tragic failure for three primary reasons.

First, it was never funded in the amount necessary to meet the needs. Secondly, there was a total lack of foresight or thought in planning the structures for public housing. Finally, there was no allowance made for increasing the subsidy to meet the increasing cost of living or the increasing costs of maintaining and operating the public housing structures which were built.

St. Louis stands at the head of the list of cities with the most notorious public housing situation. You have all heard of Pruitt-Igoe. This project is a landmark and tribute to the failure of this Nation to provide decent housing for the poor—and a testimony to the priority which housing has received.

Pruitt-Igoe has been inspected by persons from all over the country and the world—they are brought here to see how public housing should not be built. Pruitt-Igoe was erected to replace a slum—but it created a situation which has come to haunt the poor and to blight the city.

Pruitt-Igoe was built during the brief spurt of construction energy in the early fifties. The slum replaced by Pruitt-Igoe housed 5,000 people—but when Pruitt-Igoe was built it housed 12,000 people in the same area; 7,000 to 9,000 of that number were children—put in 33 high-rise structures which now, 13 years later, stand 30% vacant because of the combination of blunders which created it and which have fed its uncanny existence.

Aside from the structural problems which cannot be altered—but which might be dealt with, Pruitt-Igoe suffers from a serious lack of operating funds and the inability of tenants to finance with their rent the operation and maintenance of the monstrosity.

To summarize the Pruitt-Igoe situation, it is an architectural failure—a social and economic disaster. The irony of it is that tenants who cannot afford private housing, citizens who must turn to subsidized housing, citizens who do not desire but who must turn to Pruitt-Igoe—cannot even afford to live there.

Pruitt-Igoe may be the worst—but it is representative of what is happening in public housing throughout this country. We have not fulfilled the goal for providing a "decent home for Americans." We have not provided the poor with a place to live, and when we have tried, we have done it so badly that we have compounded the problem. This, in short, is what rent-strikes, tenant sit-ins, walk-ins and squat-ins are made of. These people are desperate—and nobody seems to care.

One of my first acts as a member of Congress was to address the public housing situation. I introduced legislation or a rent-subsidy to public housing tenants—by providing that the Federal Government would increase its subsidy in the amount required to lower those rents to a maximum of 25% of tenant income.

Housing authorities are strapped to the chair. They have no funds. Housing authorities in 15 cities are designated, even by HUD, as in dire financial crisis. It is a universal crisis and it took no genius to see that money had to come forth from somewhere.

The house banking and currency committee reluctantly entertained the thought of tenant subsidy—but passed over it.

Late last summer, Senator Brooke came forth with similar legislation and as a member of the Senate Banking and Currency Committee—he succeeded in Senate passage.

Through cooperative efforts, the Brooke amendment became law. We managed to get an authorization of $75 million for financing the cost of lowering tenant rents and for improving the operating and maintenance services of public housing projects.

Needless to say, we were pleased with the success. Public housing authorities were pleased and public housing residents, who are now organized into the national tenants rights organization—were pleased.

Our pleasure was shortlived, for after passage of that landmark law in December, the Nixon budget was released—showing that instead of $75 million, only $33 million was requested to carry out the new sections of public housing law.

This amount will not be sufficient to lower tenant rents in public housing, it will not be sufficient to eliminate the deficits of housing authorities, it will not be enough to improve any operating and maintenance services, the intent of the law will be nullified—because, as George Romney put it—the housing budget was cut to the bone—and he was "glad of it."

And that is an up-to-date example of why housing, as a national concern, a national issue of a national program—is the *"longest running official lie."* It is one more chapter in the "great American housing hoax" and an illustration of why the promise of a "decent home for every American" is a farce.

Fair housing, in which you have expressed a specific interest, is equally a farce.

The city of St. Louis ranks 11th in the number of black residents. More than 36% of our population is black.

A recent report on fair housing in St. Louis led Civil Rights Commission Chairman Theodore Hesburgh to say—that the racial division of St. Louis is supported by a broad network of institutional systems whose leaders disclaim responsibility for them. In St. Louis, the suburbs are white—and the city is 50% black—and St. Louis County maintains a noose around the city.

Over a period of nine months, the committee for freedom of residence in the city of St. Louis surveyed the situation. They utilized thirteen black and white checkers who visited 15 white real estate companies in St. Louis for the expressed purpose of purchasing or selling a home.

The findings of the survey have stunned some people. They did not stun the black citizens of St. Louis who have long known that the white real estate community is dominated by a network of criminals who freely admit their intent to circumvent, by whatever means, the fair housing law which has been on the books for a year and a half.

The real estate agents visited in the survey—revealed to the checkers, without prompting—how they "help" white people, how they can usually recognize the voice of a "colored" inquirer over the phone, how they wouldn't want their white clients to be subjected to some "buck nigger" at the door to buy their home, how they have decided not to use "for sale" signs which may attract the attention of a potential "colored buyer"—and how the city of University City has "reaped its share of problems from the colored people"—and how other parts of the city must be protected from the "colored element".

And there is an interesting tale about one "real estate agent who at the time was serving as president of the Metropolitan St. Louis Real Estate Board"—and who confessed to the checker that "in view of his prejudices, he often has to talk out of both sides of his mouth and wear two hats as president of the Real Estate Board."

It comes as no surprise to me—that the racism of the majority of the people in St. Louis is, little by little, being documented for public view. No black citizen who has lived in St. Louis as long as I have—could possibly be surprised.

It doesn't occur just here in St. Louis. It happens in every American city every day—where lawbreakers run free to manipulate the housing market for the containment of blacks in areas designated by the white real estate community. It happens every day—that the law is used to deny the rights of black citizens.

What does come as a surprise to me is that white racists seem to expect their cries for law and order to be respected—by a black community which has felt the hypocrisy of the law. We are tired of being told which laws must be obeyed and which laws can be ignored. Frankly, we will no longer tolerate it.

A person may need formal education to practice law in this country—but a person does not need formal education to understand the hypocrisy of the law, nor does he need to be a lawyer to recognize that until law is based on justice, there can be no respect for law.

It is an explosive situation. This city and all other cities are gambling with dynamite when they blatantly refuse to extend opportunities and rights to black Americans. I relate this not as a threat—but because I would be derelict in my duties not to relate it as an obseravtion which I believe valid.

You must realize—that the problem of fair housing or the problem of housing for the poor—none of it can be discussed in a vacuum. These problems inherently involve racism, poverty, and the climate of this country.

The problem of housing for the poor is that the poor cannot afford housing on the private market. Neither, of course, can they afford food, clothing, or medical services. Neither can they expect a decent education or job training. Housing is only one element of the problem of economics and racism—and for the poor, the problem of economics is the problem of finding an opportunity to get into the system. For the black who are poor, it is a double challenge.

When you are uneducated, unskilled, and come from a generation of poverty, how do you get out of the cycle? Where do you start? Better yet, when you have nothing going for you but public disdain and public apathy, where do you find hope?

If you are both poor and black, the question is something else again in a country where it took a national commission of experts to tell us what we have known for a long time—that white people just don't like black people.

It is virtually impossible to discuss any of the American problems without zeroing in on poverty and racism. We cannot realistically discuss environmental problems without discussing the human atmosphere. The urban environment is as plagued by the human condition and human spirit as it is by smog—and I dare say the latter does not pose any greater threat to our health and security than our pollution of the human element.

The economic bondage of black citizens is a part of the urban environment—because that is where we are.

At the turn of the century, 80 percent of the black people were still in rural areas. With the advent of machines to replace people—blacks moved away. In 1940, only one-third of the Nation's black citizens lived on farms. By 1960 that number was down to 8 percent and now, it is estimated to be about 7 percent—about the same percent as for the white population.

Black citizens have been migrating, from the South to the North and West. In 1930, 92 percent of all black Americans lived in the South. By 1940 only 77 percent of the black population lived in the South. By 1960, only 60% were in the South and in 1968, it was estimated to be 58%.

The South lost more than 4 million black Americans between 1940 and 1966—and the cities grew with new black residents.

Wherever black Americans have gone, the problems of poverty and racism have skyrocketed. They look for hope and they look for jobs—when little of either exists for blacks.

The average black median income in 1967 was only 59% of the median income for white people. The average black family earns less money than the average white family—whether or not he has had the same education, the same training—or more, than the white.

I point this out to show that the problem of housing for the poor and for the black who are poor—will not be solved until the economics of this country have been adjusted. Black people are fighting for fair housing—but we are fighting for the freedom of black people to earn a decent wage. We are fighting to free ourselves from the walls of a ghetto and from a society which systematically works to exclude us from participating in the system—while it curses our poverty.

When black college graduates earn $3,095 less than white college graduates per year, when these black college graduates earn $1,040 less per year than white high school graduates—and $300 less per year than white high school dropouts, we are not free.

Those who perceive our struggle as a battle to buy a home wherever we choose to live do not perceive our struggle at all. Until there is an integration of economics and opportunity, there can be no integration of housing.

Black men represent 10 percent of the employed males in this country—but only 2% of the doctors, 2.5% of the dentists, 1.5% of the insurance brokers, 3.3% of the plumbers, 1.5% of the electricians, and only .5% of the engineers.

Black women represent 13 percent of the female work force—but only 2.4% of the lawyers, 5.6% of the professional nurses, 6.5% of the medical technicians, 2.4% of the telephone operators, 1.5% of the secretaries and 8.8% of the elementary school teachers.

You may look to me and say—then how did you get to become the first black Congressman from the State of Missouri? And I would say to you that being the first black "anything" in the year of nineteen hundred and seventy—is not an achievement or verification of this land of opportunity—it is a tragedy.

And then you may say, if you can do it, why cannot other blacks do it. And I would say to you, if Richard Nixon could become President, why didn't you become President?

In other words, until this Government and Americans are as concerned with where black people live in this Nation—as they are with the air and the water and the neighborhood school—there will be no advancement on the front of human rights.

I applaud your efforts for fair housing—but I seek your recognition of a responsibility to act for fair treatment. Until the numbers of the American public demand it—laws for rights will be ignored.

The American people must demand a Government which appeals to its potential for freedom and brotherhood—and we cannot long tolerate a Government which appeals only to the capacity of people for prejudice and hatred. Above all, we cannot let an American Government rob the American people of their capacity for freedom and of their capacity for extending it to every American citizen.

MRS. EMMA TUCKER OF FREEPORT: ILLINOIS MOTHER OF THE YEAR

HON. JOHN B. ANDERSON

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 20, 1970

Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I am proud to announce that the 1970 Illinois Mother of the Year is Mrs. Emma Tucker of Freeport, a community of 27,000 people in the 16th Congressional District of Illinois. Mrs. Tucker is especially deserving of this honor since she is the mother of 43 children, including five of her own and 38 senior Girl Scouts who sponsored her as Mother of the Year.

I would like to quote from the letter of nomination written by the Girl Scouts because I think it best summarizes those qualities which made Mrs. Tucker such an outstanding mother, and moreover represents what we have all come to respect and appreciate in all mothers. The girls wrote:

Without Mrs. Tucker's help, our Girl Scout troop would probably no longer exist. She has been a faithful leader in guiding us in

our Scouting and community activities. We know that she cares about us all. We can tell her our problems, and she understands. One could summarize Mrs. Tucker in three words—care, share and understand—she does. Because of these things, we, her scout daughters believe Mrs. Tucker should be "Mother of the Year."

As a result of that glowing recommendation, Mrs. Tucker was chosen Mother of the Year by a jury of the Illinois Mother of the Year Committee which is affiliated with the American Mothers Committee, Inc., of New York City. I will have the pleasure and honor of being present at a reception in Freeport this weekend at which the official citation and mother's pin will be presented to Mrs. Tucker. In May, Mrs. Tucker will travel to New York to represent Illinois in the American Mother of the Year ceremonies.

At this point in the RECORD, Mr. Speaker, I would like to include three articles from the Freeport and Rockford newspapers which further detail the life and service of Mrs. Emma Tucker, an outstanding example of American motherhood. The articles follow:

[From the Freeport Journal-Standard, Mar. 26, 1970]

MRS. F. C. TUCKER IS ILLINOIS MOTHER OF THE YEAR

Mrs. Francis C. Tucker, mother of 5 and scout leader "mother" of 38, is the 1970 Illinois Mother of the Year.

She will represent Illinois in the American Mother of the Year ceremonies at the Waldorf-Astoria in New York City early in May.

Mrs. Tucker, whose husband is the pathologist at Freeport Memorial Hospital, lives with her family at 861 W. Stephenson St. She was nominated for the honor by members of Freeport Senior Girl Scout Troop 132.

SCOUTS NOMINATE

Word of her selection as top "Illinois Mother of the Year" was received here today.

"Without Mrs. Tucker's help," the scouts wrote, "our Girl Scout troop would probably no longer exist. She has been a faithful leader in guiding us in our Scouting and community activities.

"We know that she cares about us all. We can tell her our problems, and she understands. One could summarize Mrs. Tucker in three words—care, share and understand—she does.

"Because of these things, we, her scout daughters believe Mrs. Tucker should be 'Mother of the Year.'"

HAS ACTIVE FAMILY

Her own active family includes three daughters and two sons. The eldest daughter, Betty, now Mrs. Alfred Guntermann, was crowned Miss Freeport in 1961. Now the mother of two, herself, she makes her home in Fort Wayne, Ind. Her son, Donny, is 2½ and daughter, Katie, is 5 months.

Son Bob, 23, is home after a tour of duty in Vietnam with the Marine Corps.

Twins Jean and Joan, are 22. Jean is a senior at Knox College. She was an AFS student in Norway and spent a year at the University of Hamburg, Germany. Joan, who was a cytotechnologist at Milwaukee-St. Luke's, has returned to college studies at Trinity College.

John, 16, is an honor student at Culver Military Academy.

MULTIFACETED ROLE

The role of motherhood for Mrs. Tucker is a multifaceted one. As a family, the Tuckers have camped and traveled in 48 states with their children.

Community interests have also been a part of Mrs. Tucker's life. She is or has been active in some 25 civic, service and church organizations in Freeport and in Cedar Rapids, her former home.

At present, she is in the midst of a project to take all 38 scouts to Switzerland this summer for a three-week period. To earn the needed $12,800, Mrs. Tucker and the girl scouts outlined a money-making program. They started serving suppers, making candy mints and sponsoring travelogues.

EARNED $10,800

To further augment the travel fund, Mrs. Tucker and the scouts took over the snack concession stand at Krape Park last summer, dispensing popsicles, caramel corn, ice cream cones. The stand was a 7-day week operation, with the girls, under Mrs. Tucker's leadership, working from 11 a.m. to 9:30 p.m. Each was assigned a specific job and time for the 4-month period.

To date $10,800 has been banked, and tickets and plans have already been worked out for the trip to Adelboden, Switzerland.

The Senior Scout Troop has been a special project of Mrs. Tucker's since the family moved to Freeport in 1958. However, Mrs. Tucker's interest in Scouting goes back more than the 12-year-period. She has been active in the movement 35 years, starting as a scout herself at age 14. She received her "Golden Eagle" (highest rank in Girl Scouting comparable with the Eagle rank in Boy Scouting) at age 18 and became a scout leader in 1933.

In 1963, Mrs. Tucker set up a program for Candy Stripers at Freeport Memorial Hospital, using the senior girl scouts. "The Thanks Badge," the scouts distinguished service award, was presented to her for leadership in Girl Scouting by the Green Hills Scout Council on Dec. 5, 1969.

Some of Mrs. Tucker's other Freeport activities include her work with Benevolent Circle of King's Daughters (also helped to organize the Junior Service Circle of King's Daughters here in 1968); Chapter BE of PEO (served as president the past two years); county, state and national auxiliaries of the medical society; church organizations; YWCA, state and county historical societies, American Field Service Committee; American Association of University Women; Stephenson County Republican Women's Club.

TRAVELOGUES, PROGRAMS

Many in Freeport have heard Mrs. Tucker's programs on the state parks of Illinois, travelogues on travel abroad (including her trip with scouts in 1954 and 1964 to Mexico) and her program on "Symbols of the Cross" (a subject of a recent Journal-Standard church page feature.)

Dr. Tucker plans to accompany his wife to New York for the ceremonies in May.

Mrs. Tucker is the former Emma Elizabeth Scott of Chicago. She and her twin sister were graduated from Hyde Park High School in 1934. Mrs. Tucker received her B.S. degree in health and physical education in 1941 from George Williams College. Lake Geneva, Wis. Her minor was in social group work.

After the Tuckers were married in June 1941, they were commissioned under the American Board of Commissioners of Foreign Missions to go overseas China.

[From the Rockford Sunday Register-Star, Mar. 29, 1970]

"CARE, SHARE, AND UNDERSTAND—SHE DOES!": MEET FREEPORT'S EMMA TUCKER—No. 1 MOTHER

(By Millie Vickery)

FREEPORT.—When Mrs. Francis C. Tucker received word that she had been selected as the 1970 Illinois Mother of the Year, she was in the midst of a typical day—working with a group of her Senior Girl Scouts.

Wife of Dr. Tucker, pathologist at Freeport Memorial Hospital, and mother of five children, Emma Tucker is troop leader for 38 senior scouts of the Freeport area. Her scouts sponsored Mrs. Tucker for Mother of the Year, so it was particularly fitting that some of them should be with her when she received the word.

MARINE SON READS TELEGRAM

Several girls had gone with Mrs. Tucker to the Tucker family cottage at Lake Geneva, Wis., which the scouts had undertaken to paint as a fund-raising project for their trip to Europe this summer.

A telegram from the American Mothers Committee, received at the Tucker home at 861 W. Stephenson St., was read to his mother by Bob Tucker, just back from Vietnam with the Marines.

One daughter, Jean, was with Mrs. Tucker at Lake Geneva; Jean is vacationing from Knox College and her twin, Joan, is a student at Trinity College. The eldest is Betty, wife of Alfred Guntermann of Fort Wayne, Ind., and mother of two small children; youngest of the Tucker children is John, 16, a student at Culver Military Academy.

According to the 38 Senior Girl Scouts who sponsored her for Mother of the Year, "she has been a great mother to every one of us, too."

SHE'S CLOSE TO SCOUTING

Among her many activities, Girl Scouting has always been especially close to Emma Tucker's heart. She became a scout herself at 14 and a leader at 16, and has been leader for the Freeport Senior Troop 132 for the past 12 years.

This year's trip to the International Girl Scout Center at Idelboden, Switzerland, will be the second big trip Mrs. Tucker has taken with her scouts. The first was a 6,000-mile camping trip through eight states to visit the International Cabana in Mexico. Another year she trained the senior scouts for a camping trip to Expo 67 in Canada.

"EXAMPLE TO EVERYONE"

Writing letters of recommendation for their candidate, one girl stated "One could summarize Mrs. Tucker in three words: Care, Share, and Understand—and she does!"

Another wrote: "Mrs. Tucker is an illustrious example to everyone. Just by watching her we learn that unselfishness is more satisfying than wanting. She is constantly on the run doing errands for everyone and visiting friends from all over the world."

"We all marvel at the accomplishments of this outstanding mother," stated another.

TO NEW YORK IN MAY

To sum it all up, they said, "Without Mrs. Tucker's help our Girl Scout Troop would probably no longer exist. She has been a faithful leader in guiding us in scouting, community activities, and helping others. Through her we have learned the meaning of 'giving of ourselves.' Because of these things, we, her scout daughters, believe Mrs. Tucker is the ideal choice for Mother of the Year."

The official citation and Mother's Pin will be presented to Mrs. Tucker at a reception in late April. Then in May she will go to New York City to represent Illinois in the American Mother of the Year ceremonies.

ORDAINED AS MISSIONAIRES

Emma Scott Tucker, 53, a native of Illinois, graduated from George Williams College, was the recipient of a Physiology Research Scholarship and did graduate work at Columbia University.

In 1941 she married Dr. Tucker and the couple was ordained as a team for overseas missionary work that year, but World War II interfered with their plans. Dr. Tucker joined the Army and served three years in China. His parents, medical missionaries in

China for 40 years, were among the last to leave in 1941.

After the war, although busy raising her own family, Emma Tucker always found it possible to participate in many community activities, particularly with young people.

She has been a Sunday School teacher, officer of the Women's Society of Christian Service, a Campfire Girl leader, Cub Scout Den Mother for six years; YWCA volunteer teacher in Keep Fit classes, and served on the YW. Teen-Age commission.

THEY'RE FAMILY CAMPERS

Past president of the Freeport PEO chapter, she is also active in the American Association of University Women Medical Auxiliary, Hospital Auxiliary, and the Order of Eastern Star.

Dr. and Mrs. Tucker began family camping trips when their twins were 2½, Bob, 4 and Betty, 6. Wanting their children to see their great country and appreciate it, they planned different trips each summer. They have visited every state in continental U.S.A. as well as Mexico and Canada.

[From the Rockford Morning Star, Friday, Mar. 27, 1970]

FREEPORT MOTHER OF FIVE WINS STATE CONTEST

FREEPORT.—Mrs. Emma Tucker, 53, wife of Freeport pathologist Dr. Francis C. Tucker, was named Thursday as Illinois' 1970 Mother of the Year.

She was selected from state candidates by a jury of the Illinois Mother of the Year Committee, affiliated with the American Mothers Committee Inc. of New York City. The award was announced by Dr. Felicia D. Koch, Granite City physician who is chairman of the Illinois committee.

Mrs. Tucker will represent Illinois in national Mother of the Year competition in New York May 3–4.

Representing Wisconsin in this contest will be a former Beloit minister, Mrs. Alice Snow, now pastor of the United Church of Christ in Clintonville. She is the widow of Rev. Arthur Snow, pastor of Beloit's Second Congregational Church, who was killed in a traffic accident two years ago.

The Illinois winner is the mother of three daughters and two sons. Her husband is on the staff at Freeport Memorial Hospital.

Members of the Girl Scout troop which Mrs. Tucker leads nominated her for state honors. Scouting is one of Mrs. Tucker's many civic interests.

The Girl Scout troop will go to Switzerland this summer, the trip financed through bake sales and other fund-raising activities.

CONSIDERS NEEDS AT HOME

HON. OGDEN R. REID

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 20, 1970

Mr. REID of New York. Mr. Speaker, I include in the RECORD today a chart calculating the application of the local tax dollar in the town of Mamaroneck, N.Y., including the villages of Larchmont, Mamaroneck, and part of Rye Neck.

The chart was prepared several weeks ago for a town meeting set up by interested residents with a view toward investigating our priorities. The meeting, cochaired by two area residents, Mrs. Linda Davidoff and Mr. William Reynolds, was moderated by Dr. James G. Emerson, Jr. and featured the noted physicist and author, Dr. Ralph E. Lapp, as its principal speaker. Others participating included State Senator Anthony B. Gioffre, Assemblyman Joseph Pisani, Mrs. Christine K. Helwig, the supervisor of the town of Mamaroneck, Mayor Leo Goldsmith of Larchmont, Mayor Arthur Phillips of Mamaroneck, county legislator Thomas F. Keane, Jr., representatives from the school boards, and village trustees.

The figures speak for themselves to show not only that a majority of Federal income taxes go to the military, but also that a substantial portion of local taxes go for military procurement and operations. In my view, considering our needs at home for decent education, and housing opportunities, for pollution control, and for health research and care, these dollars must be redirected away from military hardware and toward the needs of our citizens. We need to end the war in Vietnam. We need new priorities backed by major resources.

The material follows:

I. How much do local residents pay out in taxes?

Larchmont Village tax	[1] $1,299,000
Mamaroneck Village tax	[1] 1,977,000
Mamaronack Town tax	[2] 4,527,000
Rye Neck tax on Town of Rye	[3] 566,000
Mamaroneck School tax	[4] 8,020,000
Rye Neck School tax	[4] 1,598,000
Total local taxes	17,987,000

[1] 1969, from Village Hall figures.

[2] 1969, from Town Hall figures. Includes collection of County and certain State taxes for Larchmont and Mamaroneck Villages except for the Rye Neck Area of Mamaroneck Village.

[3] 1969, from Town Hall figures. Includes County and locally-collected State taxes.

[4] 1969, from School Board figures.

CALCULATION OF 1970 FEDERAL PERSONAL INCOME TAX, MAMARONECK TOWN AND RYE NECK

Place	Population [2]	1959 median family income [3]	Percent of 105 ZIP code median income [4]	Per capita tax [5]	Total tax [6]
105 ZIP code area [1]	565,000	$8,427	100.0	$910	$514,150,000
Larchmont Village	6,900	11,915	141.4	1,287	8,880,000
Mamaroneck Village and Mamaroneck Town	12,500	7,327	86.9	791	9,888,000
Mamaroneck Village in Rye Town (Rye Neck)	8,000	8,127	96.4	877	7,016,000
Mamaroneck Town outside villages	13,000	12,883	152.9	1,390	18,070,000
Total Federal personal income tax	$40,400			1,085	43,854,000

[1] 105 ZIP code area includes all of Westchester except for White Plains, Yonkers, and New Rochelle.

[2] Extrapolated from special census conducted in 1965. Assumed arithmetic population increase between 1965 and 1970 equal to actual increase between 1960 and 1965. U.S. Census Bureau Series P–28, No. 1420, June 22, 1966.

[3] U.S. Censuses of Population and Housing, 1960, Census Tracts, New York, N.Y., pt. 2. Medians for places specified above computed from totals from component Census Tracts.

[4] Calculated from col. 2.

[5] Total Federal personal income tax paid for year 1966 in 105 ZIP code area—$343,000,000, from Internal Revenue Service, 1966 statistics of income, supplemental, ZIP code area data. Yields $607 per capital of 1970 population. Figure for 1970 assumed to be 50 oercent larger, equal to Budget Bureau estimated increase in personal income tax collections between fiscal year 1967 and fiscal year 1971. Per capita tax for specified places computed by applying col. 3 to $910, on assumption that per capita Federal income tax is proportional to family income.

[6] Col. 1 times col. 4.

Note. Total New York State personal income taxes paid by local residents at 10 percent of Federal personal income taxes $4,385,000.

Grand total, all taxes paid by local residents	
Local	$17,987,000
State	4,385,000
Federal	43,854,000
Total	66,226,000

II. WHERE DOES THE LOCAL TAX DOLLAR GO?

$$\text{School tax share of local taxes} = \frac{9,924,000}{66,226,000} = 15 \text{ percent}$$

Military share of local taxes:

54 percent of Federal personal income tax paid by local residents [1]

54 percent × $43,854,000 = $23,681,000

$$\text{Military share of local taxes} = \frac{23,681,000}{66,226,000} = 39 \text{ percent}$$

$$\text{Vietnam share of local taxes} [2] = \frac{8,770,000}{66,226,000} 13 \text{ percent}$$

[1] Military share of national government expenditures (1969).

Source: Joint Treasury Department and Budget Bureau releases, July 28, 1969.

	Amount [in millions]	Ratios (percent)	
Total outlays	$184,769		
Less Social Security Act trust funds	−36,692		
Total	148,077	100	
War-related outlays:			
Defense Department	77,893		
Military assistance	783		
Estimated 50 percent Atomic Energy Commission total	1,225		
Total (present)	79,901	54	
Veterans [1] Administration	$7,670		
Interest on public debt	16,613		
Total (past)	24,283	16	
Grand total	104,184	70	
All other outlays	43,893	30	

[2] See above, Vietnam spending in 1969=20 percent of total Federal budget.

Note: Special support of Vietnam operations is included in the foregoing figures, largely in Defense Department. The amount is $29,100,000,000.

THE IMPORTANCE OF THE APOLLO PROGRAM

HON. GEORGE P. MILLER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 20, 1970

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, yesterday, two newspaper editorials, one in the Washington Post and the other in the Washington Star, eloquently and pointedly summed up the importance of the Apollo program to the Nation in the light of the dire emergencies encountered in Apollo 13. I have seldom read more profound assessments of our manned space program than those brilliantly expressed by the two articles which I wish to include in today's RECORD of the House proceedings.

Let me point out that the fears and the distress Americans personally experienced last week were shared by people in every part of the world by messages of encouragement and concern. The Soviet Union, in the name of President Podgorny offered any assistance required in the recovery of our astronauts, even to the point of diverting many ships to locations in the Indian Ocean in case events dictated their landing there. Yesterday, President Podgorny telegraphed the President rejoicing in the safe return of the Apollo 13 crew.

I want to underscore the fact that, despite the Apollo 204 tragedy at Cape Kennedy, no other major technological program undertaken by the United States has achieved the degree of successful flight operations that has the manned space flight program. Up to Apollo 13, our astronauts have been launched into space 22 times to accomplish successful missions. All have been returned safely to earth. This is a triumph of science and technology, a monumental achievement of all the men and women of our space team and NASA leadership.

I urge every Member to read the editorials and to reflect at length upon the immeasurable importance of our manned space program to ourselves and the generations to come that will carry on the exploration of space from the beginnings we have provided far beyond a level of maturity we can even now envision.

The editorials follow:

[From the Washington Post, Apr. 19, 1970]

WE CAME TO ACCEPT THE UNTRIED AS THE COMMONPLACE, UNTIL APOLLO 13 BURST BUBBLE

(By Haynes Johnson)

The footprints are still imperishably graven on the lunar dust and the flag still flies on the surface of the moon, but it all seems more distant, unreal and unattainable now. The loud bang that rocked Apollo 13 and echoed back to us from outer space last week did more than challenge our comfortable assumptions about manned space flight. It reminded us how much we have taken for granted, how much has been achieved and how far man has yet to go.

Some day, some one is going to write one of those great American novels about our space effort. From the beginning, it was always larger than life. Tens of billions of dollars spent, hundreds of thousands of men at work, an incessant drumbeat of publicity, reputations to be made and lost, fortunes to be won, political power to be gained, horizons to be conquered, national rivalries to be settled, war-and-peace stakes always in the whispered background, individual acts of daring, moments of fear, moments of death—all these were merely the backdrop for the essential story. Man was fulfilling his ancient dream. He was reaching into the heavens.

OUR TANGIBLE GAINS

There are some intimately associated with America's space effort who see its greatest achievement as a state of mind. It has made men believe that the impossible can come true. They speak of the new concepts of motion, of the ability of ordinary men for the first time to accept something truly alien. Perhaps so, but there are other, more tangible, results.

It has created a new technology. In rocketry and aeronautics; in structural design of everything from huge engines to the smallest, most sensitive parts; in new methods and sources of energy, fuels, lubrication; in the entire field of computer programming, telemetry and data processing, the space program has brought a wealth of knowledge that can be—and is being—applied to make life better on earth.

It has taught us not only more about space and celestial bodies, but about our own environment. It has helped to create worldwide communications by satellite; permitted us to participate in a president's journey abroad or a war on a distant continent. It has increased our knowledge of the weather, advanced medical research and introduced new methods of photography.

It has also given immense power, for good or ill, to those who control the air above. Rockets that can maneuver, rendezvous, join and then separate on peaceful missions can be applied for more sinister purposes. In basic research, in management concepts, in the fields of geophysics and astronomy, the impact has been immense.

All these are among the obvious, if not always understood, secondary effects of America's calculated decision to venture into space. Others are more subtle, but they have changed the country profoundly and personally.

If you go down to Cape Kennedy you can see a part of what it has meant. On the windswept dunes near the ocean, away from the ranges where men leave for the moon, are plaques, markers and rocket models of the past. They form the Stonehenge of the space age.

There, you can read of the deeds of Shepard and Glenn and Grissom, of suborbital flights, of Vanguard and Gemini and chimpanzees in space. Already, the machines they used have become antiquated artifacts. They are mute reminders of how the space age became an integral part of American life.

Without quite realizing it, our language and even our national style were influenced. Certainly, the tempo of life in the '60s was accelerated in part by the new techniques ushered in with the space age.

As a nation, we cried "go-go-go" as the early rockets slowly lifted. Later, we had our go-go dancers and our new beats and our restless, energetic dances. We spoke of blastoffs, and launching pads, and A-OK, and countdowns, and going into orbit. And we grew up, millions of us now in college, high school or elementary school, taking it all for granted. We had never known anything else.

Every step along the way, we came to accept the untried as the commonplace. We listened to—and then witnessed—it all in our own living rooms. We saw them leave, rendezvous, dock, open their capsule, "walk" in space, circle the moon, land on the moon, walk on the moon and return to earth with pinpoint precision. We saw our own pale blue earth, covered with clouds, as a distant jewel. Our remaining poets were even moved to write verses about it.

A CRITICAL APPRAISAL

Then, last week, the bubble burst. It wasn't so certain after all.

Along with the anguish over the astronauts and their ordeal, there was another kind of reaction. The accident aboard Apollo 13 clearly did not signal the end of manned space flight, but it did cause America to look more closely and critically at its space effort.

The immediate reaction of the space experts was predictable. Space, like any other kind of exploration, contains high risks—but they are risks worth taking, and risks that must be made acceptable. You must learn by your mistakes. The need is to fly the systems.

There was, however, a general air of sober stock-taking, a recognition that the more sanguine dreams are not so easily attainable. Manned flight to Mars, for example, now seems farther away than ever. A feeling exists that the immediate direction of the space program will be changed to more mundane missions. Some see a new orientation toward flying manned missions nearer the earth, to provide more data related to our own environment.

Beyond that, the Apollo 13 incident is causing many to take a more philosophical look at the space program. Of all its spectacular successes, perhaps its greatest achievement is this: the space program is the cleared proof that a nation can set a difficult goal and carry it out. If it has done nothing else, it has demonstrated how America can, when it wants to, marshal its talent, commit its treasure, gain public support and achieve its task.

Business, labor, science, government and the general public worked together in a uniquely successful fashion. They have shown us what can be done, and some of the ways to do it. Their joint effort stands as the best example of a planned program overcoming potentially insurmountable obstacles.

VEERING EARTHWARD

After the landing on the moon last summer, one point was made repeatedly: Now is the time for America to supply the same kind of energy and techniques to solving its more pressing problems here at home. That point is even more valid today. From a national standpoint, it is one of the lessons emerging from the Apollo 13 aftermath. Others are more personal—and universal.

We have been reminded anew of the warning given by James E. Webb, the former space administrator, in the early 1960s. "Men will perish in space as they have on the high seas," he said, "and wherever they have ventured into unknown regions."

And, finally, all of us everywhere can draw another kind of lesson from the flight of Apollo 13. Like the best of the space age itself, it transcends narrow boundaries.

For a moment, anyway, it brought mankind a little bit closer together.

[From the Sunday Star, Apr. 19, 1970]

A LOST MISSION, AND THE FUTURE IN SPACE

At 1:08 p.m. Friday, Washington time, the ordeal of Apollo 13 ended. But as the Command Module plunged into the waters of the South Pacific to end the agonizing odyssey of Lovell, Haise and Swigert, the trial began for the Apollo program and the future of man in space.

Indeed, even while the endangered astronauts and their NASA advisers struggled to improvise an antidote for deep-space disaster, a muted chorus of criticism and doubt could be heard around the world. Men in the street, newspaper commentators and a scattering of scientific and official spokesmen first expressed the hope that the astronauts would be brought safely home to earth. And then, not infrequently, expressions of admiration for the bravery and the ingenuity of the crew were coupled with scathing criticism of the decision that had, in effect, issued the invitation to disaster.

Of greater practical significance was the fact that among those who now question the wisdom of continuing man's exploration of space are some of those who will be directly responsible for deciding what the future of the United States space program will be. Members of both the House and Senate committees chiefly responsible for the direction and the funding of the space agency have echoed such doubts. America, they point out, has proved its capability of going to the moon and getting safely back. Why, then, continue to tempt fate with repeated trips to the lifeless desert that orbits our planet?

In addition to those who consider the lunar program as a race that has already been won, there are growing numbers who have become persuaded that the vast expenditures of the space program were misspent. And for nearly everyone, including the hard-core space enthusiasts, much of the excitement has worn off, and has been replaced with a relaxation

born of repeated success that borders on boredom.

The shattering of that smug assurance—the awakening from a complacent dream to the reality of a nightmare—combined with the misunderstanding and the growing antipathy to produce the inevitable adverse reaction. It is still too early to judge the extent and the strength of that reaction. But it is not too early to answer it.

The Apollo program should not be abandoned. It must be adjusted because of the failure of the mission of Apollo 13. It must be delayed until all that can be done is done to prevent a recurrence of the near-disaster. And then it must be carried through as planned, to the completion of Apollo 19 and the test of the long-duration orbital workshop known as Operation Skylab.

The argument that the race is over, so why are we still running, has no validity. The race to the moon—if indeed there ever was a serious attempt by the Russians to make a manned lunar landing—is over. But if the national interest in the moon was limited to a demonstration of technical superiority and a boost of national prestige, the entire space program has been a vastly expensive waste of time and energy.

The answer is that the moon-walk mission of Apollo 11 was not an end but a beginning. The program is aimed not at lunar landing, but at lunar exploration. Billions of dollars have been poured into the technology required to put man's intelligence physically out into space. The study of our fossilized satellite which has remained virtually unchanged from the dawn of earth's creation, has begun. It is a study that can answer the riddles of the ages about the origins of the universe and—perhaps—of life itself.

The argument that an expenditure of $25 billion cannot be justified by the potential technological and scientific gains is more difficult to refute. Certainly, if President Kennedy or the Congress could have read clearly the turbulent decade that lay ahead, the total commitment to a lunar landing before 1970 probably would not have been made.

But neither the President nor the legislators could foresee the drain on the national economy and morale that the minor military problem of Vietnam would become. They could not guess the extent of the social turmoil that would be produced by the despair of the inner cities and the rising demands of the socially and economically disadvantaged. The commitment was made, and has, in large measure, been fulfilled. It would be tragic folly to decide now, with the wisdom of hindsight, to reject that commitment and cancel the remainder of the program after the vast bulk of the money has been spent and just as the scientific dividends have begun to accrue.

The failure of Apollo 13 was a setback, not a disaster. But even if the worst had happened, if three men had sacrificed their lives in the hostile void of deep space, it should not have created insurmountable doubts or forced a pullback from the infinite frontier that man has now reached.

Technological progress—indeed every elevation of life from the slime at the ocean's edge to the present reach for the stars—has been accompanied by danger and by sacrifice. But the real danger is not the occasional tragedy that has marked man's endless quest for knowledge. The danger to the human species and to life itself will come if man finally decides that he has learned all that is worth knowing and gone as far as he needs to go. When life stops hoping, wondering and reaching, the retreat to the safety of the primordial ooze will begin.

Space flight offers more than a potential for scientific knowledge. It offers humanity the incalculable dividend of pride in itself and in this fragile planet. Already, the new view that man has been granted from space has basically altered humanity's appreciation of the earth. It is no accident that mankind's exploding awareness of the need to preserve this oasis of life coincided with the first voyages into nearby space. For the first time man could see his world and its surrounding atmosphere for what it really is: A delicately balanced and closed life-support system.

The world-wide reaction of concern for the three endangered astronauts was, perhaps, the major indication of mankind's need for a new horizon. During the four days of Apollo 13's ordeal, thousands of men met sudden, violent and tragic deaths in automobiles, in airplanes, in war. But the world watched breathless as Aquarius pushed the stricken Odyssey around the moon and back to earth.

No one human life can truly be said to be more valuable than any other. Each is infinitely precious. Yet the prayers of millions rode with Apollo 13.

The answer must be that men, the world over, instinctively recognize the metaphysical importance of the reach into space. Lovell, Haise and Swigert were not just three Americans on a dangerous mission. They, and those who will follow, the ambassadors of life to new, unknown regions.

The success of these first halting steps into space has brought a new vision to a slightly weary world and given mankind a new pride in its humanity. It is a gift without price. It is an offering that must not be withdrawn because of a momentary setback and a dramatic demonstration of the dangers that have always been present.

THE STUDENT IN THE UNIVERSITY AND SOCIETY OF TODAY, NO. 7

HON. ROBERT McCLORY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 20, 1970

Mr. McCLORY. Mr. Speaker, while the discussion and passage by the House of H.R. 16916, making appropriations for the Office of Education for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1971, is still fresh in everyone's mind, I would like to call attention to a series of stories outlining the historical battle over fiscal year 1970 appropriations for the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.

The following articles have been excerpted from the Washington Status Report, a monthly monitor of developments in Congress of significance to colleges, universities, and other organizations concerned with higher education, edited by John H. Meyers and Bruce R. Hopkins. The excerpts are presented in chronological order beginning with the July 1969 newsletter and culminating with the final wrap-up in last month's newsletter following the passage and signing of Public Law 91-204—H.R. 15931.

Together, these stories comprise an incredible tale of legislative inefficiency, to say the least. The series might be described as an anatomy of a disaster narrowly averted. The young people in our society who complain that the system is not working well have here a beautiful piece for their files. I hope my colleagues will retain it in their files as a reminder of the urgent need for congressional reform.

The articles follow:

EXCERPTS FROM THE WASHINGTON STATUS REPORT

HEW APPROPRIATIONS FOR FISCAL YEAR 1970

(By John H. Myers and Bruce R. Hopkins)

JULY 31, 1969.

Higher education funding.—The House, culminating three days of consideration, passed, on July 31, a bill (H.R. 13111) providing FY 1970 appropriations for higher education programs administered by HEW. In one of the few surprise developments of the session, the House overwhelmingly (242-106) added $894.5 million to the Administration's education budget.

For education, the Administration had requested $3.035 billion in new spending authority. This was increased by $123 million by the House Appropriations Committee and increased again on the House floor by $1.042 billion, bringing the total amount for education programs in FY 1970 to $4.2 billion. This is an increase of $629 million over FY 1969 appropriations.

The increase came as a result of a one-package amendment adding funds for nine different programs, which was sweetened by providing an extra $398 million for aid to impacted areas (a program aiding schools in 385 Congressional districts whose enrollment is increased by students of parents who work at Federal installations). The Administration had requested $187 million for this aid program. Once the pace was set, the House also added $15.5 million for the education of handicapped children and $9.2 million for public library construction.

In addition to the boost for the impacted aid program, the House increased appropriations for the National Defense Student Loan Program by $40.8 million to $229 million (the Administration asked for $161.9 and the House Appropriations Committee granted $188.2 million) and for higher education construction by $33 million (the House Appropriations Committee had recommended no funding at all, although the authorization level is $711.4 million).

The amendment also set the following levels of appropriations: $50 million for school libraries, $78.7 million for equipment, $17 million for guidance and counseling, and $164.9 million for supplemental centers.

The House bill cuts appropriations for educational opportunity grants (by $16 million) to $159.6 million and for the NDEA fellowship program (by $5.3 million) to $56.1 million. The request for $154 million for the College Work-Study program was met.

Money to fund the International Education Act (1966) programs was denied (again), as were funds for Networks for Knowledge, improvement of graduate education, and public service education programs.

Other items funded include: developing institutions ($30 million), community services and continuing education ($9.5 million), training of college personnel under the Education Professions Development Act ($10 million), librarian training ($4 million), Fulbright-Hays training grants ($3 million), and the land grant institution program ($14.7).

It is unclear at this time whether the House floor action modified Committee provision appropriating $11.7 million for annual interest grants for construction of academic facilities. Assuming the provision remains intact, the appropriation would provide for second-year payments on the $3.9 million in subsidies provided in a FY 1969 appropriations bill and $7.6 million for the first payments on approximately $145 million in new private loans.

Considerable credit for passage of the package amendment is being given to the Emergency Committee for Full Funding of Education Programs, a coalition of educational organizations formed earlier this year to lobby for more money for colleges and universities. Despite the House action, however,

and assuming the Senate goes along, Congress will still be providing for FY 1970 only 44 percent of the funds authorized in various education laws.

AUGUST 31, 1969.

Higher education funding.—By the time the House completed consideration of the FY 1970 appropriations bill (H.R. 13111) for the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, and passed the measure on July 31, numerous changes in the Administration's and its Appropriations Committee's recommendations had been made. Adjustments were made in numerous appropriation items as well as in the earmarking for activities within certain appropriations.

For HEW, the Administration's budget estimate was $16.43 billion, which was raised by the House Appropriations Committee to $16.61 billion. Following adoption of various amendments offered from the floor, the total level of appropriations was raised to $17.53 billion.

Specifically, for the Office of Education, the Administration estimated $3.18 billion, the House Appropriations Committee recommended $3.30 billion, and the House appropriated $4.22 billion (of which $860 million is for higher education), compared with $3.62 billion which was actually appropriated for FY 1969.

A list of individual appropriations for particular higher education programs is as follows (stated in millions):

1. Program assistance:	
(a) Strengthening developing institutions	$30
(b) Colleges of agriculture and the mechanic arts	12.1
(c) Undergraduate equipment	none
2. Construction:	
(a) Public community colleges and technical institutions	43
(b) Other undergraduate facilities	33
(c) Graduate facilities	none
(d) Interest subsidization	11.28
(e) Technical services	5.1
3. Student aid:	
(a) Educational opportunity grants	159.6
(b) Direct loans	229
(c) Insured loans	63.9
(d) Work-study programs	154
4. Personnel development:	
(a) College teacher fellowships	56.2
(b) Training programs	10
5. Planning and evaluation	1
6. Other:	
(a) College library resources	12.5
(b) University community services	9.5
(c) Educational broadcasting facilities	4
(d) Fulbright-Hays training grants	3
(e) International Education Act	none

Action on the House floor did not modify the Committee provision appropriating $11.8 million for annual interest grants for construction of academic facilities. Assuming the provision remains intact, the appropriation would provide for second-year payments on the $3.9 million in interest subsidies provided in FY 1969 appropriations and $7.6 million on first-year payments, in connection with subsidized loans in the amount of $290 million ($145 million of which would be new private loans).

This legislation was introduced in the Senate on August 1 and was referred to the Senate Committee on Appropriations, where action will resume when Congress reassembles on September 4.

OCTOBER 31, 1969.

Student aid programs authorizations, appropriations increased.—The Senate, on October 13, and the House, on October 16, approved the conference report on the Emergency Insured Student Loan Act of 1969 (H.R. 13194). The Act was signed into law on October 22.

Most of the attention this legislation received has focused on the emergency situation existing with respect to the student insured loan program [IF3]. However, the Act would also increase authorizations for the national defense student loan program, the college work-study program [IF4], and the educational opportunity grant program [IF1]. (These increases were added by the Senate and approved by all but one of the House conferees.)

Authorizations for the national defense student loan program would be increased to $325 million for FY 1970 and $375 million for FY 1971. (Under prior law, authorizations were set at $275 million for FY 1970 and $300 million for FY 1971. The FY 1969 operating level was $190 million.)

For the college work-study program, authorizations for FY 1970 were increased from $250 million to $275 million, and from $285 million to $320 million for FY 1971.

Authorizations for the educational opportunity grant program were raised from $100 million to $125 million for FY 1970, and from $140 million to $170 million for FY 1971.

[During the course of House debate on the report, Rep. Edith Green (D-Ore.) said that her Subcommittee on Education (of the House Education and Labor Committee) would begin hearings on the basic Higher Education Act in November and December of this year, with the hope that "early in 1970 we can come up with another bill."]

Then, on October 28, the House took an unusual step by adding to a generally routine "continuing resolution" (H.J. Res. 966), which was to provide stop-gap spending authority for the remainder of the year to agencies whose appropriation bills have not been enacted, over $1 billion in education funds.

The House passed legislation in July, appropriating $4.2 billion ($1 billion in excess of the Administration's request) for education programs in FY 1970 [WSR, Vol. I, No. 1, p. 9]. The Senate has yet to consider the House enactment but adoption of this resolution by that body would pump the extra funds into the education programs in advance of the regular appropriation bill. The resolution is based upon the appropriation levels as provided in the House appropriation bill (see above). On the same day, 36 Senators co-sponsored a resolution (S.J. Res. 163) identical to the one approved by the House.

The House resolution was passed in the face of opposition of the leaders of both parties and the House Appropriations Committee, amid reports that the President would either veto the resolution or sign it and refuse to spend part or all of the existing funds.

NOVEMBER 30, 1969.

Education Funds Increased.—Culminating two weeks of unusual legislative maneuvering, the President, on November 14, signed into law a joint resolution (H.J. Res. 966) appropriating, for education programs, over $1 billion more than the Administration's budget request.

This increase, initiated by the so-called "education lobby", was approved by the House on October 28, when that body added the Cohelan amendment to the generally routine "continuing resolution" [WRS, Vol. I, No. 4, p. 9]. The joint resolution provides stop-gap spending authority for the Government agencies whose appropriation bills have yet to be enacted. (Without the resolution, such agencies' spending authority would have expired on October 31.)

Rep. Jeffery Cohelan's amendment provided for appropriations at the level set by the House-passed HEW appropriations bill (H.R. 13111). That bill would appropriate $4.2 billion for education programs for FY 1970, or more than $1 billion in excess of the Administration's request. Although this appropriations bill passed the House in July [WSR, Vol. I, No. 1, p. 9], the Senate has not yet acted upon it.

The Senate, on November 13, went along with the House action, albeit reluctantly. Observers believed that the education lobby had lined up sufficient votes on the Senate floor (e.g. 47 Senators co-sponsored an identical resolution) and the Senate Appropriations Committee did not want to risk defeat. Moreover, because the Defense Department appropriation bill has not yet been enacted, the resolution provided for funds with which to meet the Navy and Air Force personnel November 14 payday, and the Senators were unwilling to vote against such support for the military. But Appropriations Committee Chairman Richard Russell served notice that the action will not be considered a precedent and that he does "not intend to report any measure with such a provision in the future." Senator John Williams characterized the procedure as "blackmail" and a "shotgun operation."

Many Senators were greatly irritated with the fact that they were forced, in effect, into voting for the joint resolution. They were principally upset because (1) the Senate Appropriations Committee was deprived of the opportunity to consider FY 1970 Office of Education appropriations beforehand and (2) they believed that the continuing resolution procedure, traditionally employed to preserve the integrity and options of the appropriations process, was prostituted. Minority Leader Hugh Scott said that "many of us are in sympathy with all or most of the goals sought for the funds included here, but I hope that it will clearly not be regarded as a precedent and that this method will not be resorted to again, because I entirely agree it is not in the best interests of getting good and carefully considered legislation."

The Senate made one alteration in the joint resolution, to which the House subsequently agreed. The House version would have continued the provisions of the resolution for five days subsequent to adjournment of the Congress. The Senate changed the expiration date to December 6. Because the Senate is not likely to pass all of the appropriations bills respecting the spending authority continued by the resolution, undoubtedly another continuing resolution will be required early in December. In the face of the Senate's stated determination not to pass another such resolution containing appropriation increases, the outcome is, at best, uncertain.

Pursuant to this congressional action, HEW can commit funds as follows: NDEA student loans, $229 million; undergraduate facilities construction, $33 million; vocational education, $488.7 million; NDEA equipment grants, $78.7 million; and NDEA guidance and counseling programs, $17 million.

Despite the foregoing efforts, the President has instructed the Office of Education not to spend the increase in funds "at this time." He made reference to his August 12 statement in which he said: "Let me reiterate my intention not to spend in this fiscal year any funds appropriated in excess of my budgetary estimates of April this year. No commitments will be made to spend these additional appropriations until the Congress has completed action on all appropriation bills and revenue measures."

Among the disturbing aspects of employing this unprecedented method to generate appropriations for education programs is the possibility that, in the future, the procedure could be utilized to deny educators a hearing in the House or Senate.

DECEMBER 31, 1969.

Regular HEW Appropriations Stalled.—The day following Senate passage of a $21.4 billion Departments of Labor-HEW appropriations bill (H.R. 13111), President Nixon announced that he would veto the measure. "As much as I sympathize with the objectives of some of the programs for which the Congress has voted increased appropriations," he wrote in a letter to Senate leaders, "I cannot, at this critical point in the battle against inflation, approve so heavy an increase in Federal spending." However, to avert the veto, Congress opted not to send the conference report on the bill to the President, but chose instead to continue to fund these departments and related agencies through January, 1970, by updating a previously passed continuing resolution (P.L. 91–117). [The updating amendment was attached to a FY 1970 supplemental appropriations bill (H.R. 15209)—see below.]

The history of this appropriations bill is reflected in the following totals (in billions):

Administration requests for programs in House bill	$16.49
House Committee bill	16.65
House-passed bill	17.57
Administration requests for programs in Senate bill	19.83
Senate committee bill	20.81
Senate-passed bill	21.36
Conference compromise	19.74

The basic breakdown of the appropriations in the conference agreement is as follows: Department of Labor, $980 million; Department of HEW, $16.7 billion; OEO, $1.9 billion; and other agencies, $1.16 billion.

Even though the conferees slashed more than $1.6 billion from the Senate version of the appropriations bill, the legislation apparently was still not rendered acceptable for the President. Of this cut, more than $1.1 billion was for advance funding for FY 1971 elementary and secondary education programs (which was requested by the Administration) and about $500 million came from the increases in program levels which the President found objectionable. The House passed the compromise on December 22, but Senate Majority Leader Mike Mansfield postponed Senate action on the measure until Congress returns next month.

Had the Senate passed the conference report and sent it to the President, he could ultilize a pocket veto, by not signing the bill while Congress was adjourned. If President Nixon had likewise vetoed the supplemental appropriations bill, the spending authority for the affected agencies would have expired. These two vetoes would have meant either a continuing congressional session or a post-Christmas special session. Now, the President will, if he elects to veto the bill, have to take such action while the Congress is in session (which means that a veto must be coupled with an explanatory message) and able to override the veto.

The conference agreement contains $3.26 billion for the Office of Education (not including $1 billion of 1969 appropriations), which is $53 million more than provided in the House bill and $1.38 billion less than in the Senate version. Specifically for higher education, the compromise bill contains $871.9 million, an increase of $12.2 million over the House bill and a decrease of $135 million as provided in the Senate measure.

The battle for higher education funds openly began in July, when the House voted a more than $1 billion increase in education funds over the Administration's FY 1970 budget request for the Office of Education. The President had asked that the FY 1970 funding for the Office of Education be $3.18 billion. But the House Appropriations Committee recommended $3.3 billion and the House upped that to $4.2 billion [WSR, Vol. I, No. 1, p. 10].

Incorporated in the House increase was another $73.7 million for higher education programs: $33 million for academic facilities construction grants for undergraduate institutions and an extra $40.7 million for NDEA student loans. The Administration and the House Committee had sought only $43 million for community colleges facilities grants; the House action brought the total FY 1970 appropriations for undergraduate academic facilities construction grants to $76 million. The increase in the student loan appropriation brought the House total to $229 million.

The next stage of the FY 1970 education appropriations process came when the House forced the Senate to prematurely accept the House increases, by including them in a temporary continuing resolution (H.J. Res. 966) [WSR, Vol. I, No. 4, p. 9; No. 5, p. 3]. Delays in preparation of the regular appropriation bill by the Senate Appropriations Committee required enactment of another continuing resolution (S.J. Res. 1017) in early December.

The Senate bill, reported on December 16 and passed on December 17, compares with a $17.6 billion House version and an Administration request of $19.8 billion. One reason the amount contained in the House bill is lower is because many items which are funded in the Senate bill were not considered by the House, due to lack of authorization bills or to budget amendments which were proposed subsequent to House action. But the Senate Committee's increase also stemmed from hikes in appropriations for construction for community colleges and technical institutes, college library resources, educational opportunity grants, and other programs.

The following shows the amounts to be appropriated (in millions) for various higher education programs under the three basic versions of the bill:

	House version	Senate version	Conference version
1. Program assistance:			
(a) Developing institutions	$30	$30	$30
(b) Land-grant institutions	12.1	19.4	19.4
(c) Undergraduate equipment	0	14.5	0
2. Construction:			
(a) Community colleges and technical institutes	43	125	43
(b) Other undergraduate academic facilities	33	75	33
(c) Graduate academic facilities	0	0	0
(d) Interest subsidization	11.8	11.8	11.8
(e) State administration and planning	6	6	6
(f) Technical services	5	5.1	5.1
3. Student aid:			
(a) Educational opportunity grants	159.6	175.6	164.6
(b) Work-study programs	154	154	154
(c) Direct loans	229	229	229
(d) Insured loans	63.9	63.9	63.9
(e) Special programs for disadvantaged students:			
(1) Talent search	5	5	5
(2) Upward Bound	30	30	30
(3) Special services in college	10	10	10
4. Personnel development:			
(a) College teacher fellowships	56.2	56.2	56.2
(b) Teacher training	10	10	10
5. Health-related-facilities construction:			
(a) Medical and related	94.5	114.5	106.5
(b) Dental	23.6	23.6	23.6
(c) Health research facilities	0	10	5
(d) Medical library construction	0	1.9	.95
6. Other:			
(a) College library resources	12.5	25	20.8
(b) Educational broadcasting facilities	4	5.6	5.1
(c) International Education Act	0	2	0
(d) University community services	9.5	9.5	9.5
(e) Fulbright-Hays training grants	3	3	3
(f) World affairs centers, fellowships, and research	15	7	15

The final version of the appropriations bill also modifies a House provision designed to punish student disrupters, so that only guilty students, not their universities, would lose entitlement to Federal money. The new provision reads as follows:

"No part of the funds appropriated under this Act shall be used to provide a loan, guarantee of a loan, a grant, the salary of or any remuneration whatever to any individual applying for admission, attending, employed by, teaching at, or doing research at an institution of higher education who has engaged in conduct on or after August 1, 1969, which involves the use of (or the assistance to others in the use of) force or the threat of force or the seizure to property under the control of an institution of higher education, to require or prevent the availability of certain curriculum, or to prevent the faculty, administrative officials, or students in such institution from engaging in their duties or pursuing their studies at such institution."

However, the conferees rejected a House amendment which would have applied Federal sanctions against school desegregation presently used in the South applicable as well in the North. Also, the conferees retained a provision of the Senate bill designed to nullify the so-called Whitten amendment, inserted by the House, which would deny Federal funds for the busing of students to achieve racial balance.

Since the Labor-HEW appropriations bill was made the pending business of the Senate, it will be taken up and almost certainly passed as soon as the second session gets underway. Should President Nixon make good his veto threat, congressional Democrats will seek to override the veto (a ⅔ vote is required) and undoubtedly will attempt to convert the challenge into a partisan attack on the President. This infighting has already begun (e.g., House Education and Labor Committee Chairman Carl Perkins said the veto threat "can only be regarded as a declaration of war on American education") and the coming November congressional elections will serve to intensify the clash. The anti-Administration argument will espouse the "national priorities" theme that only the Democrats are interested in health, education and welfare issues.

In a related development, reports are that the Nixon Administration is recommending basically the same amount of money for higher education for FY 1971 as the Congress appropriated for FY 1969. This would mean that the Bureau of the Budget has imposed a FY 1971 spending ceiling on the Office of Education of approximately $3.4 billion. It is further reported that, within the $3.4 billion limitation, student assistance programs are increased and institutional aid is decreased. New Office of Education programs designed to encourage community colleges and campus reform have apparently been severely slashed.

JANUARY 31, 1970.

House sustains Nixon HEW appropriations veto.—The House of Representatives, on January 28, sustained by a vote of 226 to 191 President Nixon's veto of the $19.7 billion Departments of Labor and HEW, and related agencies, appropriations bill (H.R. 13111). This was 52 votes short of the necessary two-thirds majority which would have been required to override the veto. The House action requires the Congress to come forth with a new level of appropriations for the remainder of FY 1970, for the departments and agencies affected, that is acceptable to the President. This could be accomplished by new legislation or by merely extending for the remaining five months the continuing resolution by which the departments and agencies are presently being funded. The resolution will otherwise expire on January 31. Another alternative that the President

might accept would be a bill containing the same levels of appropriations as in the legislation he vetoed but without the requirement that all formula grant funds must be spent.

Congressional observers had generally predicted that the House would uphold the President's veto. House Republicans have been claiming that they alone had nearly all of the votes necessary (135 of 145) to sustain the veto and that enough Democrats would supply the needed margin of votes. Nonetheless, during the 2½ days preceding the House vote, members of the education lobby were combing the corridors of the House office buildings seeking enough votes to override the veto. As it turned out, 156 Republicans and 35 Democrats supported the President.

The most striking element of uncertainty was the $600 million of impacted aid which goes into a great majority of congressional districts, as many congressmen were expressing displeasure at having to vote against such assistance. However, the Nixon Administration was tacitly holding out the opportunity for a compromise of approximately $440 million in a subsequent appropriations bill.

Earlier, the President, making good repeated warnings that he would veto the bill, on January 26, signed his veto (his first) of the legislation. His action came following House approval (by voice vote) of the Senate version of the conference report. The President's decision to veto the measure, based largely on his contention that the appropriation level was inflationary, was dramatized by the fact that the announcement was made on nationwide television, where the signing also took place.

The President said that the nation cannot afford the extra $1.262 billion which Congress has appropriated (over $1 billion of which is in the field of education). His reasons for vetoing the bill were summarized by him as "the wrong amount for the wrong purpose and at the wrong time."

President Nixon said that the amount appropriated was the "wrong amount," because a cut in the Federal budget was necessary to stop the rise in the cost of living.

The President said that the bill increases spending for the "wrong purposes", in that the measure "for the most part simply provides more dollars for the same old programs without making the urgent new reforms that are needed if we are to improve the quality of education and health care in America." To this he added:

"I believe that when we consider how much we are putting into education in the United States we are entitled to get more out in terms of better quality of education. That is why in my education message which I will shortly be submitting to the Congress I will propose a new and searching look at our American school system. In this examination we will look at such basic questions as why millions of our children in school are unable to read adequately; we will put emphasis on improving the quality of education for every child in America."

President Nixon's third reason for the veto was that the bill requires the money to be spent at the "wrong time." He noted that the school year is nearly three-quarters complete and that the legislation would require expenditure of appropriations by June 30. "When money is spent in a hurry, a great deal is wasted," he said, "There is no good time to waste the taxpayers' money but there is no worse time to waste it than today."

In the formal veto message which the President transmitted to the Congress, he added a fourth reason for his action. He said that "nearly nine-tenths of these increases is for *mandatory* programs which leave the Executive Branch no discretion whatever as to the level or the purpose of the added expenditures." And, he noted, "this fact sharply differentiates this appropriation from other inflated measures that I have approved."

The veto further inflamed the first big domestic issue of 1970, although the Congress has been determined to clash with the President on this matter ever since the extra appropriations were voted by the House in July [WSR, Vol. I, No. 1, p. 10]. With the congressional elections approaching, the Democrats are certain to espouse the theme that only they are concerned with the needs of the ill, the aged, the children and the poor. For example, Rep. Carl D. Perkins, Chairman of the House Education and Labor Committee, said after the President's announcement that the veto "will only deny educational opportunity to millions of American school children." On the other hand, the President had said that "the issue is not whether some of us are for education and health programs and others against." Senate Majority Leader Mike Mansfield offered this rejoinder: "To pass this bill will be to move a little closer toward a new and better balance as between domestic urgencies, the needs of defense, and the requirements of foreign policy . . . In that sense, this is the right bill at the right time and for the right purpose."

As reported [WSR, Vol. I, No. 6, p. 11], the Senate took up the Labor-HEW-OEO appropriations bill as its first item of pending business when the Congress reconvened on January 19. After two days of consideration, the Senate passed the measure on January 20 by a 74 to 17 vote. But, on an amendment offered by Senator Gaylord Nelson (D-Wisc.), the Senate on January 21 delayed transmission of the bill to the President by voting to earmark portions of the $1.948 billion appropriated for the Office of Economic Opportunity. The House bill had appropriated the money in a lump sum. Subsequently, the House agreed to this modification and the enactment was sent to the White House.

The earlier legislative history of the appropriations bill and a chart showing the relative amounts appropriated by the House, Senate, and conference versions may be found in the previous newsletter [WSR, Vol. I, No. 6, pp. 11–14].

February 28, 1970.

HEW appropriations.—As of this writing, the Senate had not taken up the new bill (H.R. 15931) making FY 1970 appropriations in the amount of $19.4 billion for the Departments of Health, Education, and Welfare, and Labor, and related agencies. The subcommittee of the Senate Appropriations Committee, on February 24, approved the measure but the parent committee has yet to reach agreement. Earlier, on February 19, the House by a 315–81 vote passed the bill, in the face of a possible (and second) presidential veto. An effort by House Republicans to reduce the amount by $433 million failed by a vote of 189 to 205.

The new legislation was necessitated because the President, on January 26, vetoed the initial regular appropriations bill (H.R. 13111) which would have provided $19.74 billion for those departments and agencies. The President's decision to reject the measure was based largely on his contention that the appropriation level was inflationary, although he broadly attacked the bill as providing "the wrong amount for the wrong purpose and at the wrong time." The House sustained the President's veto on January 28 [WSR, Vol. 2, No. 1, p. 2].

By upholding the President, the House required its Appropriations Committee (where appropriations measures are initiated) to assemble a funding package acceptable to the President. The Committee's approach was twofold: a reduction in the appropriation level by $446 million and a provision (the so-called Michel amendment) empowering the President with discretionary authority over expenditure of the funds. (The President has been insisting that most of the appropriations in the first bill were for "mandatory programs which leave the Executive Branch no discretion whatever as to the level or the purpose of the added expenditures.")

The House Appropriations Committee reported (H. Rep. No. 91–840) the HEW-Labor measure on February 16 and the measure was sent to the House Rules Committee for a rule protecting the bill from amendment during the floor debate. (Technically, such a rule would protect the bill against points of order, as legislative language is supposed to be forbidden in an appropriations measure.) However, the Rules Committee, by a vote of 9 to 6, refused to grant the rule, and the appropriations bill went to the floor wide open for amendments.

As reported, the appropriations bill contains two other amendments, offered by Reps. Charles T. Jonas (R-N.C.) and Jamie Whitten (D-Miss.), both of which are designed to legalize the so-called "freedom of choice" school plans. There was considerable speculation that most Appropriations Committee Republicans threw their support behind these two amendments in return for votes on the amendment sponsored by Rep. Robert H. Michel (R-Ill.) granting the President authority to withhold appropriated money.

Once on the floor, the provision giving the President discretionary authority to withhold funds (which was opposed by Appropriations Committee Chairman George A. Mahon), was deleted on a point of order (the two anti-desegregation amendments survived). A Republican effort to forbid the President from spending 2½ percent of the money in the bill failed by 16 votes.

Moreover, the bill was amended by adding $80 million to the appropriations level for the impacted aid program. In his original FY 1970 budget request, the President sought $202 million for that program but Congress voted $600 million. The President suggested a compromise of $440 million, which is contained in the Appropriations Committee bill.

As passed by the House, the appropriations measure is a mere $365 million less than the amount provided in the earlier package rejected by President Nixon. On February 22, HEW Secretary Robert Finch said that the House act "continues to carry the same excesses and faults that caused the President to veto this important and vital measure in the first place."

Meanwhile, eight months into FY 1970, the Departments of HEW and Labor, and related agencies, continue to be funded pursuant to "continuing resolutions," the most recent (H.J. Res. 1072, P.L. 91–193) of which extends the spending authority for the departments and agencies through February 28. The spending level authorized by these resolutions is the same as the level provided by virtue of the Joelson-Cohelan amendments which added $900 million to the FY 1970 appropriations for the Office of Education, for a total appropriation of $4.2 billion in the vetoed bill [WSR, Vol. 1, No. 1, p. 10; No. 6, p. 12]. It is interesting to note that while the President insists that nearly nine-tenths of the programs funded by HEW involve mandatory spending, Secretary Finch testified before the Rules Committee that the Administration is not spending at the level authorized by the continuing resolutions.)

MARCH 31, 1970.

H.E.W. appropriations imbroglio ends.—Culminating one of the very longest appropriations squabbles, President Nixon, on March 5, signed into law (P.L. 91–204) a bill (H.R. 15931) making FY 1970 appropriations for the Departments of Health, Education, and Welfare, and Labor, and related agencies.

The measure provides for total appropriations in the amount of $19.38 billion, and was rendered palatable for the President by the inclusion of a provision directing him to cut two percent of H.E.W.'s funds from the bill, thereby enabling him to reduce appropriations to approximately $19.035 billion.

The $19.38 billion package is $579.7 million more than the President wanted (the revised request was $18.8 billion) and only $365.2 million less than the amount provided in the bill (H.R. 13111) he vetoed in January [WSR, Vol. 2, No. 1, p. 2]. Comparable FY 1969 appropriations were $19.23 billion or a mere $154 million less.

Under the authority provided in the FY 1970 appropriations bill, the Administration will reduce H.E.W. appropriations by $347.3 million. Thus, the total appropriations are only $232.4 million over the revised request, and about $550 million above the original request, are $712.5 million less than in the vetoed bill, and are $193.7 million less than comparable FY 1969 appropriations.

Under the terms of the two-percent reduction provision (Section 410), which was basically devised by Sen. Norris Cotton (R-N.H.), no one program may be reduced by more than 15 percent, with no reduction at all for the Social Security Administration, the Railroad Retirement Board, the U.S. Soldier's Home, and payments into the Social Security and Railroad Retirement trust funds. Moreover, pursuant to a pre-arranged understanding with H.E.W., neither the Hill-Burton hospital program, the program of grants to the states for vocational education, nor the controversial impacted aid program will be subjected to the appropriations reduction. A "perfecting amendment," sponsored by Sen. Thomas F. Eagleton (D-Mo.), caused the 15 percent reduction provision to apply to specified funding rather than to general categories.

Implementation of the reduction will impact the funding of these programs of interest to subscribers (compared to the $19.38 billion version):

1. Undergraduate facilities construction—reduced from $33 million to $28.05 million.
2. Direct student loans—from $229 million to $195.7 million.
3. College teacher fellowships—from $56.2 million to $48.8 million.
4. Upward Bound—from $30 million to $29.95 million.
5. Higher education planning and evaluation—from $1 million to $900,000.
6. College library resources—from $20.8 million to $9.9 million.
7. Librarian training—from $6.8 million to $4 million.
8. Educational broadcasting facilities—from $5.1 million to $4.3 million.
9. Education professions development—from $107.5 million to $95.5 million.
10. Public library assistance (services and construction)—from $44.2 million to $37.5 million.
11. Medical, dental, and related institutions support—from $105 million to $101.4 million.
12. Nursing school support—from $8.4 million to $7 million.
13. Public health school support—from $10.1 million to $9.5 million.
14. Allied health professions—from $11.6 million to $10.9 million.

Other programs of interest to subscribers reached final funding at these levels:

1. Strengthening developing institutions—$30 million.
2. Construction of public community colleges and technical institutions—$43 million.
3. Interest subsidization—$11.75 million.
4. Educational opportunity grants—$164.6 million.
5. Student insured loans—$63.9 million.
6. College work-study programs—$154 million.
7. Talent Search—$5 million.
8. Special services—$10 million.
9. University community services—$9.5 million.
10. Centers, fellowships, and research in foreign languages and world education—$15 million.
11. Fulbright-Hays training grants—$3 million.

The House version of this appropriations bill passed in February [WSR, Vol. 2, No. 2, p. 6]. Besides containing more money than the President wished to spend and no discretionary authority enabling the Administration to withhold funds, the House enactment included three amendments, sponsored by Rep. Jamie Whitten (D-Miss.) and Charles R. Jonas (R-N.C.), designed to slow efforts to enforce desegration in the South.

However, the full Senate Appropriations Committee adopted the Cotton amendment, which was approved by the Senate 45 to 40 on February 27. The following day, the Senate diluted or deleted the three anti-desegregation amendments designed to prevent H.E.W. from taking action against Southern school segregation. The two Whitten amendments were nullified by amendments offered by Sen. Charles McC. Mathias (R-Md.), which added the words "except as required by the Constitution." Rep. Jonas' amendment was dropped from the bill on an amendment offered by Senate Minority Leader Hugh Scott (R-Pa.). The bill passed the Senate 68 to 0 on February 28.

The House agreed to the conference report (the conferees having accepted the Senate bill) on March 3 and the Senate cleared it on March 4.

The history of the embattled H.E.W. appropriations legislation, which has been chronicled in the previous eight issues of The Washington Status Report, may be briefly but graphically seen via the following schedule of appropriations levels (in billions):

Initial Administration request	$16.49
House committee bill (H.R. 13111)	16.65
House-passed bill	17.57
Senate committee bill	20.81
Senate-passed bill	21.36
Conference compromise (vetoed)	19.74
Administration revised request	18.80
House bill (H.R. 15931)	19.38
Senate bill and final version (with 2% feature)	19.04

Somewhat ironically, final congressional action on the H.E.W. bill came on the very day (March 4) that the House Appropriations Commitee subcommittee on Labor-H.E.W. began sessions on FY 1971 funding. The Committee intends to report a separate funding bill for education this year, on April 9, as well as the regular Labor-H.E.W. package, on June 11. House Appropriations Committee Chairman George H. Mahon (D-Tex.) said that it is hoped that the early reporting of the separate bill "will assist in expediting final congressional enactment so that the educational community generally will have a much more definite idea of the approved Federal funding levels well in advance of the coming school year."

MAN'S INHUMANITY TO MAN—HOW LONG?

HON. WILLIAM J. SCHERLE

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 20, 1970

Mr. SCHERLE. Mr. Speaker, a child asks: "Where is daddy?" A mother asks: "How is my son?" A wife asks: "Is my husband alive or dead?"

Communist North Vietnam is sadistically practicing spiritual and mental genocide on over 1,400 American prisoners of war and their families.

How long?

COMMISSION ON CIVIL RIGHTS: STATEMENT ON SCHOOL DESEGREGATION

HON. JEFFERY COHELAN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 20, 1970

Mr. COHELAN. Mr. Speaker, the Commission on Civil Rights was created to evaluate the efforts of this Nation to end racial discrimination. It has consistently issued reports that have analyzed the positive and negative steps in forwarding this vital national goal. Recently, the Commission issued a strong statement critizing President Nixon's lack of leadership in the area of improving race relations, specifically in the area of school desegregation. In his March 24, 1970, speech, President Nixon made it clear that it would have to be the courts alone that bear the national burden of ameliorating our racial tensions in schools. I deplore this and I feel the Commission has rightly indicted the President for his abdication of leadership.

The Commission goes beyond an indictment of the President's statement to show how fragile the distinction between de facto and de jure segregation is. I was particularly impressed with the sections on the "Burden on Schools" and the "Importance of Integration." The entire statement, however, is well reasoned and timely and well worth detailed analysis by the readers of this RECORD. The statement follows:

STATEMENT OF THE U.S. COMMISSION ON CIVIL RIGHTS CONCERNING THE STATEMENT BY THE PRESIDENT ON ELEMENTARY AND SECONDARY SCHOOL DESEGREGATION

On March 24, 1970, the President issued an important civil rights statement. The President's statement is comprehensive and thoughtful. He has made clear his strong support for the constitutional principle of the 1954 Supreme Court decision in *Brown* v. *Board of Education:* "We are not backing away. The Constitutional mandate will be enforced."

The President also has given his view of the contents of that constitutional mandate. "Deliberate racial segregation of pupils by official action," the President said, "is unlawful, wherever it exists." He pointed out emphatically that "it must be eliminated 'root and branch'—and it must be eliminated at once." Further, the President stated that "segregation of teachers must be eliminated" and ordered that steps be taken to assure against discrimination in the quality of facilities or the quality of education delivered to school children within individual school districts.

As the President recognizes, however, the issues are more complex than merely ending current practices of deliberate public school segregation and discrimination, and their implications for the future of the country are far-reaching. While many of the problems are common to nearly all minority groups in all parts of the country, others frequently are unique to particular sections of the country or to particular minority groups. Prob-

lems of segregation and inadequate school facilities, for example, cut across racial or ethnic lines and exist in all regions. Black children in the rural South, however, experience educational deprivations different in kind from those of children who live in northern ghettos. By the same token, Mexican American and other Spanish-speaking children experience unique hardships when they come from homes where their first language is Spanish but enter an educational environment where only English is permitted, and as a result are shunted automatically into lower ability groups and subjected to curricular discrimination.

The President addressed himself to many of the more complex issues that have been troubling the Nation—Issues such as what can be done about so-called *de facto* school segregation, what are the most effective and sensible means of enforcing school desegregation requirements, how much of a social burden can the schools reasonably be expected to bear, how important is integration to the achievement of minority group children, how effective can busing be as a means of carrying out school desegregation, how important is adherence to the neighborhood school principle, and what kinds of resources should the Federal Government make available to local communities to achieve the goal of equal educational opportunity?

These are issues of critical importance deserving of the highest level of consideration and discussion. In the course of its history, the Commission has paid continuing attention to many of these issues. We are committed to the purpose for which this Commission was created: To act as an objective, bipartisan factfinding agency and to continually apprise the President, the Congress, and the Nation of the facts as we see them. The Commission believes that the experience and information we have gathered over the years concerning the issues discussed in the President's statement provide a sound basis for analysis and comment that can contribute to their clarification and be of help to educators, other public officials, and concerned Americans generally. It is in this spirit that we speak out now.

DE JURE VERSUS DE FACTO

The President draws a sharp distinction between *de jure* and *de facto* school desegregation, contending that under the former there is a positive duty to end it, while under the latter, "school authorities are not Constitutionally required to take any positive steps to correct the imbalance." This statement represents a strict interpretation of existing Supreme Court decisions.

It can be argued, however, that the Supreme Court's decision in *Brown* warrants a broader interpretation. For one thing, while the holding of the Supreme Court in the *Brown* case was limited to legally compelled or sanctioned segregation, the Court's concern extended as well to segregation resulting from factors other than legal compulsion. The Supreme Court quoted with approval a lower court finding that "Segregation of white and colored children in public schools has a detrimental effect upon the colored children. *The impact is greater when it has the sanction of law . . .*" (Emphasis added), and concluded: "Separate educational facilities are inherently unequal . . ."

Thus the Court expressly recognized the inherent inequality of all segregation noting only that the sanction of law gave it greater impact. In a sense, therefore, the President's sharp distinction between *de jure* and *de facto* segregation tends to blunt what many think is a crucial thrust of *Brown*.

The Commission, moreover, in the course of its investigations, has found numerous examples—North and South—which suggest that it is not adequate to describe school segregation as purely *de facto*—that in many cases, school segregation that appears to result solely from accidental housing patterns turns out, upon closer examination, to result in large part from decisions by school and other public officials.

For example, decision on school boundary lines have been made with the purpose and effect of isolating minority group members in their own separate and unequal schools. Sites for new schools, even recently, have been strategically selected so as to assure against racially integrated student bodies. The size of schools has been determined with an eye toward maintaining racial separation. As the President recognizes, conduct of this type is illegal. Instances of purposeful school segregation have been found in surprising places, in the North as well as the South. The school systems of New Rochelle, New York; South Holland, Illinois; Pasadena and Los Angeles, California; and Pontiac, Michigan, are among those which have been found by the courts to have practiced deliberate school segregation in violation of the Fourteenth Amendment. There is no doubt that there are many more instances of school segregation resulting from conscious decision of school officials than the relative handful that have come to the attention of the courts.

It also should be understood that legally compelled or sanctioned school segregation is not a phenomenon unique to the South. In many northern and western states, the current pattern of racial separation of students is a legacy of an era when laws and policies explicitly authorized segregation by race. States such as Indiana, New Mexico and Wyoming maintained separate-but-equal laws beyond the mid 1940s. In other northern states, such as Ohio and New Jersey, cities and counties persisted in maintaining separate schools for black students well into the 1950s.

Even in those instances where school segregation is a result of housing patterns with no apparent complicity of school officials, government at all levels—local, State, or Federal—invariably is heavily implicated. Historically, racial zoning ordinances imposed by local law were a formidable factor in creating and maintaining racially exclusive neighborhoods. Although such ordinances were held unconstitutional as early as 1917, some communities continued to enforce them, even as late as the 1950s.

Judicial enforcement by State courts of racially restrictive covenants has been another important factor. Although these covenants were private agreements to exclude members of designated minority groups, the fact that they were enforceable by the courts gave them maximum effectiveness. Not until 1948 was the judicial enforcement of such covenants held unconstitutional, and not until 1953 was their enforcement by way of money damages held unlawful. Racially restrictive covenants no longer are judicially enforceable, but they still appear in deeds and the residential patterns they helped to create still persist.

Various exercises of local governmental authority, such as decisions on building permits, the location of sewer and water facilities, building inspection standards, zoning and land use requirements, and the power of eminent domain have been used to exclude minority group numbers from designated neighborhoods and even from entire communities.

The Federal Government, principally through its public housing and FHA mortgage insurance programs, has been all too often a willing partner in the creation and perpetuation of racially segregated neighborhoods, even to the point of insisting upon them. Until the late 1940s, for example, FHA insisted on racially restrictive covenants to insure against integrated housing developments. Until 1962 when the Executive Order on Equal Opportunity in Housing was issued, the agency continued willingly to do business with discriminatory builders and developers. The Public Housing Administration permitted its funds to be used for the creation and perpetuation of segregated housing projects well after the courts had made it clear that such practices were in violation of the Constitution. Other Federal programs, such as the highway and urban renewal programs, which involve massive displacement and relocation, also have had the effect of intensifying residential segregation.

The point we are making is that the current situation we face, in which most minority group children attend school in isolation from children of the majority group, is *not* accidental or purely *de facto*. In many cases, it has resulted in whole or in substantial part from an accumulation of governmental actions. Thus the categorical distinction between *de jure* and *de facto* segregation is not as clear-cut it would appear. Upon closer examination, there is probably little legal substance to the concept of *de facto* school segregation. Further, in the Commission's view, the Government has a moral as well as legal responsibility to undo the segregation it has helped to create and maintain. There is no statute of limitations by which government in its many forms can be exonerated from its past misdeeds or relieved of its current obligations.

The Commission believes that the necessary course of action is to make available to the Department of Justice and the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare the resources necessary to determine on a nationwide basis those cases which appear on the surface to involve *de facto* segregation but which in reality involve *de jure* school segregation, and then to take steps to correct the situation. We note that the President, in his budget request for Fiscal Year 1971, has asked for substantial increase in resources for civil rights enforcement in both departments—56 additional positions for the Civil Rights Division of the Department of Justice and 144 additional positions for the Office for Civil Rights in the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. It is important that the President's request be honored. It also is important that the attention of these two departments be directed specifically to the problem of apparent *de facto* segregation that may, in fact, have been consciously created and maintained *de jure*. We believe that to accept without investigation the notion of widespread fortuitous and ingenuous school segregation and to determine policy on that basis would be a serious mistake.

Further, there is a large arsenal of weapons, in the form of nondiscrimination laws and low- and moderate-income housing programs, available to combat housing segregation and remove it as a cause of school segregation. As this Commission also recently pointed out in its report on "Federal Installations and Equal Opportunity," the leverage of the substantial economic benefits generated by Federal installations can be used effectively to promote housing desegregation.

Another important way to promote housing desegregation is to provide people with the economic wherewithal necessary to expand their choice of housing. The President's Family Assistance and Manpower Training proposals, as well as the Administration's endorsement of the "Philadelphia Plan," represent forward moving efforts to enable the poor, a disproportionately high number of whom are minority group members, to join the Nation's economic mainstream and expand their choice in housing and other aspects of life through adequate income and job stability.

ENFORCEMENT OF SCHOOL DESEGREGATION

The President's statement was largely silent concerning the means that will be used to bring about an end to dual school systems. Experience in the 16 years since the *Brown* decision provides many lessons on what kind of enforcement works and what kind does not. During the first ten years

following *Brown*, when litigation was the sole enforcement mechanism, progress in carrying out the Supreme Court's mandate was frustratingly slow—three percent desegregation in 10 years. Since the enactment of Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, however, with its provision for administrative enforcement, progress has accelerated enormously—30 to 40 percent desegregation in the last five years. In a July 3, 1969, statement the Attorney General and the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare indicated that the Government was deemphasizing the use of administrative enforcement under Title VI in favor of a return to litigation. This, despite the evidence of the practical utility of Title VI as an enforcement mechanism. The fact that the President made no reference to the means to be used raises the fear that litigation will, in fact, continue to be substituted for administrative enforcement. In its September 1969 report on "Federal Enforcement of School Desegregation," the Commission characterized the Administration's reliance on litigation as "a major retreat in the struggle to achieve meaningful school desegregation." The Commission believes it is important that a clear statement of policy be made by the President to allay these fears.

The President made plain in his statement, however, two other principles which apparently will guide his Administration in carrying out the Supreme Court's mandate: local discretion and reliance on good faith of local school administrators. Again, on the basis of the experience of the past 16 years, the Commission believes that neither is adequate assurance. The progress that has been made in promoting school desegregation in the South has not often resulted from local initiative, alone, but more frequently from persistent Federal pressure, joined with local initiative. Experience also has demonstrated that results alone—and not good faith—are the only true measure of compliance with the Supreme Court's mandate.

BURDEN ON THE SCHOOLS

Another area that warrants further discussion is the suggestion that we are asking too much of our schools. The President said: "They have been expected not only to educate, but also to accomplish a social transformation." The Commission believes this is true—that much is being asked of our schools, that much always has been asked of them. The important point, however, is that they have delivered. During the great waves of immigration that brought millions of oppressed people to this land of promise, it was the schools that we relied upon to educate the children of these immigrant families and to integrate them into American society. They did not fail us then.

But they are failing today. The children of the Nation's ghettos and barrios are not receiving the quality of education afforded to more affluent majority group children, nor are they being enabled to join the Nation's social and economic mainstream. Above all, they are not being integrated into American society, but are becoming alienated from it. To be sure, the problems facing the schools may be more difficult than those they faced in earlier days when they succeeded so well. But these problems cannot be viewed as insoluble, nor can we relieve our schools of the burden, heavy as it may be, of being the chief instrument by which they will be resolved. For the schools occupy a special place in American society. As the President pointed out:

"The school stands in a unique relationship to the community, to the family, and to the individual student. It is a focal point of community life. It has a powerful impact on the future of all who attend. It is a place not only of learning, but also of living—where a child's friendships center, where he learns to measure himself against others, to share, to compete, to cooperate—and it is the one institution above all others with which the parents shares his child."

Public schools must again be asked to play their traditional role as "the balance wheel of the social machinery." It will not do to insist that we are placing too heavy a burden on the schools. It is a burden that they always have accepted and they must accept it now. It should be a national priority of the highest order to provide our schools with the necessary resources—adequate facilities, better teacher training, and the like—to hear this burden. It is for this reason that we welcome the President's allocation of one and a half billion dollars. There are urgent needs for all of this and more, plus a clear pinpointing of the precise educational priorities for school improvement throughout the country.

There simply is no other institution in the country so equipped to do the job. If the public schools fail, the social, economic, and racial divisions that now exist will grow even wider. It would be even worse, however, if the schools do not even try.

IMPORTANCE OF SCHOOL INTEGRATION

In his March 3, 1970, message on "Education Reform," the President made the following statement: "Quality is what education is all about; desegregation is vital to that quality." That statement did not represent a suggestion of a new direction in national policy, but rather, an accurate and succinct description of one of the cornerstones of established policy.

It has been settled that desegregation is fundamental to the achievement of equal educational opportunity. All three branches of the Federal Government have spoken with one firm resolve on this matter and the Nation has committed itself to achieving the goal of quality integrated education for all of our children. Studies have been made, such as the Coleman Report, the Commission's own report on "Racial Isolation in the Public Schools," and a recent study of the New York State Board of Regents, which indicate that racial, as well as social class, integration has a positive effect on the achievement of school children. These studies are useful in contributing to better understanding of the elements that make for quality education. They in no way question the fundamental policy of school desegregation. That policy is based on considerations as important as school achievement scores. School integration is necessary to create the understanding and sense of common purpose so vital to the Nation's future well-being. The key question now is not the relative merits of desegregation, but how to accomplish it.

It is true, as the President points out, that the adult community has failed to achieve for itself the kind of multiracial society that we are seeking to achieve in schools. The failure of the adult community, however, only highlights the necessity of insuring that our children receive the kind of training in integrated school environments that will equip them to thrive in the multiracial society they will enter. In fact, nowhere is integration more easily achieved than among children, who are born without prejudice and who accept other human beings for their human values, without automatic judgments based on race or color. If we delay this training until they enter the adult society, we will have been too late. It is in the schools where our children's attitudes and perceptions can be influenced to enable them to succeed where we, their parents, have failed.

BUSING

In his statement, the President raised the issue of busing and cautioned that we must proceed with the least possible disruption to our children's education. Busing has become an emotionally charged word and the issues involved have been the subject of considerable misunderstanding. Many who oppose busing do so on the basis of certain assumptions, one of which is that riding to school disrupts a child's education and causes harm. This is a serious issue which should not be argued solely in terms of assumptions or emotion. The Commission believes that facts which it has found in the course of its investigations may contribute to clarifying the issue and sharpening the debate over it.

Busing is neither a new nor a unique technique, and its use is not limited to facilitating desegregation. For example, for decades, black and white children, alike, in the South were bused as much as 50 miles or more each day to assure perfect racial segregation. In many cases, busing was the exclusive privilege of white children—black children often were required to walk considerable distances. No complaints then were heard from whites of any harmful effects. Nor was any concern exhibited over the damage suffered by black children through their deliberate segregation. The Supreme Court in *Brown* described vividly the nature of the harm to which Negro children were being subjected.

"To separate them from others of similar age and qualifications solely because of their race generates a feeling of inferiority as to their status in the community that may affect their hearts and minds in a way unlikely ever to be undone."

Thus the arguments that some now make about the evils of busing would appear less than ingenuous. The plain fact is that every day of every school year 18 million pupils—40 percent of the Nation's public school children—are bused to and from school, and the buses log in the aggregate more than two billion miles—nine billion passenger miles—each year. It also should be understood that the overwhelming majority of school busing has nothing to do with desegregation or achieving racial balance. The trend toward consolidation of schools, for example, particularly in rural areas, requires extensive busing. It causes no disruption to the educational routines of the children and is treated as normal and sensible.

Amid the controversy over busing, in many school systems, North and South, transportation is being used quietly and effectively as a means of bringing about desegregation. The bus rides are not long—in Berkeley, California, for example, a city of 120,000 people, the bus trip never exceeds 20 minutes—and it causes no harm. In the South, of course, the amount of busing needed to bring about desegregation frequently is considerably less than was required to maintain dual school systems. For example, at the Commission's 1968 hearing in Montgomery, Alabama, we found that black students in Selma, seeking to attend trade school, were bused some 50 miles to the nearly all-black Trenholm School in Montgomery, although the Rufus King trade school was located in Selma. Rufus King, however, was all-white.

It is a mistake to think of the problems of desegregation and the extent that busing is required to facilitate it solely in the context of the Nation's relatively few giant urban centers such as Chicago, New York, or Los Angeles. In most of our cities the techniques necessary to accomplish desegregation are relatively simple and busing creates no hardships. The experience in communities which have successfully desegregated could easily be transferred to cities of greater size.

Even in giant urban centers progress in desegregation does not require interminable bus rides or disruption of our children's education. The President, in discussing the recent California court decision requiring desegregation of the Los Angeles school system, quoted "local leaders" as estimating that the total cost of busing will amount to 40-million dollars over the next school year. This estimate represented the contention of the

defendants in that litigation. It was presented to the court for the purpose of arguing against the feasibility of desegregation in that city's school system. In fact, the court rejected this estimate as unrealistic.

In Los Angeles, as in other cities, substantial desegregation can be accomplished through relatively simple devices such as alteration of existing school attendance are as, school pairing, and the establishment of central schools. To be sure, transportation is necessary in giant urban centers as it is in smaller cities, but here too, it is false and defeatist to assume that the bus rides must be lengthy or that the education of our children will be disrupted.

In the Commission's view, the emphasis that some put on the issue of busing is misplaced. As most Americans would agree, it is the kind of education that awaits our children at the end of the bus ride that is really important.

NEIGHBORHOOD SCHOOLS

In his statement, the President emphasized the desirability of maintaining the neighborhood school principle. For several reasons, the Commission questions whether this should be one of the cornerstones upon which national educational policy rests.

For one thing, neighborhood schools do not represent the invariable principle governing school attendance that many believe. Frequently, neighborhood attendance is subordinated to other educational goals. In some cities, for example, handicapped children or academically talented students attend schools other than the one in their neighborhood.

Further, the Commission has found numerous instances of departures from neighborhood attendance policy that have had the effect of promoting racial segregation, where faithful adherence to the neighborhood school principle would have assured integrated student bodies. In Cleveland, Ohio, and San Francisco, California, for example, optional zones were created to permit white students who otherwise would have attended racially integrated schools to choose instead nearly all-white schools out of their neighborhood. Transfer plans, ostensibly instituted to relieve overcrowding, also have had the effect of promoting racial separation.

There is, in fact, a good deal of inconsistency and hypocrisy that all too often surround the lip service paid to the neighborhood school principle. Courts, as well as school officials, have had little difficulty in dismissing its importance for the purpose of maintaining segregation. In Cincinnati in 1876, for example, black children who had to walk four miles each way to attend a black school brought suit to enter the much nearer white school. The court refused and said: "Children cannot cluster around their schools like they do around their parish church." Several years ago, then Chief Judge Tuttle of the U.S. Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit, in a case involving the Mobile, Alabama, school system, made some observations on this point:

"Both in testimony and in the briefs, much is said by the appellees about the virtues of 'neighborhood schools.' Of course, in the brief of the Board of Education, the word 'neighborhood' doesn't mean what it usually means. When spoken of as a means to require Negro children to continue to attend a Negro school in the vicinity of their homes, it is spoken of as a 'neighborhood' school plan. When the plan permits a white child to leave his Negro 'neighborhood' to attend a white school in another 'neighborhood' it becomes apparent that the 'neighborhood' is something else again. As every member of this court knows there are neighborhoods in the South and in every city of the South which contain both Negro and white people. So far as has come to the attention of this court, no board of education has yet suggested that every child be required to attend his 'neighborhood school' if the neighborhood school is a Negro school. Every Board of Education has claimed the right to assign every white child to a school other than the neighborhood school under such circumstances. And yet, when it is suggested that Negro children in Negro neighborhoods be permitted to break out of the segregated pattern of their own race in order to avoid the 'inherently unequal' education of 'separate educational facilities,' the answer too often is that the children should attend their 'neighborhood school.' So, too, there is a hollow sound to the superficially appealing statement that school areas are designed by observing safety factors, such as highways, railroads, streams, etc. No matter how many such barriers there may be, none of them is so grave as to prevent the white child whose 'area' school is Negro from crossing the barrier and enrolling in the nearest white school even though it be several intervening 'areas' away."

There also is some question whether the narrow attendance areas served by neighborhood schools truly represent the "neighborhood" as we currently understand that term. In fact, the meaning of neighborhoods has changed over the years. Recent developments in the pattern of urban life—rapid population shifts and the growing distances city residents travel for recreation, business, and shopping—have diffused traditional neighborhood patterns. They no longer are the self-contained, cohesive communities they may once have been. In short, it is doubtful that adherence to the neighborhood school principle is required by considerations of close community ties in narrow geographical areas. The schools have an opportunity, by broadening the geographical areas they serve, to expand the experience of children beyond that of the restricted confines of their narrowly defined neighborhood, and establish the school as a broader "community" or "neighborhood" in which the lives of all who attend can be enriched.

If adherence to the neighborhood school principle frequently interferes with efforts to promote desegregation, there also is some question concerning its value as a means of providing quality education. The essence of the neighborhood school is a self-contained unit serving a relatively small student population. In larger units, however, economies of scale frequently make possible the offering of a broader curriculum and the provision of new and expensive equipment that are not economically possible in schools which serve small numbers of students. Many rural areas, for example, in an effort to improve the quality of education, have abandoned the tradition of small individual school houses in favor of consolidated schools serving much larger student bodies. In short, adherence to the neighborhood school principle under current conditions not only tends to interfere with efforts at desegregation, but also has little bearing on efforts to improve the quality of education and in some cases may even thwart those efforts.

The Commission believes that ideally and ultimately, resolution of the problem of school segregation lies in residential desegregation, which will remove the emotional issues of neighborhood schools from the arena of civil rights controversy. Residential desegregation can be accomplished through laws and policies designed specifically to secure an open housing market, and administered with dedication and purpose. This does not mean, however, that efforts to desegregate the schools should await the day when the neighborhood desegregation has been achieved. We cannot afford to make integrated education wholly dependent upon open housing, for to do so would be to consign at least another generation of children to education in racially isolated schools.

HELPING COMMUNITIES TO DESEGREGATE

We have spoken of communities that have recognized the problem of school segregation and have determined to eliminate it on their own. Many of these are in the South and they have complied with judicial and administrative requirements by devising imaginative and successful plans not only for achieving physical desegregation but also for assuring quality education for all children. Some of these communities are in areas commonly thought to be among the most opposed to desegregation. For example, Pass Christian and New Albany, Mississippi, both have accomplished full desegregation and have taken steps to assure that the desegregated schools are not white schools or black schools, but schools that all children can feel a part of. As measured by white and black student participation in school activities, daily attendance rates, and achievement scores, their efforts have been successful.

Other communities, particularly in the North, while they have been under no legal compulsion to accomplish desegregation, nonetheless have sought to do the job. The President has pointed out that these school officials are free to take steps beyond the constitutional minimums to diminish racial separation.

The Commission questions, however, whether this is enough, and whether the appropriate posture of the Federal Government on this important matter should be merely a passive one. Rather, we believe it is essential that financial and technical assistance, be made available to assist these communities in bringing about total and successful desegregation as rapidly as possible.

We recognize, of course, that the President has made a commitment of one and one-half billion dollars over the next two years to carry out his school policies, and we applaud this step. There is need to clarify how this money will be used. The President specified two purposes: "Improving education in racially impacted areas, North and South, and for assisting school districts in meeting special problems incident to court-ordered desegregation."

It is not clear whether these two purposes are considered mutually exclusive—whether school districts *not* under court order would be eligible for assistance under this program to promote desegregation or whether the President's proposal assumes that so-called *de facto* segregation is with us to stay. If the latter, then the proposal may well have the effect of providing built-in financial incentives for the perpetuation of racial segregation in schools not under court order and transform an acceptance of the reality of *de facto* segregation of the reality of prophesy. We believe again that further official clarification of this point is needed.

The President has made it clear to all that his Administration intends to carry out the Supreme Court's mandate of an immediate end to legally sanctioned dual school systems.

Much more, however, is necessary. The problems of racial isolation in the Nation's schools cannot be resolved solely through cautious adherence to a narrow construction of existing case law. The courts, in defining the constitutional requirements relating to desegregation have informed us only of our minimum mandate, not the maximum that we are permitted to do to accomplish school desegregation. In education, as in other areas of national concern, it is the responsibility of the Congress and the Executive Branch to act beyond this minimum, using the broad authority provided under the Constitution. Thus it is not sufficient to say that local school officials who have not maintained legally compelled separate systems may desegregate their schools if they choose to. The necessity of desegregation must also be urged and the resources made available to accomplish it if our Nation is to move toward the ideal of "one Nation, under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all." It is this word "all," with its special connotation of equal educational opportunity for all the

children in America which has inspired most of our comments. We believe that here is the central concern, the true promise of what America will be in the years ahead—one Nation, indivisible, or two Nations divided.

The Commission fears that the President's statement, particularly his sharp distinction between *de jure* and *de facto* segregation, well may have the net effect, though unintentional, of signaling a major departure from the policy of moving toward integrated schools and that open society of which he spoke so well in his statement.

Last September, in its report on "Federal Enforcement of School Desegregation," the Commission pointed out:

"This is certainly no time for giving aid and comfort, even unintentionally, to the laggards while penalizing those who have made commendable efforts to follow the law, even while disagreeing with it. If anything, this is the time to say that time is running out on us as a Nation. In a word, what we need most at this juncture of our history is a great positive statement regarding this central and crucial national problem where once and for all our actions clearly would match the promises of our Constitution and Bill of Rights."

The Commission is aware that the problem of school segregation is one of enormous difficulty and complexity. Yet a realistic assessment of the scope and dimensions of the problem should not result in a resigned acceptance of its indefinite continuation or a defeatist conclusion that it is beyond our capacity to resolve. The Commission is convinced of the ability and will of the American people to respond affirmatively to a call to end the injustice that school segregation represents. This call requires a major investment of resources, the commitment of public and private officials on the Federal, State, and local level—indeed of all Americans—and above all, the continuing example of courageous moral leadership from the President of the United States.

MEMBERS OF THE COMMISSION

Rev. Theodore M. Hesburgh, C.S.C., Chairman.
Stephen Horn, Vice Chairman.
Frankie M. Freeman.
Maurice B. Mitchell.
Robert S. Rankin.
Manuel Ruiz.
Howard A. Glickstein, Staff Director.

DEMOCRACIES CONSTITUTE LESS THAN ONE-THIRD OF THE WORLD'S NATIONS

HON. ROMAN C. PUCINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 20, 1970

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, much has been said recently about the state of the world and the form of governments that the people of the world live in.

I think it is most significant that a recent study of world governments shows that only 38 out of 131 governments in the world are listed as democratic, with the remainder having various forms of governments, from outright dictatorships, to Communist-dominated governments, to weak democracies.

I am placing in the RECORD today a table of these world governments so that we Americans can see how difficult it is for the ideals of democracy to survive in a very troubled world.

This study shows the magnitude of difficulties the United States encounters in its efforts to deal with all of these countries, but more important it shows what a long and difficult job lies ahead before we can say that this world is indeed secure for democracy.

I am particularly anxious to see those of my colleagues who are so quick to denounce the situation in Greece to study this table and I believe I have a right to ask where is the outrage of those who criticize Greece in regard to the rest of the world's nations, and why have they singled out only Greece when we should be voicing the same indignation in defense of freedom in the rest of the world.

The table follows:

THE STATE OF THE WORLD, 1970

Country	Population	Political system	Percent illiterate	Free press	Average income	War or peace	Life expectancy
Afghanistan	16,133,000	Strong king: no parties	90	No	$52	Peace	(1)
Albania	2,019,000	Communist	28.5	No	305	do	63
Algeria	12,943,000	President backed by army	81	No	207	do	35
Argentina	23,617,000	Military rule: no parties	13.6	No	699	do	63
Australia	12,013,000	Democratic	(2)	Yes	1,820	Fighting in Vietnam	67
Austria	7,349,000	Democratic: Nazi party banned	(2)	Yes	1,091	Peace	66
Barbados	253,000	Democratic	1.1	Yes	371	do	62
Belgium	9,619,000	do	3.3	Yes	1,600	do	67
Bolivia	4,439,000	Military rule	67.9	No	167	Fighting guerrillas	49
Botswana	611,000	Democratic	78	Yes	86	Peace	(1)
Brazil	88,209,000	Military rule: Strong president	39.3	No	252	do	39
Britain	55,235,000	Democratic	(2)	Yes	1,560	do	67
Bulgaria	8,370,000	Communist	(2)	No	1,000	do	67
Burma	26,389,000	Military rule one party	42.3	No	59	Civil unrest	40
Burundi	3,406,000	Military rule: 1 party	(1)	No	38	Peace	35
Cambodia	6,557,000	Strong premier: 1 party	69.2	No	120	do	44
Cameroon	5,562,000	Democratic	(1)	Yes	102	do	34
Canada	20,772,000	do	(2)	Yes	2,087	do	68
Central African Republic	1,488,000	Military rule: 1 party	(1)	No	102	do	33
Ceylon	11,964,000	Democratic	22	Yes	132	do	61
Chad	3,460,000	Strong president: 1 party	50	No	60	do	(1)
Chile	9,351,000	Democratic	16.4	Yes	465	do	49
China	730,000,000	Communist	46.1	No	(1)	do	(1)
China (Taiwan)	13,466,000	Dictatorship by Chiang-Kai-Shek	20	No	221	do	64
Colombia	19,825,000	Democratic: Communist Party banned	37.7	Yes	279	Fighting guerrillas	44
Congo (Brazzaville)	870,000	Military rule: 1 party state	84.6	No	167	Peace	37
Congo (Kinshasa)	16,730,000	President backed by army: 1 party state	84.6	No	104	do	37
Costa Rica	1,640,000	Democratic	15.7	Yes	357	do	61
Cuba	7,937,000	Communist Party dominant	(2)	No	(1)	do	(1)
Cyprus	622,000	Strong president	24.1	Yes	699	do	63
Czechoslovakia	14,362,000	Communist Soviet enforced	(2)	No	1,783	do	67
Dahomey	2,571,000	President backed by army	(1)	No	64	do	37
Denmark	4,870,000	Democratic	(2)	Yes	1,947	do	70
Dominican Republic	4,029,000	Strong president	40.1	No	228	do	56
Ecuador	5,695,000	Democratic but weak	32.7	Yes	199	do	(1)
El Salvador	3,266,000	Democratic	51	Yes	245	do	56
Ethiopia	23,900,000	Strong emperor: No parties	(1)	No	59	Border disputes	(1)
Finland	4,688,000	Democratic	(2)	Yes	1,479	Peace	64
France	50,320,000	do	3.6	Yes	1,738	do	67
Gabon	480,000	Strong President: 1 party	87.6	No	266	do	25
Gambia	350,000	Democratic	(1)	Yes	70	do	43
Germany East[3]	17,084,000	Communist	(2)	No	1,778	do	68
Germany[3]	58,015,000	Democratic	(1)	Yes	1,512	do	67
Ghana	8,376,000	Weak democracy	20	Yes	213	do	38
Greece	8,803,000	Military rule: All parties banned	19.6	No	686	do	67
Guatemala	4,864,000	Strong president	70.6	No	264	do	48
Guinea	3,795,000	Strong president: 1 party	(1)	No	93	do	26
Guyana	700,000	Democratic but weak	24.1	Yes	262	do	59
Haiti	4,674,000	Dictator: Parties banned	89.5	No	75	do	32
Honduras	2,535,000	President backed by army	64.8	No	209	do	44
Hungary	10,255,000	Communist	3.2	No	1,265	do	67
Iceland	200,000	Democratic	(2)	Yes	1,972	do	70
India	523,893,000	do	72.2	Yes	81	Naga war	41
Indonesia	112,825,000	Military rule: Communist Party banned	57.1	No	91	Peace	(1)
Iran	26,985,000	Strong king: Communist Party banned	87.2	No	243	do	42
Iraq	8,634,000	President backed by army: 1 party	85.5	No	223	War with Israel	(1)

Country	Population	Political system	Percent illiterate	Free press	Average income	War or peace	Life expectancy
Ireland	2,910,000	Democratic	(2)	Yes	841	Peace	68
Israel	2,745,000	do	15.8	Yes	1,158	War with Arab neighbors	70
Italy	52,750,000	do	8.4	Yes	1,020	Peace	67
Ivory Coast	4,100,000	Strong president: 1 party state	(1)	No	203	do	35
Jamaica	1,913,000	Democratic	18.1	Yes	431	do	62
Japan	101,039,000	do	(2)	Yes	921	do	68
Jordan	2,039,000	Strong king	67.6	No	235	War with Israel	52
Kenya	10,209,000	Strong president	(1)	Yes	100	Peace	40
Korea (North) [3]	13,000,000	Communist	(1)	No	(1)	Border clashes with South Korea	47
Korea (South) [3]	30,470,000	Strong president: Communist party banned	29.4	Yes	140	Border clashes with North Korea	51
Kuwait	540,000	Strong sheik: no parties	5.32	No	[4] 3,240	Peace	68
Laos	2,825,000	Premier backed by army	Not known [1]	No	68	do	(1)
Lebanon	2,580,000	Weak democracy	20	Yes	294	do	65
Liberia	1,130,000	Strong president	91.1	No	154	do	60
Libya	1,803,000	Military rule	87.1	No	802	do	(1)
Luxembourg	336,000	Democratic	(2)	Yes	1,655	do	61
Malagasy Republic (Madagascar)	6,350,000	Weak democracy	66.5	Yes	97	do	37
Malawi	4,285,000	Strong president: 1 party state	93.5	No	45	do	(1)
Malaysia	10,384,000	Weak democracy: Communist party banned	77.7	No	255	do	55
Mali	4,787,000	Military rule: 1 party state	(1)	No	64	do	27
Malta	319,000	Democracy	42.4	Yes	498	do	40
Mauritania	1,120,000	Strong president: 1 party state	(1)	No	94	do	67
Mauritius	787,000	Weak democracy	38.4	Yes	211	do	58
Mexico	47,267,000	Democratic	34.6	Yes	478	do	55
Mongolia	1,174,000	Communist	4.6	No	(1)	do	(1)
Morocco	14,580,000	Strong king	86.2	No	168	do	47
Nepal	10,700,000	Strong king: Parties abolished	94.9	No	90	do	44
Netherlands	12,743,000	Democratic	(2)	Yes	1,465	do	71
New Zealand	2,751,000	do	(2)	Yes	1,714	Fighting in Vietnam	68
Nicaragua	1,842,000	Strong president: Backed by army	50.4	No	316	Peace	(1)
Niger	3,643,000	Strong president: 1 party state	99.1	No	73	do	37
Nigeria	62,650,000	Military rule: Parties suspended	40	No	68	War with Biafra	(1)
Norway	3,819,000	Democratic	(2)	Yes	1,763	Peace	71
Pakistan	109,520,000	Military rule	81.2	No	108	do	53
Panama	1,372,000	Military rule: Parties suspended	30.1	No	477	do	57
Paraguay	2,231,000	Strong president	25.7	No	192	do	(1)
Peru	12,772,000	Military rule	39.4	No	241	do	51
Philippines	35,993,000	Weak democracy	28.1	Yes	233	Fighting in Vietnam	48
Poland	32,207,000	Communist	4.7	No	1,113	Peace	64
Portugal	9,505,000	Premier, dictatorship: 1 party state	38.1	No	423	Fighting in African colonies	60
Rhodesia [3]	4,170,000	White minority rule	(1)	Yes	217	Fighting African guerrillas	[5] 66—[6] 50
Romania	19,721,000	Communist	11.4	No	938	Peace	65
Rwanda	3,405,000	Strong president	(1)	No	38	do	(1)
Saudi Arabia	6,990,000	Strong king: No parties	79	No	151	do	(1)
Senegal	3,685,000	Strong president	94.4	No	182	do	37
Sierra Leone	2,475,000	do	60	No	111	do	(1)
Singapore	1,988,000	Democratic	33.9	Yes	561	do	(1)
Somalia	2,745,000	do	93	Yes	62	do	(1)
South Africa	19,176,000	White minority rule	68.5	No	521	do	[5] 64—[6] 44
Spain	32,411,000	Dictatorship	17.6	No	707	do	67
Sudan	14,770,000	Weak premier: Military rule	88	No	91	do	(1)
Swaziland	395,000	Strong king	77.2	Yes	155	do	48
Sweden	7,912,000	Democratic	(2)	Yes	2,665	do	71
Switzerland [3]	6,130,000	do	(2)	Yes	2,171	do	68
Syria	5,738,000	Military rule: 1 party	70.5	No	204	War with Israel	(1)
Tanzania	12,590,000	Strong president	(1)	No	60	Peace	35
Thailand	33,693,000	Military rule: Communists banned	32.3	No	127	Fighting in Vietnam	53
Togo	1,772,000	Military rule: No parties	(1)	No	72	Peace	31
Trinidad and Tobago	1,030,000	Democratic	26.2	Yes	620	do	62
Tunisia	4,660,000	Strong president	84.3	No	172	do	53
Turkey	33,530,000	Weak democracy	61.9	No	299	do	52
United Arab Republic	31,680,000	Strong president: 1 party	80.5	No	166	War with Israel	51
Uganda	8,133,000	Strong president	74.9	No	82	Peace	50
United States	205,000,000	Democratic	2.2	Yes	3,421	Fighting in Vietnam	70.5
U.S.S.R.	237,808,000	Communist	1.5	No	1,533	Peace	66
Upper Volta	5,175,000	Military rule: 1 party	82	No	42	do	35
Uruguay	2,818,000	Strong president	9.7	No	607	do	(1)
Venezuela	9,686,000	Democratic	34.2	Yes	836	Fighting Communist guerrillas	66
North Vietnam [3]	20,700,000	Communist	35.5	No	(1)	Fighting in South Vietnam	(1)
South Vietnam	17,414,000	Strong president: Backed by army	(1)	No	92	Fighting Communists	35 (app)
North Yemen	5,000,000	Military rule: 1 party	50	No	44	Civil war	50
South Yemen	1,700,000	Strong president: 1 party	55	No	60	Peace	50
Yugoslavia	20,186,000	Communist	23.5	No	737	do	62
Zambia	4,065,000	Strong president	58.6	Yes	231	do	40

[1] Not known.
[2] Less than 1 percent.
[3] Country does not belong to the United Nations.
[4] Oil income.
[5] White.
[6] African.

Note: Most of the figures in this chart were gathered and published by the United Nations. The page was research and prepared by Leonard Aronson.

THE FIRING OF WILLIAM WOESTENDIEK OF WETA

HON. JAMES F. HASTINGS

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 20, 1970

Mr. HASTINGS. Mr. Speaker, a serious issue has been raised in the last few days over the firing of William Woestendiek, a news editor of the WETA educational television station, solely because his wife had been hired as press secretary for a well-known Republican, Mrs. Martha Mitchell.

This action obviously poses a threat and an insult to the individual freedom and integrity of all newsmen, not to mention the threat presented to their wives as free individuals. Much justified criticism is being heard of this action from all quarters—including an unlikely source, the Washington Post. While the Post has not been known for its support of Mrs. Mitchell, it still felt the obligation to point out the injustice and dangers posed by this WETA policy. I insert an editorial from this morning's Post in the RECORD at this point:

[From the Washington Post, Apr. 20, 1970]

WETA: LEANING TOO FAR OVER BACKWARD

Martha Mitchell, the wife of Attorney General Mitchell, is given to moments of exuberance in which she has expressed herself vigorously, some would say excessively, on a variety of public issues, and in ways which we presume do not reflect considered administration policy. The Attorney General has been very good about this, in our view—not that it is necessarily any of our business. He has been loyal and relaxed, taking the view that there is no automatic connection between what his wife says or does as a private citizen and his role as a public official. Recently he hired a former newspaperwoman, Kay Woestendiek, as press secretary for his wife, presumably in an effort to help keep this distinction clear. Whereupon, Mrs. Woestendiek's husband William, was summarily fired from his job as editor of WETA's "Newsroom" show, on the grounds that his wife's job with Mrs. Mitchell somehow endangered the show's "credibility." There is fine irony in this: Mr. Mitchell hires a press secretary for the presumed purpose of helping maintain the line between his public life and his wife's private life, and WETA sacks the press

secretary's husband for fear that his professional life would be compromised by his wife's job.

"Every time there would be a story from that part of the administration," said William J. McCarter, general manager of the local public broadcasting station, "people would make the connection over and over. It would eat away at us."

Nonsense. WETA has every good reason to maintain its independence of mind. But if that is what it takes, its independence of mind must be in a pretty soggy state. It has been flatly denied that the decision was made under the influence of outside pressure, notably from Fred W. Friendly, television adviser to the Ford Foundation, which supports the "Newsroom" show. The finger points, instead, to pressure from the WETA staff. But this only makes it worse; assuming that it was an inside job, the decision was still Mr. McCarter's and what he is saying, in effect, is that WETA cannot keep its balance unless it controls the wives of its employees. In our view, President Nixon made a lot more sense on this same issue when he declined, after one of Mrs. Mitchell's more outspoken contributions to the public dialogue, to take responsibility for the wives of members of his cabinet. In these matters there are sometimes hard choices—between what people will think and what is right. James Thurber had it about right in the moral he wrote to one of his famous fables. You might just as well fall flat on your face, he said, as lean too far over backward.

WETA POSES SERIOUS QUESTION TO THE PUBLIC AND TO THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT

HON. CATHERINE MAY

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 20, 1970

Mrs. MAY. Mr. Speaker, education television station WETA of Washington has now posed a serious question to the public and to the Federal Government: should either one continue to support a medium which exhibits little regard or respect for the integrity of the individual.

Last Friday night the management of WETA summarily fired the director and editor of its "Newsroom" show solely on the grounds that his wife had gone to work for Mrs. Martha Mitchell.

The reason given was that the man fired, William Woestendiek, would not be able to do an unbiased job with his wife working for a Republican.

Mr. Speaker, that reason casts a reflection on the integrity and ability of every newsman in this country.

In addition, it is a clear indication that the Neanderthal types at WETA are still living in a period when a man's wife cannot have a career of her own.

The question that now confronts us is this: is this attitude limited to WETA or is it widespread among subsidized and licensed educational television stations? If it is, then certainly both the public and the Government should reexamine the support they give these stations. If, as is likely, only WETA maintains this policy, then action should be taken to end it.

ASTRONAUTS SAFELY BACK FROM THE BRINK—A SAGA OF COURAGE

HON. JOE L. EVINS

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 20, 1970

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. Never has there been a human drama to surpass the turbulent voyage of Apollo 13 as three courageous, disciplined astronauts cooly piloted their crippled space vehicle around the moon and safely back to earth.

The prayers of America and the world reached out to the three astronauts—Jim Lovell, Fred Haise, and John Swigert—as they improvised a workable spacecraft out of their battered equipment—survived a strange explosion—and hit the bullseye in the Pacific with a successful splashdown.

Congress is proud of these courageous men—America is proud—and the world is proud—and we want to welcome the astronauts home and commend and congratulate them for their magnificent courage and supreme discipline in the face of awesome odds and constant danger, proving then men take over when machines fail.

In this connection the Washington Daily News in an eloquent editorial called the return of the astronauts one of the remarkable scientific achievements of all time.

Certainly this is true and because of the interest of my colleagues and the American people in this most important achievement I place the editorial from the News in the RECORD.

The editorial follows:

[From the Washington Daily News, Apr. 18, 1970]

BACK FROM THE BRINK

If ever there was a scientific marvel, this had to be it.

Pick any word you like—incredible, inspiring, fantastic, sublime. The rescue of Apollo 13—by the grace of God and the ingenuity of man—was all of these, and more.

To astronauts Lovell, Haise and Swigert—a joyous welcome back.

To the technicians at mission control in Houston, to the hundreds of scientists and engineers who coaxed the stricken craft back home—the thanks of a nation for a job superbly done.

There could have been no more angelic sight this side of paradise than the parachutes that blossomed south of Samoa yesterday easing the command capsule, Odyssey, into the warm waters of the Pacific Ocean.

It may be an odd thing to say about a mission that failed, but the return of three astronauts from the edge of the moon with a ruptured rocket ship—literally falling apart in space—must have been one of the remarkable scientific achievements of all time.

In many ways, it was even more remarkable than our two successful moon landings last summer and fall.

Failure to land on the moon after twice doing it before was a keen disappointment. It must have been a special disappointment to Jim Lovell, making his fourth and last trip into space, the only man ever to soar to the moon twice—and never to set foot on the lunar surface.

But we may have learned more from this one failure than from all the past successes of the Apollo program.

We learned first of all that we've got the brains, the courage and the plain cussedness to patch up a crippled space bird in flight—that we can respond magnificently when things go wrong.

We proved that it pays to operate our space program openly, with our mistakes on display along with our triumphs.

At least a dozen nations, large and small, volunteered to help in the rescue. Millions of people who never have met an American—and probably never will—offered their prayers and encouragement and when it was all done joined in the celebration in wholehearted ecstasy.

There is no doubt, of course, that the explosion in Apollo 13's main power plant last Monday night raises some hard questions about future space exploration.

What happened? Why? How can we prevent it from happening again?

And how can we build enough backup features into Apollo 14 to make sure that—no matter what—the next crew of astronauts will have an even better chance to survive?

While this is being done, the flight of Apollo 14 may have to be postponed from October to some later date. It should not be canceled. Or abandoned as "too dangerous."

This would be a poor time to back away from a program that has cost $24 billion, opened new frontiers in space and captured the imagination of the world and every American eager to meet a useful challenge.

Certainly there are risks in space.

There were risks when Hillary scaled Mt. Everest, when Cousteau plunged to the bottom of the sea. There were risks when Lindbergh flew the Atlantic and Byrd searched out the South Pole.

These are risks worth taking. There is no reason to stop now.

STATES

HON. ODIN LANGEN

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 20, 1970

Mr. LANGEN. Mr. Speaker, a most sobering article has been brought to my attention which is surely worthy of our consideration.

In this day of intemperate demands being hurled by a host of professional pressure groups, how much more important is it to keep in mind the best interests of the group that makes everything possible—the taxpayers.

Let a voice from this patient and troubled all-too-silent majority be heard—grant that we might have the wisdom to heed:

[From the Minneapolis Star, Apr. 10, 1970]

DECLINE AND FALL OF THE UNITED STATES

To the Editor.—Mailmen, FAA controllers and teachers. These people are forbidden by law to strike, but they have seen the way: If enough people break the law the enforcement becomes impossible.

These are the vanguard. Get your piece of pie while you can. The hell with the public.

And who's next? Policemen? Firemen? Garbage collectors? Highway patrolmen? Judges? Tax collectors? The barriers are down. Precedents have been set.

It only remains for the ultimate to hap-

pen: a taxpayers' strike! Suddenly there is no pie to gobble up; John Q. is fed up. You don't want to work, drop dead!

So then we have anarchy. Is that what you want? Enjoy the view; you've seek the peak. This is the decline and fall of the United States.

VERNON A. BORN.

MINNEAPOLIS.

MEAT QUOTAS SHOULD BE SUSPENDED

HON. EDWARD P. BOLAND

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 20, 1970

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Speaker, it will not do much good for me to simply discuss high prices for food in these days of inflation.

Any housewife knows that is happening to her food budget, and now she has to back and fill every day to try to feed her family while still making ends meet.

Her job may be the hardest in the country—and no matter how good she is at cutting corners, she falls further behind each week.

We all know that inflation is the biggest culprit in this food price situation. What many of us do not know is that the administration has it in its power to do something about meat prices.

Mr. Speaker, the administration should remove the quota on meat imported into this country. This would help the consumer save money on the price he or she pays for meat.

Yes, our Government is preventing the importation of available meat, especially beef, at a time when meat prices, according to Government statistics, have reached their highest point in the 60 years during which records have been kept by the Department of Agriculture.

All the statistics show that there is a shortage in this country of meat used for hamburger, frankfurters, and coldcuts.

Yet, this is the kind of meat, prohibited under the import quotas, from entering this country in quantities large enough to lower food budgets for the average working man's family.

Mr. Speaker, the irony—yes, the tragedy—is that there is no shortage of such meat in the world.

Australia, New Zealand, Mexico, and Ireland all have good, wholesome meat waiting to be shipped into this country under sanitary standards which are exactly the same as those for meat produced right here in this country.

These countries are all friends of the United States. But, they are limited by quotas from selling their surplus meat to the American market while at the time meat prices here are the highest in history because of a shortage.

I urge the administration to suspend these meat quotas so that the countries that are qualified to ship wholesome meat into this country can do so at a larger rate than now permitted by our Government.

This action will help hold down the food budget of the average family. And, let us face it—hamburger is a staple for many families.

Mr. Speaker, our Government's trade policies are indeed a source of puzzlement to those living in the Northeast.

New England workers wonder why they have to face daily unfair competition with generous imports of foreign electronics, textiles, and shoes produced by cheap labor and threatening American jobs.

Yet, when these same New England workers buy meat—and oil for their stoves and furnaces in bitter cold winter—they have to pay higher prices because of Government import quotas. All meat and oil import quotas do is take money out of their household budgets by pushing prices up.

TRIBUTE TO MR. BERNARD J. DONAHUE

HON. GLENN M. ANDERSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 20, 1970

Mr. ANDERSON of California. Mr. Speaker, at the conclusion of this school year, Bernard J. Donahue, principal of Carson High School, is retiring after a span of over 30 years' service in the Los Angeles School System.

Mr. Donahue, a native of Los Angeles, attended St. Vincent Elementary School, Loyola High School, and Loyola University. He was awarded a bachelor of arts degree from Loyola University in 1930. Over the years, he continued his education at the University of Southern California and was awarded a master of science degree in 1948.

The retiring principal began his long career in education at Bret Harte High School in 1931. From 1932 until 1937, Mr. Donahue taught at Torrance High School. In 1937, he began an 8-year period at Hamilton High School where he taught until 1945. During 1945, he served as vice principal of Banning High School. In late 1945 and early 1946, Mr. Donahue returned to Hamilton High High School to resume his teaching duties.

Mr. Donahue returned to the field of school administration in 1946, where he was the vice principal of Torrance High School. From 1947 until 1962, he served as vice principal and later, principal, of Banning High School. In 1962, Mr. Donahue began his tenure as principal of Carson High School—the position he holds today.

In addition to his service to the community in the school system, Mr. Donahue has served the community through his membership in the Rotary Club, the Young Men's Christian Association, and the Carson Chamber of Commerce.

Mr. Donahue's professional affiliations include membership in the National Association of Secondary School Principals, the California Association of Secondary School Administrators, the Los Angeles Association of Secondary School Administrators, and the Los Angeles Senior High School Principals' Association in which he served for a period as president.

Mr. Donahue and his wife, Laura, have a daughter, Mrs. Shelia F. Miller.

I would like to join in honoring Bernard J. Donahue for his outstanding service to the parents and children in the Los Angeles area who have had the opportunity to come in contact with him. His dedication, integrity, and intellect have been an inspiration to many. The Los Angeles School System has benefited greatly from his service, and he will be missed.

VIETNAMIZATION AND LAND REFORM

HON. ALBERT W. JOHNSON

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 20, 1970

Mr. JOHNSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, impressive signs of success in two crucial areas of the war in Vietnam, Vietnamization and land reform, are noted in a recent column by two writers visiting Bien Hung, a Mekong Delta hamlet.

The victory of the South Vietnamese forces in taking and holding control of this area is significant. The column notes that local forces may soon be able to relieve even the South Vietnamese Army here.

Second, the great hope offered by the Thieu government's new program of land reform is discussed.

I ask that this column by Robert S. Allen and John A. Goldsmith in the Wichita Eagle be inserted in the RECORD. The column follows:

[From the Wichita Eagle, Apr. 9, 1970]

PACIFICATION IS HOPEFUL

(By Robert S. Allen and John A. Goldsmith)

BIEN HUNG, VIETNAM.—This Mekong Delta hamlet, now controlled by the government, is both a showcase and a test-case for pacification and the eventual Vietnamization of the war.

South Vietnam's 21st Division, under the command of 40-year-old Brigadier General Nguyen Vinh Nghi, took the hamlet in mid-October. It had been under the control of the Viet Cong since early in the war.

The minor victory in itself is significant. The 21st Division, one of South Vietnam's best, has never been reinforced by the assignment of U.S. troops. It gets air and naval support from U.S. units, but the division's successes are its own.

Bien Hung is making impressive progress under the watchful eye of the An Xuyen Province chief, Col. Le Chicoung. All-important local defense forces are being trained. A headquarters complex for the government of the Song Ong Doc district is under construction near the mouth of the canal.

Economic prospects for the hamlet are very good. The river yields a bountiful fish harvest. Rice and other crops prosper in the marshlike delta soil.

The North Vietnamese still use an infiltration route from Cambodia into the dense U Binh Forest to the north. Moving his airmobile units frequently, however, General Nghi has been able to narrow the forest area in which the North Vietnamese can operate safely.

So it is not surprising that visitors, seeking information on pacification and Vietnamization now find their way into the operating area of the 21st Division in the southwest corner of Vietnam which was once considered a Viet Cong stronghold.

As recently as 1967 only 44 per cent of the people in the six-province operating area of the 21st Division lived in areas under government control. In 1969 the percentage reached 92.5. By the end of 1970 Nghi and his aides hope it will rise to 96 per cent.

Refugees from the war, attracted by the lush delta harvest, are resettling in the area. The Viet Cong are now having great difficulty with their local recruiting efforts. Since the government forces took over, Bien Hung itself has had little Viet Cong pressure—a fact which has certainly contributed to the advances here.

After his forces took over the hamlet in October, General Nghi assigned one regular army battalion for its protection. The test will come when that regular battalion is withdrawn for use elsewhere in the 21st Division area.

Then defense of the hamlet will rest initially with local forces—with the hamlet's Popular Force platoons now being trained, with nearby Regional Force companies and with the volunteers of the People's Self Defense Force, who get arms and ammunition but no pay from the government.

The rainy season is approaching. Air support and air mobility will be reduced. The Viet Cong and the North Vietnamese can be expected to step up their activities in the 21st Division's operating area.

There is much hope, great confidence, but no assured security yet for Bien Hung and other hamlets like it.

Even the skeptics, who have despaired of pacification based on the experience of the past, concede that the Thieu government has taken a bold step with its new program of land reform. It is called the Land-to-the-Tiller program.

Currently about 80 per cent of Vietnam's rice paddies are farmed by tenant farmers. Generally they cultivate farms of less than five acres and give the landlord 35 per cent of their crop as a rental fee.

The new program will virtually eliminate tenant farming and give the small farms to the Vietanmese who till them. With U.S. help, financial and otherwise, landlords will be compensated with 20 per cent down payments and bonds to cover the balances of their losses.

Landlords fought the bill in the Vietnamese legislature, and the Thieu government took some legislative lumps. As finally approved by the assembly, however, the program is almost exactly as President Thieu submitted it.

As many as six million people, a million farm families, will be affected by the Land-to-the-Tiller program. That is land reform on a major scale, and it will make landowners of many people who have had little contact in the past with the government in Saigon.

U.S. Ambassador Ellsworth Bunker, who is not ignorant of such matters, recently called Land-to-the-Tiller "the most extensive and revolutionary land reform law that I am aware of."

UNAUTHORIZED DISCLOSURE OF TAX RETURNS

HON. ROBERT E. JONES

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 20, 1970

Mr. JONES of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, in recent days public accounts of information from the income tax returns filed by several citizens of this Nation have been disturbing to thoughtful persons.

The alarming aspect is the public disclosure of confidential information which is as yet unrelated to any actual charges of law violation or wrongdoing.

Should there be evidence of unlawful acts or misconduct in the filing of income tax returns, proper legal actions should be taken through the established judicial systems. It is in the courts that decisions of guilt or innocence should be determined.

The indiscriminate disclosure of tax information is becoming common practice and this is a most flagrant violation of the confidential relationship between the taxpayer and his Government.

This valued relationship between the individual citizen and the Federal Government, with the promise that it is confidential and trusted, has been the foundation of the citizen's voluntary compliance with the law. This is an essential characteristic which distinguishes our society from the totalitarianism of a police state.

The other agencies of Government, along with the Internal Revenue Service, should guard and hold in strictest accountability the confidential information that is supplied by citizens. Indiscriminate disclosures bring doubt as to the fidelity of the Government and can impede the imparting of truthful information by our citizens.

FUNDAMENTAL AMERICAN RIGHTS DENIED WILLIAM WOESTENDIEK OF WETA

HON. FLETCHER THOMPSON

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 20, 1970

Mr. THOMPSON of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, the management of educational television station WETA has cast an aspersion on the integrity of the press that ought not to go unchallenged.

On Friday, WETA fired a highly competent newsman, William Woestendiek, admittedly for the sole reason that his wife, Kay, had gone to work for Mrs. Martha Mitchell.

The station management protested that it fired Woestendiek to avoid any hint of bias in its news coverage.

In doing this WETA told every reporter and newsman in this country that no reporter or his or her spouse can hold any political views or have any political connections without it reflecting on that reporter's presentation of the news.

Mr. Speaker, every reporter should rise up in righteous indignation. Indeed, so should every politician. This kind of an attack on the character and integrity of the press must not be allowed to go unchallenged.

Not if we are to hold to the belief that each adult individual is responsible for his own performance and must be judged on his own merits.

Mr. Speaker, the fact that a federally subsidized television station has denied this fundamental American right means something is wrong. I believe we have a responsibility to take a look at this situation. The Federal Government, through its support of educational television, cannot afford to be involved in this kind of a political reprisal.

HIJACKING AND WORLD LAW

HON. WILLIAM L. HUNGATE

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 20, 1970

Mr. HUNGATE. Mr. Speaker, we are all increasingly concerned about aircraft hijacking and the need for world cooperation in finding solutions to this problem.

The door to greater international cooperation most certainly should be opened with this critical problem. And, hopefully, it could provide a new direction in solving many global problems through united world efforts.

I believe my colleagues will find most interesting and enlightening the following article from the January–February 1970, edition of the World Federalist, U.S.A.:

HIJACKING AND WORLD LAW

(By William M. Sheehan)

An Eastern Airlines DC8 jet, with crew of eight and 138 passengers, neared the end of its evening New York-Miami flight. The stewardess had brought coffee and snacks to the pilot and co-pilot and was returning to the dimly lit passenger cabin. Suddenly a burly man, dragging a child, not his own, with one hand and holding a gun in the other, brushed past her.

Pointing the gun at the child's head, the man shouted at the pilot: "Havana, or this kid, and all of us, don't go anywhere."

The pilot and co-pilot didn't argue. Company policy had long since been established. Don't risk the lives of scores of innocent people and an aircraft worth many millions of dollars to see if the hijacker means business. He usually does.

A bullet through the skin of a pressurized, high-flying plane can result in explosive decompression. One wild shot into the oxygen tanks or cockpit control mechanism could spell instant disaster, even if none of the crew were hit.

"Going to Havana", radioed Eastern's pilot to Federal Aviation Administration Control at Jacksonville, Florida. "You know what that means."

FAA Control knew only too well. There have been scores of Cuban detours. Aircraft operating in Eastern USA now have cards printed in Spanish and English with a dozen explanations, such as, "Going to Havana but must notify Authorities," "Aircraft requires fuel, must land first" or "Aircraft too heavy, circling airport to burn fuel," which can be pointed to for the benefit of nervous, Spanish-speaking hijackers. Pilots in the area carry approach maps to Havana's José Marti Airport, showing navigational aids and directions for instrument landing approaches.

Not all hijacks are to Cuba. Last November, the world's longest hijack, 6,900 miles and 17½ hours, from California to Rome, was accomplished by 20 year old U.S. Marine Raffaels Minichiello in a commandered TWA Boeing 707 jet. En route, passengers were off-landed at Denver, a new trans-ocean flight

crew taken on at New York and three refuelings effected. No lives were lost and the culprit was apprehended in Italy. But according to Board Chairman Charles Tillinghast, the junket cost TWA more than $40,000 for direct costs alone.

The statistical probability of any one of the world's annual 300,000,000 passengers being aboard a pirated aircraft may be small, perhaps as low as 1 to 170,000. But the odds are getting smaller.

Worldwide there were no highjacks in 1966. In 1967 there were 6. In 1968, 27. In 1969 they averaged nearly two commercial airlines a week. The idea is certainly catching on.

But when it happens as it has to thousands of passengers, it may mean more than a missed business appointment, shortened holiday or failure to attend a wedding, christening, convention or graduation ceremony. It may mean one's life.

SKYWAY ROBBERY

Unprecedented challenges tend to elicit exceptional answers. There is a new, bold solution to the problem. First it may be useful to consider just what hijackers are up to.

In November 1968, a Philippine Airlines plane was cruising at 10,000 feet from Cebu, in central Philippines, to Manila. Four men leaped from their seats brandishing guns. "This is a stick-up," shouted the leader. "Reach for the sky." His companions proceeded to search and rob each passenger. When they got to Senor Vallarin, a plain-clothes Federal policeman, the latter whipped out his gun. Wild shooting ensued. Passengers screamed and ducked for cover.

When it was over, one passenger, caught in the cross-fire, lay dead. Several others were seriously wounded. Miraculously, the airplane escaped major damage and landed on the Manila runway, at the hijacker's behest, a mile from the Administration Building. Taking the pilot and two other crew as hostages, the gunmen climbed over the airport fence and made a successful getaway.

A similar gun battle took place recently in an Ethiopian Airlines DC6. On a domestic flight from Addis Ababa to Diredawa, it was forced by a group of Eritrean secessionists to overfly Diredawa, and land on the Arabian Peninsula at Aden. After the aircraft was down, an Ethiopian security man travelling incognito pumped six bullets into the leader, 18 year old Mohammed Seed. But is was too late. The surviving secessionists requested and received political asylum of the Southern Yemen Government.

Ethiopian Airlines, a small but excellently administered airline, has been plagued with such mishaps. This was their fourth such incident in 1969. At Frankfurt last spring, one of their two DC8 jets was virtually gutted by firebombs left behind by Arab passengers. Ato Katema Yifru, young and personable Ethiopian foreign minister, whom I met in Addis last March, said: "Hijacking is not only childish but reckless. We need concerted international action. It would be a deterrent if countries agreed to hand over hijackers straightaway, as Saudi Arabia did in the recent case of two Egyptians."

In September 1969, a band of 12 men and one woman, some armed with machine guns, hijacked simultaneously two aircraft in Ecuador. When the planes landed in Colombia for refueling, the pilot and co-pilot of one plane resisted and were shot, the pilot being killed. The band continued on the remaining aircraft to Cuba, with further refueling stops at Panama and Jamaica.

A hijacked passenger is not safe even after the aircraft has landed. A TWA jet, with over 100 passengers and crew aboard, was diverted to Damascus by a young woman and male accomplice of the Palestinian Liberation Front whilst en route from Athens to Tel Aviv. Upon landing, passengers and crew were evacuated hurriedly by means of the emergency escape chute. They had barely touched the ground when the aircraft was demolished by an explosion. Instructions of the PLF had been to destroy not only the aircraft, but the passengers and crew as well. The Syrians detained two Israelis, presumably as hostages in future Arab-Israeli negotiations.

WHAT TO DO

Suggested solutions are a dime a dozen. They may be classified as either operational or legal.

For example, it has been proposed the cockpit be equipped with concealed darts which could be fired at the intruder and render him instantly unconscious, presumably before there is time for his finger to pull the trigger or his bomb to be dropped. Another suggestion has been to have a trap door in the flight deck which could be opened suddenly to send the unwelcome visitor to his doom below. No doubt this would require a sign "Hijacker stand here".

More seriously, thought has been given by airlines, pilots and government officials to the possibility of identifying potential hijackers at the boarding gate by behavioural traits common to such persons, as well as of pre-flight inspection of passengers and baggage for hidden weapons, either visually or by use of X-ray metallic detectors. These operational techniques are not being generally pursued because of the indignity and inconvenience that would be occasioned to millions of innocent air travellers. The public is already subject to extensive, and for the most part unavoidable, delays in air traffic control, baggage handling and customs examinations.

Some airlines assign plain-clothes detectives to each flight. But this is expensive and, as demonstrated by the Philippine Airlines incident, can lead to fatal violence aloft. If, as in the hijack of an El Al jet at Zurich or the Ethiopian plane at Aden, the security man opens fire after touchdown, it is usually too late to do any good anyway.

Both airlines and pilots associations have offered large rewards for information leading to the arrest and conviction of air criminals, with little or no success. The international airline pilots association, IFALPA, has threatened a worldwide 24-hour strike of its 40,000 members to dramatize the gravity of the situation and the need of quick, drastic, government action, especially by the United Nations Security Council. Interpol, the international criminal police organization, has urged that all national penal codes include hijacking provisions, so courts will have more effective control.

LEGAL SOLUTION

Despite their best efforts, no operational technique can be relied upon to keep hijackers away from planes. Once on board, it is generally agreed, nothing can be done except to yield to their demands, and so keep damage to a minimum.

The only other solution is a deterrent. It must be made clear to would-be hijackers that their intended conduct is a crime and that it will be swiftly and heavily punished. This can be done by effecting an appropriate, applicable law.

Many countries have domestic laws against air piracy. The US Federal Aviation Act authorizes a maximum sentence of death or 20 years imprisonment. In Mexico up to 20 years may be imposed. The Canadian criminal Code sets a limit of 14 years. Cuba, still a favourite hijack destination, has made hijacking a heavily punishable crime and permits extradition, subject to bilateral government agreement. Even without such a bilateral, Castro has demonstrated his desire to be rid of non-political refugee hijackers by returning such persons to the USA via Canada, with which Cuba maintains diplomatic relations.

The trouble with domestic laws against hijacking is they cannot be brought into play unless the domestic court gets physical jurisdiction of the culprit. The latter, whether political refugee, saboteur, psychopath or just plain bad-guy, usually has enough sense to select a landing place where he may expect to receive sancutary.

The present method of effecting international legal rights and obligations is through bi-lateral or multi-lateral treaties. In 1963, at Tokyo, 16 nations signed a "Convention on Offences and Certain Other Acts Committed On Board Aircraft," to become effective only when 12 states had ratified it. In September 1969, the USA became the twelfth state to effect ratification. Other participating countries include such relatively unimportant states as Niger and Upper Volta, but significantly not Egypt, Cuba, Syria or any Arab state.

There are three drawbacks to effecting legal rights and obligations by treaties. *First*, they are merely promises of sovereign nation states. There is no dependable, feasible mechanism whereby those promises, if violated, abrogated or ignored, can be enforced. All an aggrieved state can do is ask for return of the hijackers. If that fails, it can threaten to use force. If that doesn't work, it has to use force, which means go to war.

Second, treaties usually lack universality. An outstanding exception, of course, is the United Nations Charter, which however doesn't deal with hijacking. The Tokyo Convention of 1963 affects barely a dozen countries and, as previously indicated, fails to embrace those countries whose co-operation in effecting a return of a refugee from justice for trial is essential.

Third, treaties require a vast amount of time and effort to negotiate and, once agreed, their terms are frozen. To update or revise them requires almost as much work as creating them originally.

Thus the Tokyo Convention, only half a dozen years old, is already obsolete in important respects. It contains no provision for extradition. Even if there were such, the state of sanctuary would be free to say, "This is a political refugee. Therefore we do not accede to a request for extradition."

WORLD LAW

What all this adds up to is that our existing domestic and international machinery for creating and enforcing legal obligations—although to the extent effectual it must be used—is clearly inadequate for our modern times and needs.

Why should world-wide trafficking in drugs, pollution of the skies and waters by nuclear and non-nuclear waste, exploration of outer space, overpopulation, unconscionable disparity of living standards and myriad other pressing sociological and political problems be subject to the archaic, inefficient and snails-pace procedures of the late Middle Ages?

What we need today is a new kind of law-making machinery to agree and enforce global laws for these and many other vital problems.

Whether along the lines of Clark and Sohn's minimal "World Peace Through World Law", Chicago University's maximal "Preliminary Draft of a World Constitution" or any other such proposal, World Federalists have an answer—law, established, adjudicated and enforced through a reconstituted and strengthened United Nations. Hijacking is just one of many reasons why man needs, not tomorrow, but today, a just, dependable and effective world law.

SO YOU FEEL ALL ALONE?

HON. JOHN M. ASHBROOK

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 20, 1970

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, every profession has its nuts and quacks and

the behavioral sciences are no exception if an item from the April 19 issue of the Philadelphia Inquirer is any indication. The article starts out by saying:

Sharing nudity is one way of getting rid of the terrible feeling that one is all alone in the world, according to some innovative psychologists.

This new, earth-shaking treatment is known as nude-encounter therapy, and in the words of Dr. S. F. Kreitzer, a clinical psychologist:

It would be a great change and of great benefit in the lives of many of the so-called "silent majority."

In the days of Mark Twain's Tom Sawyer and Huck Finn similar characters would be run out of town on a rail, but alas, today they get to enlighten convention gatherings with their nonsense. Their rantings would be hilarious if the moral connotations were not so serious.

The item, "Psychologist Cites Value of Nude Therapy," by George Getze from the Philadelphia Inquirer of April 19 is inserted at this point:

PSYCHOLOGIST CITES VALUE OF NUDE THERAPY

(By George Getze)

LOS ANGELES, April 17.—Sharing nudity is one way of getting rid of the terrible feeling that one is all alone in the world, according to some innovative psychologists.

But nudity, they say, to be anything other than plain nakedness, has to be supervised by somebody trained in using it as a psychological device.

Nude-encounter therapy was one of the subjects discussed at the 1970 convention of the Western Psychological Assn. here.

S. F. Krietzer, a local clinical psychologist, said in an interview that nude-encounter therapy is a new way of helping people feel comfortable with themselves and others.

THAT OLD FEELING

He said that to feel comfortable, people have to lose the lonely feeling that nobody understands them, a feeling that can lead to despair and suicide.

"People express this by saying to themselves, 'nobody would or could accept me if I let them know what I am really like,'" Dr. Kreitzer said.

Therapy helps them get rid of this notion, and nude-encounter therapy is a faster and more successful way of going about it with many people, he said.

PROFESSIONAL AID

Dr. Kreitzer said he himself looked upon nude-encounter therapy with fear and misgivings but that he has now decided it is a valuable aid in his work.

He does not think that nude-encounter therapy should be limited to those who are seriously disturbed.

"It would be a great change and of great benefit in the lives of many of the so-called 'silent majority,'" Dr. Kreitzer said.

Nude-encounter therapy has been growing for the past several years since it was first seriously tried by Paul Bindrin, a local psychologist who runs what he calls "nude marathons."

RAW DEAL

He describes the nude marathon as a "deeply involving and highly sensitive group process in which individuals discover the basic life style they have expressed since infancy."

For a $75 fee, Bindrin offers "general session" nude marathons, open to everybody; "advanced sessions," for experienced participants only; "creative mating," for couples who would like to "enliven" their relationship by facing to the conflict between the urge to be close, with its problems of possessiveness and jealousy, and the urge to be free; and "creative meeting," for singles who are "tired of playing the dating game and wish to meet under more transparent circumstances."

THE PENTAGON AND THE NEWS MEDIA

HON. ANDREW JACOBS, JR.

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 20, 1970

Mr. JACOBS. Mr. Speaker, I insert the following speech delivered by Mr. A. Ernest Fitzgerald in the RECORD, as follows:

THE PENTAGON AND THE NEWS MEDIA

(By A. Ernest Fitzgerald)

Several weeks ago, after I had worked as a consultant to CBS Television on its program exposing the massive cost overruns on the Navy's Mark 48 torpedo system, a very fine review in *Variety* cast me as a critic of the nation's news media, despite my enthusiasm for this particular TV program. Since I think this characterization of my views is only partly accurate, I'd like to take the opportunity today to clarify my position.

In the first place, I think the media have done a remarkable job of telling the public the story of my adventures with the Pentagon bureaucrats. Without this coverage, I'm sure I would have been fired long before I was, and perhaps prosecuted on the false charges—later retracted by the Air Force—that I violated security and provided classified documents to the Congress. At the very least, I would have disappeared from sight and would not be addressing you today.

But as I mentioned to a newspaper reporter at the height of the hassle over my testimony on the C–5A aircraft cost overruns—more than a year ago—I'm afraid all the attention to the personal aspects of my case has partly obscured the far deeper and more critical issue: that of the Pentagon's role in our economy and its poor stewardship of the enormous funds entrusted to its care. This issue is exemplified by the Pentagon's toleration of huge cost overruns and its continuing reluctance to put pressure on the giant military contractors to deliver their products in reasonable accordance with original contract specifications. On this issue—which I think is one that really counts—the media have been slightly less spectacular than in reporting on the human interest stories.

You're all probably familiar with the recently enunciated doctrine of "Agnewsticism." This isn't really new, of course, but frequently rears its head in time of great controversy. Generally speaking, an Agnewstic holds that the national media should be impartial and objective toward all sides of a given question—except when the Administration or its friends happen to be involved. As a distinguished young lady in the first family put it in a wire service interview several weeks ago, "The Vice President is incredible. I feel I should write him a letter. He's amazing—what he has done to the media . . . helping it to reform itself. I'm a close watcher of newspapers and TV. I think they've taken a second look. *You can't underestimate the power of fear.*"

Now this may be shrewd psychology and good politics, but it's a poor way to run a democratic government. It flies in the face of the essential concepts of a free press and an informed electorate. But it's bound to have some effect. In-depth, probing reporting on Administration activities, especially in the Pentagon, has not significantly expanded on the air-waves.

For those of us troubled by bungling and high-handedness on the part of the officials who run the Pentagon, this is a most critical time, certainly no time to stifle questioning by intimidating the media. Along with huge cost overruns on major weapons programs, the Pentagon is getting airplanes whose wings break off, tanks that blow themselves up and missiles that won't even make it out of their own silos. Never has there been a greater need for thorough and objective reporting on the Pentagon's performance of its job.

Granted, it's hard for a reporter to penetrate the opague shroud of secrecy thrown up by the Pentagon bureaucrats and to dig out stories that the bureaucracy would rather suppress. Unfortunately, however, I know of several instances where networks have declined to run well-documented Pentagon horror stories that have been handed them virtually on silver platter. Some typical examples:

Last year one of the major networks had complete information on a story concerning a giant defense contractor, one which has had considerable difficulty in developing one of our major weapons systems. As far back as 1966, there was knowledge within the government that serious financial problems were involved. However, the facts were covered up—deliberately concealed—and withheld from both Congress and the public. After the issues had been discussed between Pentagon officials and company management—but before they became public—some of the company's top officials sold hundreds of thousands of dollars in personal stock holdings. Later, when massive overruns on the system were revealed, the value of the company's stock took a drastic beating. Without any explanation to the producer, the TV exposé was killed just before it was to go on the air.

A producer for another network shot news clips of the Marine Corps' court-martialing of enlisted men for refusal to give up their weekends to pull targets at civilian rifle matches sponsored by the National Rifle Association. Like the insiders' stock deal, this program was squelched without explanation even though the General Accounting Office had provided a documented account of the numbers of Marines sent on these details and the number of courts martial for refusal to participate in this demeaning, nonmilitary activity.

The same producer who worked on the Marine story wanted to do a special on the military-industrial complex but was told to "cool it" by his boss. According to his boss, there *was* no such complex.

An example of courage that ought to be repeated was the recent CBS exposé of the estimated $3.3 billion cost overrun on the Navy's new Mark 48 torpedo system—one of the few recent investigative efforts by the TV people on Pentagon procurement irregularities. On this program, despite intense pressure to drop the story, Mike Wallace and his associate, Bill Brown, persevered. The Assistant Secretary of the Navy admitted on the show that the Pentagon had tried to dissuade the network from running it and had refused to comment on the torpedo until it was clear the network was not going to yield to pressure. Since then, I've learned that at least one key TV newsman also tried to talk the network out of doing the program.

At this moment, there is another well-documented horror story which needs further airing. This is the F–111 fighter-bomber. Through a secret patriot in the Pentagon, I recently obtained a document revealing that the Air Force Systems Command—the office charged with supervising the development of the controversial F–111 aircraft program—has recommended advance payments to the plane's contractor—the General Dynamics Corporation—even though the Air Force has refused to accept further deliveries

of the F–111 pending proof testing to guard against repetition of some of its most disastrous performance deficiencies.

You may recall that several weeks ago, the Lockheed Aircraft Corporation threatened to suspend work on key military programs unless the Pentagon came up with more than $650 million in advance funding on its contracts. The warm reception Lockheed got from the Pentagon and some Congressional leaders may well have been the start of a multi-billion dollar welfare line for the giant military contractors.

The Air Force Systems Command, seemingly acting in behalf of General Dynamics is suggesting almost $40 million in advance payments which the government does not appear to be obligated to pay under a "strict constructionist" view of the situation. In addition, the contractor has been paid almost $4.5 billion on the F–111 program despite dramatic and disastrous shortcomings in the plane's performance. At present, none of the aircraft are being accepted by the Air Force. As icing on the cake, the document indicates that the Systems Command is suggesting that the government pay General Dynamics by the day. The Assistant Secretary of the Air Force, Spencer Schedler, my former boss, has reportedly been briefed on this situation. The proposed give-away may have already been approved.

The most discouraging aspect of the Systems Command proposal is that the alternative of enforcing the contract appeared to have been rejected out of hand. This alternative of enforcing the contract was pictured as "imposing an excessive burden on the contractor." As usual, nothing was said about the taxpayer burden. Instead, more "bail-out" and "get-well" money was proposed.

Despite nearly eight years of infusions of "get-well" money, the contractor has still not produced a serviceable aircraft. Figures provided by the General Accounting Office show that costs for the program have more than doubled, from $4 billion to almost $9 billion, although the quantity of aircraft ordered has been cut back from 1,693 to 710 planes. Cost estimates per copy have risen from $3.3 million to $12.4 million—an increase of more than 300 percent. Senator McClellan has said that a more accurate cost estimate is on the order of $16 million per plane.

My own experiences and observations have convinced me that we have a thoroughly unwholesome and dangerous situation in the Pentagon—one that the media will have to grapple with if we're ever going to get any improvement. The Pentagon, supposedly the main protector of our freedom, quite possibly is itself our greatest threat to personal liberty. And media people are not the only ones susceptible to intimidation. Where is the private citizens' protection against the vast and irresponsible bureaucracy that has gained control of our military machine?

The Pentagon's hierarchy is determined to put down critics—heretics in their book—and to maintain its cozy relationships with the giant military contractors. This relationship, as we have seen, comes at the expense of wasted billions in taxpayers' money. Let me give you some examples of the repression encountered by officials who have dared to buck the system:

The Air Force Colonel who assisted me in the initial disclosures of cost and technical problems in the C–5A aircraft program was suddenly found by the Air Force Headquarters to have absolutely unique qualifications to be Air Attache in Addis Ababa.

The cost analyst who detected a deliberate understatement of $300 million in the cost estimate for the Mark II electronics system for the F–111 aircraft was isolated, socially and professionally ostracized, and given no assignments for a long period of time.

The consulting firm that detected and reported $500 million of excessive costs on the engines for the F–111 airplane was blackballed by the military procurement community and forced to suspend operations.

Civil service material inspectors were labelled "traitors", fired, hounded and shut off from responsible employment for telling Congress about acceptance and use of faulty material procured for the Southeast Asia war. A Navy fuel inspector who uncovered massive thefts of oil and jet fuel in Thailand got similar treatment.

Charges of favoring "unilateral disarmament" and reflections on loyalty were levelled at Members of Congress who questioned waste in the military budget. One powerful Senator attempted to link the budget-cutting effort to the machinations of an "interlocking directorate" organized by extreme leftwingers. These attacks, which had utterly no foundation in truth, scared off a number of moderate Congressmen who had been working to control military spending.

The employers of an especially enterprising reporter, a writer adept at digging up military horror stories, were told by Pentagon officials that their star sleuth was a Communist and crazy to boot. Not one word of this reporter's work has been factually refuted, and several of the systems he criticized have since been canceled. Clearly, it isn't always healthy to place oneself in opposition to the Pentagon's spending juggernaut. Those of us who have attempted it can understand the problems faced by the news media in this regard.

As a result of committing truth before a Congressional committee on the C–5A cost overruns, I received the full smear treatment, including false accusations by the Secretary of the Air Force that I had divulged classified information and an elaborate investigation by Air Force security men to dig up something incriminating about my private life.

Happily, despite much practice, the Pentagon was no more skillful in building up their dirt file on me than in controlling costs. My friends were able to learn the names of the investigators, the file number of the investigation and other information which resulted in a partial disclosure of the facts of this dirty business. Even though nothing was found, the file was doctored and distorted for maximum personal damage. For instance, I was characterized as an economy nut because one of my cars was an old Rambler.

The obvious answer to all this is education—both by the media and other concerned groups. I simply don't think an informed public will let this kind of thing go on. But the public must be informed, and they won't be if the media are muzzled.

To date, however, the proponents of better stewardship have been scattered, disorganized and lacking in persistence. Leadership, resources, responsible direction and staying power are desperately needed. This is where the Businessmen's Educational Fund comes in.

The business leaders who make up the Businessmen's Educational Fund are not intimated by the tactics of the defenders of military boondoggling. Many have outstanding war records, and cannot be accused of being either cowards of traitors. Despite their remarkable generosity, none has any intention of giving his hard-earned property to any bungling bureaucracy. No one can realistically accuse them of being softheaded or impractical. They are leaders in their communities. Finally, our business leaders have or can command the material resources necessary to conduct a persistent, effective campaign in behalf of patriotic American taxpayers.

The BEF campaign, which I am privileged to participate in, is aimed at providing facts to the American taxpayers through business and government leaders. I view these leaders as wholesale distributors of facts which will cause patriotic taxpayers to demand that the pentagon boondogglers shape up.

As Mayor John Lindsay pointed out not too long ago, the taxpayers of New York City supply the Pentagon with $9 billion of their money every year. In this city and others across America, we believe that an informed public will demand full accountability of the Pentagon's stewardship.

I am personally convinced that education can make possible the saving of billions of dollars in the military budget. Management mechanics are not a limiting factor at present. Intent is. The military budget is high because the government officials who really matter want it that way. It is full of fat because fat equates to comfort and political power for government bureaucrats, and high, risk-free sales for the big suppliers.

So far, both the President and the Secretary of Defense have avoided binding commitments to tough improvement goals. I believe an effective educational campaign can motivate both these gentlemen to take a tough stand on military financial goals. If they are tough enough, they can cure the intent problem almost overnight.

Whether you are primarily concerned about inflation, high taxes, problems of the cities, the environment, moral decay in government or the future of free enterprise, I think you will agree that we as a nation must bring the Pentagon's bureaucracy and their favored contractors under control. Otherwise, they will continue to eat us out of house and home, and we will have inadequate resources for any improvements to our national well-being.

As I mentioned earlier, our news media have an essential role to play in this campaign. Thomas Jefferson noted that the price of liberty is eternal vigilance, and a vigilant public requires even more vigilant news media. But while emphasizing their responsibility, let us not forget our own—to offer them our strong support when they seek to do democracy's work. I believe that businessmen, as a group and as individuals, can make a vital contribution in this way.

Whatever the outcome of the BEF drive, we have an exciting time ahead of us, with a chance to do lasting good for ourselves and our country. We hope to build a constituency for stewardship which will assure external and internal security without sacrificing either our solvency or our traditional liberties.

I hope you will join us.

FEDERAL SUPPORT OF EDUCATIONAL TELEVISION NEEDS A CLOSE REEXAMINATION

HON. PAUL FINDLEY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 20, 1970

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, it is obvious that Federal support of educational television needs a close reexamination.

I do not believe that the Federal Government should support an industry that practices political discrimination any more than it should support one that practices racial or religious discrimination.

And yet that is what is happening. By its own admission WETA, a Washington education TV station, has fired a top news director solely because his wife has gone to work for a Republican, Mrs. Martha Mitchell.

The implications of such a firing get

to the very heart of our system of individual freedom and responsibility.

A person must be free to seek out the job or profession of his or her choice, without his spouse being held responsible.

A person holding a job has a right to be judged on performance, not on the political views or associations of his or her spouse.

This would seem basic, especially in an industry such as television that has proven itself so sensitive to the threat of intimidation and so aware of the rights of individuals.

The fact that it is just the opposite in the federally subsidized segment of the television industry indicates something is radically wrong. Mr. Speaker, it is our duty to see just what it is that is wrong. I trust we will not be delinquent in that duty.

OVER 30 MILLION RECEIVE FOOD FROM UNCLE SAM

HON. HAROLD R. COLLIER

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 20, 1970

Mr. COLLIER. Mr. Speaker, one might conclude that there are millions of people "going to bed hungry" if we were to listen to the chantings of some of the more vocal critics of government. If people are actually going hungry today—people who cannot help themselves—or if there are children going hungry, it should not be nor is there any need for it. An appeal to a Congressman or any other responsible public official will bring a prompt solution to the individual problem wherever it exists. For today, with all of the various Government programs, there is no cause for anyone to be without adequate food to eat.

Let us get the record on this subject straight. A study of the budget submitted by President Nixon early this year shows that over $2,000,000,000 will be provided during fiscal 1971 for the various food programs administered by the Department of Agriculture. This figure is a substantial increase over $1,500,000,000 for the current fiscal year and $900,000,000 for fiscal 1969.

Data that I am inserting in the RECORD shows that a minimum of 29,100,000 children and adults will receive food paid for by the Federal Government during the year beginning next July 1. The actual figure is probably higher by several millions, but there is a certain amount of duplication. A schoolchild could receive a free breakfast and a free lunch at school, benefit from food stamps at home, and later get free food at a summer camp for needy children. Even so, the total number of recipients of Federal food aid probably is well in excess of 30 million.

Mr. Speaker, anyone who accuses either the Congress or the President of being indifferent to the needs of the hungry is either uninformed or irresponsible. Before he makes any more wild statements, he ought to examine the data that I herewith offer for the RECORD:

CONSUMER AND MARKETING SERVICE—REMOVAL OF SURPLUS AGRICULTURAL COMMODITIES (SEC. 32)

[In thousands of dollars

	1969 actual	1970 estimate	1971 estimate
Commodity program payments:			
Direct purchases	$275,340	$359,773	$263,608
Special feeding program	44,471	100,000	186,058

Under Section 32 of the Act of August 24, 1935, as amended, an amount equal to 30% of customs receipts collected during each calendar year (except for an amount equal to 30% of such receipts collected on fishery products transferred to the Department of the Interior to encourage the distribution of fishery products), plus unused balances up to $300,000,000 are available for expanding domestic and foreign market outlets for farm commodities. As provided in recent appropriation acts, transfers have been made from this fund, primarily to the school lunch program for the purchase and distribution of agricultural commodities and the special milk program to cover the full or partial cost of milk served to school children.

Commodity program payments include *Direct purchases*, which are donated to schools, summer camps, child-care centers, nonprofit institutions serving needy persons, persons certified by welfare as eligible for relief, and disaster victims.

The *special feeding program* was initiated in 1969 to meet the urgent need for providing additional foods to needy children and adults who are determined to be suffering from general and continued hunger. The funds provided are channeled primarily through the child feeding programs authorized by the School Lunch and Child Nutrition Acts.

Distribution in 1969, including that under Section 6 of the National School Lunch Act, was as follows, by recipients in peak months:

Schoolchildren	24,100,000
Needy persons	3,800,000
Persons in charitable institutions	1,200,000

FOOD AND NUTRITION SERVICE—SPECIAL MILK PROGRAM

	1969 preliminary	1970 estimate	1971 estimate
Cash payments to States	$102,048	$83,314	----------
Operating expenses	590	725	----------
Total program costs, funded	102,638	84,039	----------
Change in selected resources	39	−39	----------
Total obligations	102,677	84,000	----------

Cash payments to States.—This program is designed to increase the consumption of fluid milk by children in nonprofit schools of high school grade and under, child-care centers, summer camps and similar nonprofit institutions. The program will be terminated at the end of fiscal 1970 as programs for feeding balanced meals to needy school children are further expanded. Most of these meals will include milk.

Funds are provided under letters of credit to State agencies to reimburse eligible participants for a part of the cost of the fluid milk consumed. Based upon available funds and prior year participation, initial reserves were established for each State for reimbursement payments through fiscal 1967. Beginning in fiscal 1968, available funds were apportioned among the States on the basis of payments made to schools and child-care institutions for program reimbursement during the preceding fiscal year. In especially needy schools, reimbursement payments may be made for the full cost of this milk for children who are unable to pay. In fiscal 1970 the program is being financed by a direct appropriation of $84,000,000 and an additional $20,000,000 provided under the Section 32 special feeding program.

The child nutrition programs and additional Section 32 funds aid in financing all child food assistance. These programs are directed at providing complete meals and food supplements, including milk, with particular emphasis on assistance for needy children. The further expansion of these programs proposed in 1971 will result in an increase in milk consumption with the additional meals to be served. These factors eliminate the need for a separate special milk program appropriation.

Operating expenses.—Administrative and technical assistance is furnished to State agencies, participating schools, and child-care institutions. Policies, procedures, and standards are developed for administering the program and determining eligibility. The program is administered directly in outlets where no State agency has assumed the responsibility for its administration, or where such agencies are prohibited by law from disbursing funds to such participants.

CHILD NUTRITION PROGRAMS

	1969 preliminary	1970 estimated	1971 estimated
Cash payments to States:			
School lunch program	$162,034	$168,041	$169,721
Special assistance	10,000	44,800	48,347
School breakfast program	3,500	10,000	12,000
Nonfood assistance program	748	10,000	12,500
State administrative expenses	153	750	750
Nonschool food program	3,244	13,572	15,000
Commodity procurement	63,983	64,325	64,325
Operating expenses	2,388	3,850	4,110
Total program costs, funded	246,050	315,338	326,753
Change in selected resources	38	----------	----------
Total obligations	246,088	315,338	326,753

The primary objective of the child nutrition programs is to make the best possible nutrition available to every child, regardless of the economic condition of the child's family or the local district. Special emphasis is directed toward reaching needy children in low income areas in schools, child-care centers, settlement houses, recreation centers, and similar nonprofit institutions devoted to the care and training of children.

These programs are authorized by the National School Lunch Act, as amended, and the Child Nutrition Act of 1966, as amended.

Cash payments to States.—The programs are operated under an agreement entered into by the State educational agency and the Department. Funds are advanced under letters of credit to State agencies for use in reimbursing participating schools and child-care institutions. Sponsors make application to the State agency and if accepted are reimbursed in accordance with the terms of their agreement.

School lunch program.—Assistance in the form of both funds and food is provided to the States, as defined in the National School Lunch Act, for serving lunches to schoolchildren. Each State's portion of the funds available is determined by a statutory formula. The formula takes into account the participation rate in the State, and the relationship between the per capita income of the State and the average United States per caipta income. States must match the Federal cash grant from sources within the State at a 3 to 1 ratio. For States with below-average per capita income, this ratio is decreased.

Special assistance.—To schools drawing attendance from needy families, Section 11 of

the National School Lunch Act provides special assistance for serving free or reduced price lunches. The legislation carries carefully prescribed criteria as to the eligibility of these schools, and a special formula for the apportionment of funds among the States.

School breakfast program.—The Child Nutrition Act of 1966 authorized a school breakfast program for two years on a pilot basis to assist States through grants-in-aid and other means to initiate, maintain, or expand nonprofit breakfast programs in schools. Public Law 90–302 extended the breakfast program through 1971.

Funds are apportioned to States by a statutory formula. While the basic payments are limited to food assistance, in circumstances of severe need, financial assistance may be authorized up to 80% of the operating costs. Applicant schools must provide justification of the need for additional assistance.

The program is operated in schools drawing attendance from areas in which poor economic conditions exist and where a substantial portion of the children enrolled travel long distances. In fiscal 1969, programs operated in schools in forty-nine States, the District of Columbia, Guam, and Puerto Rico.

Nonfood assistance program.—The Child Nutrition Act of 1966 authorized a permanent program to assist the States through grants-in-aid and other means to supply schools in low-income areas with food service equipment, other than land or buildings.

Applicant schools are required to justify their need for assistance on a project basis and submit a detailed description of the equipment to be acquired, including their proposals for its use in meeting the nutritional needs of children. In addition, State and local sources must bear 25% of the cost of equipment or facilities financed under this authority.

In fiscal 1969 schools in all States, the District of Columbia, Guam, Puerto Rico, and American Samoa, serving meals to some 934,000 children, received equipment assistance. In addition some schools received equipment assistance from the special Section 32 funds.

In order to provide nutritious meals, many schools in the country must be provided funds for kitchen equipment.

State administrative expenses.—The Child Nutrition Act of 1966 provides for advances to each State educational agency for administrative expenses. These funds are to be used for supervising and giving technical assistance to the local school districts for additional activities undertaken by them to reach more needy children under the school lunch, special assistance, school breakfast, nonfood assistance, and nonschool food programs.

Nonschool food program.—The National School Lunch Act was amended in 1968 to authorize a pilot program for three years to assist States through grants-in-aid and other means, to initiate, maintain, or expand nonprofit food service programs for children in service instiutions. These programs will reach school-age children during the summer month in settlement houses, neighborhood houses, and recreation centers. Preschool children will receive year-round assistance in child day-care centers.

Each State may receive a basic grant of not more than $50,000. The remaining funds will be apportioned by a formula to be determined by the ratio of the number of children (aged three to seventeen inclusive) from families with income under $3,000 per year in each State, to the total number of such children in all States. Up to 80% of the total cost of meals served may be paid in cases of severe need, and not more than 75% of the equipment costs may be paid to the institutions. All meals served must meet minimum nutritional standards as a condition for receiving assistance.

Commodity procurement.—Commodity procurement under Section 6 of the National School Lunch Act provides additional commodities to schools to supplement foods purchased locally for the lunch program. Section 6 procurement helps to insure nutritionally adequate lunches and appreciation for quality foods. Commodities are purchased by the Department on the basis of their nutritional value and acceptability to schools.

Protein items of chicken and meat accounted for about two-thirds of the purchases in fiscal 1969. The remaining one-third consisted of fruits and vegetables. In fiscal 1970 frozen ground beef, chicken, and fruits and vegetables are being purchased with funds transferred from Section 32, Removal of Surplus Agricultural Commodities.

Commodities acquired under price support and surplus removal programs are available to schools and child-care institutions. The volume of surplus commodities distributed depends upon market conditions.

Operating expenses.—Administrative and technical assistance is furnished to State agencies, participating schools, and child-care institutions. Policies, procedures, and standards are developed for administering the programs and determining eligibility. The programs are administered directly in private schools where the State educational agency is prohibited by law from disbursing funds and in child-care institutions where no State agency has assumed the responsibility for administering the program.

Participation in the programs from 1969 through 1971 follows:

	1969 preliminary	1970 estimated	1971 estimated
Number of children, average:			
School lunch program	17,800,000	18,700,000	18,900,000
Special assistance [1]	1,300,000	2,900,000	5,500,000
School breakfast program [1]	205,000	407,000	555,000
Nonschool food program, number of children:			
Year round	78,142	100,000	100,000
Summer program	234,428	294,400	294,400

[1] Includes special sec. 32 funding.

FOOD STAMP PROGRAM

	1969 preliminary	1970 estimate	1971 estimate
Program costs	$238,669	$596,150	$1,232,000
Operating expenses	10,051	13,828	18,000
Total program costs, funded	248,720	609,978	1,250,000
Change in selected resources	2,261		
Total obligations	250,981	609,978	1,250,000

This program helps provide improved nutrition to households with limited resources. Food coupons which may be used in retail stores for the purchase of commercial brand foods are issued to needy households that qualify to participate. The program is inaugurated at the request of State welfare agencies and these agencies are responsible for certification and coupon issuance functions.

The Department determines the allotment of coupons for each household unit, including the portion to be purchased, based on income, food needs, and other factors.

Coupons are issued by a non-Federal issuing office. Cash paid for the coupons by participants is deposited periodically in a designated Federal depository. Food stores receive cash or credit for the coupons from any commercial bank, which must accept them at face value. The coupons then flow through regular banking channels to the Federal Reserve banks where they are redeemed.

Legislation has been proposed to make substantial changes in the basic food stamp authority. The 1971 budget is based on the passage of the recommended legislation.

The appropriation for 1970 will finance needed program modifications and expansion into some new areas. The increased funds will be used to provide a greater total coupon allotment at a reduced cash outlay to the participant. The cash requirement will be reduced substantially and the total coupon allotment will be sufficient to provide a nutritionally adequate diet.

The number of participants at yearend 1969 was 3,224,233 (actual); for 1970 and 1971 it will be 5,424,000 and 7,472,000, respectively (both estimated).

Grand totals:

1969	preliminary	$919,557
1970	estimated	1,469,089
1971	estimated	2,026,419

THE ECONOMICS OF POLLUTION EXAMINED BY EDWIN L. DALE, JR. IN NEW YORK TIMES MAGAZINE

HON. HENRY S. REUSS

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 20, 1970

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Speaker, the New York Times Magazine of Sunday, April 19, 1970, included the following excellent article titled "The Economics of Pollution" by Edwin L. Dale, Jr.:

THE ECONOMICS OF POLLUTION

(By Edwin L. Dale, Jr.)

Now that environment has become a national concern, it might be well to clean up some of the economic rubbish associated with the subject. There are, alas, a few "iron laws" that cannot be escaped in the effort to reduce the pollution of our air and water, in disposing of solid waste and the like. The laws do not necessarily prevent a clean environment, but there is no hope of obtaining one unless they are understood.

We have all become vaguely aware that there will be a cost—perhaps higher monthly electric bills, perhaps higher taxes, perhaps a few cents or a few dollars more on anything made from steel—if there is a successful and massive effort to have a better environment. But that is only a beginning. There are other problems.

This article will describe the three iron laws that matter. There is no point in hiding that all three are very depressing. The only purpose in adding more depressing information to a world already surfeited with it is a small one: to avoid useless effort based on false premises. A classic example has already arisen in wistful Congressional inquiries into whether we might think of a future with somewhat less electric power, or at least less growth in electric power.

In shorthand, the three laws are:

(1) The law of economic growth.

(2) The law of compound interest.

(3) The law of the mix between public and private spending.

THE LAW OF ECONOMIC GROWTH

Whether we like it or not, and assuming no unusual increase in mass murders or epidemics, the American labor force for the next 20 years is already born and intends to work. It is hard for any of us—myself included—to imagine a deliberate policy to keep a large portion of it unemployed. But that simple fact has enormous consequences.

For more than a century, the average output of each worker for each hour worked

has risen between 2 and 3 per cent a year, thanks mainly to new machines, but also to better managerial methods and a more skilled labor force. This increase in what is called *productivity* is by far the most important cause of our gradually rising standard of living—which, pollution aside, nearly all of us have wanted. In simplest terms, each worker can be paid more because he produces more and he consumes more because he earns more. Inflation only increases the numbers and does not change the facts. Machines increase the productivity of an auto worker more than a barber, but both rightly share, through the general rise in real income, in the expansion of productivity in the economy as a whole.

It is difficult to conceive of our society or any other wanting to halt the rise in productivity, or efficiency, which has made real incomes higher for all of us. But even if "we" wanted to, in our kind of society and economy "we" couldn't. The profit motive will almost always propel individual, daily decisions in the direction of higher productivity. A business will always buy a new machine if it will cut costs and increase efficiency—and thank goodness! That is what has made our standard of living—and we do enjoy it—rise.

It is not a matter of enjoying it, however. By any fair test, we are not really affluent; half of our households earn less than $8,500 a year. Apart from redistributing income, which has very real limits, the only way the society can continue to improve the well-being of those who are not affluent—really the majority—is through a continued increase in productivity. Anyone who wants us to go back to the ax, the wooden plow, the horse carriage and the water wheel is not only living a wholly impossible dream, he is asking for a return to a society in which nearly everybody was poor. We are not talking here about philosophical ideas of happiness, but of what people have proved they want in the way of material things. This society is not about to give up productivity growth. But every increase in productivity adds to output. Now consider the next step:

We can count on the output of the average worker to continue to rise in the years ahead, as it has in the past. Nearly all current forecasts put this rise in productivity much closer to 3 per cent than to 2, and 3 per cent has been about our average in the years since World War II. So without any change in the labor force at all, our national output will go on rising by some 3 per cent a year.

What does output mean?

It means electric power produced—and smoke produced.

It means cans and bottles produced.

It means steel produced—and, unless something is done about it, water and air polluted.

It means paper produced—with the same result as for steel.

And so on and on.

But that is not the end, for there will not be a static labor force. As noted, the force for the next 20 years is already born and it is going to grow year by year (with a caveat, to be described below).

Obviously, we want to offer these people employment opportunity. So, in addition to a 3 per cent productivity growth, there will be an added growth of at least 1 per cent a year in the number of workers. The result is that we are almost "condemned" to a rise in our total output of 4 per cent a year. The only escape, it seems, would be a national decision either to have high unemployment or to try to be less efficient. Both are absurd on their face.

The law of economic growth says, then, that we already know that the national output in 1980 will be, and almost must be, some 50 per cent higher than it is now. President Nixon has said so publicly, and he is right. That is the result of an annual rate of real growth of about 4 per cent, compounded. It is terrifying. If an economy of $900-billion in 1969 produces the pollution and clutter we are all familiar with, what will an economy half again as large produce?

Is there no escape from this law? The answer, essentially, is no. But there is one possible way to mitigate the awesome results. We might reduce the labor input (but, we hope, not the productivity input), without creating mass unemployment.

Each working person has a workday, workweek, workyear and worklife. Any one of them could be reduced by law or otherwise. We could reduce the legal workweek from the present 40 hours. We could add more holidays or lengthen vacations to reduce the workyear. We are already shortening the worklife, without planning it that way: increased participation in higher education has meant later entry into the labor force for many, and retirement plans, including Social Security, have brought about earlier retirement than in the past for others.

If, by chance or by law, the annual man-hours of employment are reduced in the years ahead, our output will grow a little less rapidly. This is the only way to cut our economic growth, short of deliberate unemployment or deliberate inefficiency.

There is a cost. It is most easily seen in a union-bargained settlement providing for longer vacations without any cut in annual wages, or a legal reduction in the workweek from 40 to 35 hours, with compulsory overtime payments after that. In each case, more workers must be hired to produce the same output, and if the employer—because of market demand—goes on producing at the same level, wage costs for each unit of output are higher than they otherwise would have been. Prices will therefore be higher. This is widely recognized. Maybe we would be willing to pay them.

But we cannot guarantee less output. Only if employers produce less—because of the extra cost—would that happen. And in that larger sense, the cost of a reduction of our annual labor input is simply less production per capita because the labor force is idle more of the time.

But less production was the objective of the exercise—the antipollution exercise. If we start with the proposition that the growth of production is the underlying cause of pollution, which has merit as a starting point, the only way we can get less growth in production, if we want it, is to have more of our labor force idle more of the time. In that case, we will have more leisure without mass unemployment, as we usually think of the term. Our national output, and our standard of living, will rise less rapidly.

That last idea we may learn to take, if we can cope with the leisure. But under any foreseeable circumstances, our output will still go on rising. With the most optimistic assumptions about a gradual reduction of the workday, workweek, workyear and worklife, we shall undoubtedly have a much higher output in 1980 than we have in 1970. To a man concerned about the environment, it might seem a blessing if our economic growth in the next 10 years could be 2 per cent a year instead of 4 per cent; he cannot hope for zero growth.

The law of economic growth, then, tells us a simple truth: "we" cannot choose to reduce production simply because we have found it to be the cause of a fouled environment. And if we want to reduce the rate of growth of production, the place to look is in our man-hours of work.

THE LAW OF COMPOUND INTEREST

It is a fair question to ask: Why weren't we bothered about pollution 12 or 15 years ago? In October, 1957, to pick a date, the Soviet Union sent the first earth satellite into orbit. The American economy had just begun a recession that was to send unemployment to 7 per cent of the labor force. The late George Magoffin Humphrey, who had just resigned as Secretary of the Treasury, was warning of what he saw as vast Government spending, at that time $77-billion, and saying it would bring "a depression that would curl your hair." There were plenty of things to think about.

But nobody was worried about pollution. Conservation groups were properly bothered about parts of the wilderness (the Hell's Canyon Dam in Idaho, for example), but that was an entirely different thing. That was an issue of esthetics, not health. Nobody seemed to mention air pollution or waste that might overwhelm the space in which to put it. In a peculiarly sad irony, the late Adlai E. Stevenson had fought and lost an election against Dwight D. Eisenhower in 1956 partially on a "pollution" issue—radiation in the atmosphere from the explosion of atomic weapons.

The question, to repeat: Why didn't we worry about pollution then? The answer is that, relatively speaking, there *was* no pollution. Yes, there were electric power plants then, too. Yes, there were paper mills polluting streams. Yes, there were tin cans and paper and bottles. Some snowflakes, though we didn't know it, were already a bit black, and Pittsburgh got national attention because it tried to do some cleaning up.

But here we come to the law of compound interest. In 1957—*only 13 years ago*—our gross national product was $453-billion. In 1969, in constant dollars, it was $728 billion. That is an increase of nearly $300-billion in tin cans, electric power, automobiles, paper, chemicals and all the rest. It is an increase of 60 per cent.

So what? That was not the result of an unnaturally rapid growth rate, though a bit more rapid than in some periods of our past. The *so what* is this: in the preceding 13 years the growth had been *only $100-billion*. We were the same nation, with the same energy, in those preceding 13 years. We invested and we had a rise both in productivity and in our labor force. But in the first 13 years of this example our output rose $100-billion, and in the second 13 it rose $300-billion.

In the next 13 it will rise more than $500-billion.

That is the law of compound interest. These are not numbers; they are tin cans and smoke and auto exhaust. There is no visible escape from it. Applying the same percentage growth to a larger base every year, we have reached the point where our growth in one year is half the total output of Canada, fully adjusting for inflation. Another dizzying and rather horrifying way of putting it is that the real output of goods and services in the United States has grown as much since 1950 as it grew in the entire period from the landing of the Pilgrims in 1620 up to 1950.

Most investors know the law of compound interest. There is a magic rule, for example, known as the Rule of 72. It says, with mathematical certainty, that money invested at a 7.2 per cent rate of interest, compounded each year, doubles in 10 years. Our G.N.P., happily, does not compound at 7.2 per cent. But it compounds at between 4 and 5 per cent, and it has been compounding. The result is that the same, routine, full-employment, desirable, nationally wanted, almost unavoidable percentage increase in our national output in 1970 means precisely twice as many extra tin cans, twice as much additional electric power, and so on, as the same rate of growth in 1950. And that is only 20 years ago! We are not doing anything different, or anything awful. We are the same people. Granting approximately the same amount of human carelessness and selfishness, we are the victims solely of the law of compound interest.

THE LAW OF THE MIX BETWEEN PUBLIC AND PRIVATE SPENDING

Robert S. McNamara, the eternally energetic and constructive former Secretary of Defense and now president of the World Bank, gave a speech in February about the plight of the poor countries. In the speech he understandably criticized the United States for reducing its foreign aid effort. But in supporting his point he adopted, almost inadvertently, a piece of partly fallacious conventional wisdom:

"Which is ultimately more in the nation's interest: to funnel national resources into an endlessly spiraling consumer economy—in effect, a pursuit of consumer gadgetry with all its senseless by-products of waste and pollution—or to dedicate a more reasonable share of those same resources to improving the fundamental quality of life both at home and abroad?"

Fair enough. It means tax increases, of course, though Mr. McNamara did not say so. That is what the "mix" between public and private spending is all about. But for our purposes the point is different. Let us look more closely at the phrase: ". . . a pursuit of consumer gadgetry with all its senseless by-products of waste and pollution. . ."

As it stands, it is true. Private consumption does create side effects like waste and pollution. But now, assume a Brave New World in which we are all happy to pay higher taxes and reduce our private consumption so that the Government may have more money with which to solve our problems—ranging from poor education to poverty, from crime to inadequate health services. We shall not examine here the issue of whether more Government money solves problems. It is obviously more effective in some areas than in others. But anyway, in our assumption, we are all willing to give the Government more money to solve problems, including pollution.

Now let us see what happens.

The Government spends the money to reduce pollution. Sewage plants are built. They need steel. They need electric power. They need paperwork. They need workers. The workers get paid, and they consume.

The Government spends the money on education. New schools are built, which need steel, lumber and electric power. Teachers are hired. They get paid, and they consume. They throw away tin cans.

The Government spends the money on a better welfare system that treats all poor people alike, whether they work or not. Incomes among the poor rise by some amount between $4-billion and $20-billion, and these people consume. Electric power production rises and appliance and steel production rises, and so on and on.

The point is obvious now. A shifting in our national income or production between "public goods" and "private goods" hardly changes the environment problem at all because it does not reduce total spending, or output, in the economy.

Lest a careful economist raise a valid objection, a slightly technical point must be conceded here. Government spending is done in three categories:

Purchase of goods (tanks, typewriters, sanitation trucks and school buildings).

Transfer payments to people outside government (Social Security, veterans' benefits, welfare).

Purchase of services, meaning the services of the people it employs (teachers, policemen, park rangers, tax collectors).

To the extent that a shift to more public spending, through higher taxes and a resulting reduction of private consumption, involves the first two of these categories, the point stands as made: there will be just as much production of steel, tin cans, electric power and toasters as before. To the extent that the higher public spending goes to the third category, employment of more teachers, policemen and the like, there will be slightly less production of goods, even though these people spend their paychecks like everyone else. Essentially what happens in this case is that the society has chosen, through higher taxes, to have more services and fewer goods. If we assume that goods production brings pollution, a society with fewer auto- or steelworkers and more cops will crank out less pollution.

But this remains a relatively minor matter. Hardly anyone who proposes a solution to our problems thinks in terms of vast armies of Government workers. Reforming welfare through the President's new family-assistance plan is the perfect example; this will be a simple expansion of transfer payments. And, for that matter, building more sewage plants will be a purchase of goods. The overriding fact is that we can spend 30 percent of our G.N.P. for public purposes, as we do now, or 50 percent, and the G.N.P. will still be there. The law of compound interest will apply, forcing the G.N.P. upward. To the extent that the environment problem is caused by ever-expanding output, the third law says that it will not be essentially changed by altering the mix between private and public spending.

CONCLUSION

Three nice, depressing laws. They give us a starting point for any rational discussion of the environment problem. Our output is going to go on growing and growing under any conceivable set of choices we make.

But the starting point does not mean despair. It simply means that trying to solve the problem by reducing output, or the growth of output, is waste of time and energy. It won't and can't work.

How is the problem solved then? The purpose here is not, and has not been, to solve any problems. It has been to try to head off useless solutions. But a few things can be said:

There is, first, technology itself. The very energy and inventiveness that gave us this rising output—and got us to the moon—can do things about pollution. A fascinating case is the sulphur dioxide put into the air by coal-burning electric power plants. A very strong argument can be made that under any foreseeable circumstances we will have to burn more and more coal to produce the needed growth of electric power. And the ground does not yield much low-sulphur coal. Thus, somebody is going to have to have the incentive to develop a way to get the sulphur out before it leaves the smokestack; and if this costs the utilities money, the regulatory commissions are going to have to allow that cost to be passed along in electric bills.

Next, there is the related idea—being increasingly explored by economists, regulators and some legislators—of making antipollution part of the price-profit-incentive system. In simplest terms, this would involve charging a fee for every unit of pollutant discharged, with meters used to determine the amount. There would be an economic incentive to stop or reduce pollution, possibly backed up with the threat to close down the plant if the meter readings go above a specified level. The company—say a paper company—would be faced with both a carrot and a stick.

There is also the simple use of the police power, as with poisonous drugs or, lately, D.D.T. It is the "thou shalt not" power: automobiles can emit no more than such-and-such an amount of this or that chemical through the exhaust pipe. Once again, if the engineers cannot find a way out, the car simply cannot legally be sold. There will be, and should be, all sorts of debate "at the margin"—whether the higher cost of the different or improved engine is worth the extra reduction of pollution. The argument exists now over D.D.T.; there are clearly costs, as well as benefits, in stopping its use. But the "thou shalt not" power exists.

Finally, there are many possibilities for using a part of our public spending for environmental purposes. Sewage plants are the obvious case. President Nixon has proposed a big expansion of the current level of spending for these plants, though not as much as many interested in clean water—including Senator Edmund Muskie—would like to see.

In this case, and only in this case, a greater effort at curing pollution must be at the expense of some other Government programs unless we pay higher taxes. It is proper to point out here the subtle dimensions of the issue. There are all sorts of possible gimmicks, like tax rebates for antipollution devices for industry and federally guaranteed state and local bonds. One way or another, spending more for pollution abatement will mean spending that much less for something else, and the something else could mean housing or medical services. Every local sewage plant bond sold means that much less investment money available for mortgages, for example.

A final reflection is perhaps in order, though it is almost banal. Our rising G.N.P. gives us the "resources" to do the antipollution job. These resources include rising Government receipts. Our technology, which has given us the rising G.N.P., might find the way out of one pollution problem after another—and they are all different.

But, in the end, we cannot be sure that the job will be done. Growth of total output and output per capita will continue. The long-term relief is perfectly obvious: *fewer "capita."* That sort of "solution" might help, in our country, by about 1990. If we survive until then, the law of compound interest will be much less horrifying if the population is 220 million instead of 250 million.

MR. BERNARD J. STUPLINSKI "POLISH MAN OF YEAR"

HON. LOUIS STOKES

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 20, 1970

Mr. STOKES. Mr. Speaker, on April 25, 1970, Polish Americans, Inc. of Cleveland, Ohio will honor Mr. Bernard J. Stuplinski as the "Polish Man of the Year." This is a well deserved honor being paid to one whose professional attainment and community involvement has earned him the respect and recognition of his community. I consider Bernie, as he is fondly known in the legal profession, as a personal friend for whom I have deep respect and admiration.

A native of Cleveland, Bernard Stuplinski has spent a lifetime in service to his community. He has distinguished himself in public service in such positions as assistant county prosecutor, chief assistant U.S. attorney, acting U.S. attorney, U.S. attorney, and special counsel for the Justice Department. In addition to his professional commitment to the betterment of his community, Mr. Stuplinski has given freely of his own time and efforts to such community minded organizations as the Citizens League, Knights of Columbus, Cleveland Heights Lions Club, Lions Eye Clinic, Inc. Committee of which he is chairman, and the Association of the U.S. Army.

Additionally, Mr. Stuplinski is a member of the faculty at the Cleveland-Marshall Law School and lecturer for the

Cleveland, Cuyahoga County, and Ohio Bar Associations; the Law-Medicine Center at Western Reserve University; and the Western Reserve University School of Law.

Despite this already active schedule, Bernard Stuplinski has found time for active membership in many ethnic and professional organizations including the Cleveland Society of Poles, Polish Legion of American Veterans, Alliance of Poles, Union of Poles in America, Polish-Americans, Inc., the American Judicature Society, and the American Trial Lawyers Association.

While these are but a few of the activities in which he participates, this list is representative of his dedication to all segments of the community, and all of Cleveland joins in paying tribute to Bernard J. Stuplinski as Polish Man of the Year.

OIL IMPORTS AND NORTHEAST HEATING OIL

HON. SILVIO O. CONTE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 20, 1970

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Speaker, earlier this month, the Subcommittee on Small Business of the Senate Banking and Currency Committee, chaired by Senator THOMAS J. MCINTYRE, held 2 days of hearings on the home heating oil problems of the Northeastern States. It was my privilege to appear before that committee to urge a prompt solution to those problems.

They may be described in three words: Price, competition, and supply.

The Northeast—and New England in particular—pays the highest home heating oil prices in the Nation. We bear the heaviest cost burden of the oil import program—a glaring inequity and national scandal—since the oil import program is based on national security, and, as such, its burden should be borne equally by all citizens.

Competition in the home heating oil markets is dying. As a member of the House Committee on Small Business, I have been particularly concerned by the attrition in the ranks of independent fuel oil distributors and independent deepwater terminal operators since the inception of the oil import program in 1959. As the Cabinet Task Force on Oil Import Control found, the cause of the decline in competition is the import program itself. This program gives unfair competitive advantages to the large, integrated oil companies and penalizes the independent businessman.

Our third problem is supply, and on this point Senator MCINTYRE'S hearings developed some new, disturbing data. Mr. William F. Kenny, Jr., of New York, appearing on behalf of the Independent Fuel Terminal Operators Association, presented new projections of U.S. refinery output of No. 2 fuel oil. Those projections show that over the coming years, there will be an absolute decline—I repeat, an absolute decline—in the number of barrels of No. 2 fuel oil produced by U.S. refineries. This will come, I might add, while demand for the product is continuing to go up.

A severe supply gap is opening. In fact, the impact of these refinery trends has already been felt in parts of the Northeast over the past few winters.

The result of this supply gap can be a continuing escalation of heating oil prices until No. 2 fuel oil is as expensive as gasoline, or until we have a forced, and expensive, conversion by homeowners to gas or electric heat. But we all know that gas and electricity are also projected to be in very short supply. So where do we turn?

The solution, Mr. Speaker, is to do something about our archaic, scandalous system of oil import controls, and allow more imports of No. 2 fuel oil to fill the supply gap. That is why I have proposed total decontrol of imports of this critical product into the east coast, or, at a minimum, a sizable increase in imports, allocated to the northeastern independent deepwater terminal operators.

Only through measures such as these can the U.S. Government avoid the serious consequences—in terms of consumer costs and shortages—of the looming supply gap.

I might add, Mr. Speaker, that I will urge the new informal House Committee on Oil Import Reform, which my colleague, HENRY REUSS, and I have recently announced, to maintain continuing surveillance of this problem, to assure that prompt action is taken.

Mr. Speaker, in order that Members of the House may appreciate the magnitude of this problem, I insert Mr. Kenny's statement of April 7 at this point in the RECORD, and I call particular attention to the analysis under the heading "Supply-Demand Projections."

The statement referred to follows:

STATEMENT OF WILLIAM F. KENNY, JR.

Mr. Chairman: Thank you very much for the opportunity of appearing before you.

My name is William F. Kenny, Jr. and I am President of the Meenan Oil Company of New York. With me today are Arthur T. Soule of the Patchogue Oil Terminal Corporation of New York and Mr. Andrews Nixon of the Webber Tanks Company of Maine. All of us are independent deepwater terminal operators and we are appearing today on behalf of the Independent Fuel Terminal Operators Association; Mr. Soule is President of the Association.

Our Association is composed of 17 independent deepwater terminal operators along the East Coast from Maine to Florida. A membership list is included as Attachment A of my statement. All members own or control deepwater terminal facilities capable of receiving ocean-going tanker shipments, and none is affiliated with a major oil company.

In my statement today, I should like to cover four areas related to No. 2 fuel oil:

First, the nature of our business;

Second, the competitive squeeze we are experiencing;

Third, the projected supply and demand of No. 2 fuel oil; and

Fourth, a proposed solution to the East Coast fuel oil problem.

1. NATURE OF BUSINESS

Our member companies have terminals located in ports along the East Coast. Ocean-going tankers dock at our facilities and unload finished petroleum products, largely home heating oil, into the storage tanks that are located adjacent to the docks. Oil is then customarily pumped or barged from these tankers to smaller terminals at in-land locations for further distribution, or is sold and pumped through a system of racks at our terminal sites into tank trucks which carry the product directly to the consumer.

A deepwater terminal is a major facility and involves a substantial investment. The total investment made by our members alone for their facilities is estimated at more than $70 million.

We are wholesalers who buy products from refiners and sell to retail jobbers, dealers and consumers. In this Committee's consideration of solutions to the No. 2 fuel oil problem, it is important to realize that the deepwater terminal operator is the only marketer, aside from the major oil companies, who has facilities to receive imports and can physically bring No. 2 fuel oil from overseas.

We estimate that the total demand for No. 2 fuel oil in District I, the East Coast from Maine to Florida, is 1 million barrels per day. More than half is consumed in New England and New York State.

Independent deepwater terminal operators handle 250,000 barrels a day or 25% of the wholesale market. The remaining 75% is largely handled by major oil companies. As is apparent, the major oil companies enjoy a dominant position in the market.

2. COMPETITIVE SQUEEZE

The independent deepwater terminal business has known better days. Our period of greatest strength was the decade of the 1950's. During that time the large integrated oil compaines produced substantial amounts of No. 2 fuel oil from their refineries and they needed outlets for this product. So they encouraged independent terminal operators and marketers to build and expand and provied us substantial supplies of product at competitive prices.

As independent businessmen, we find ourselves operating in a land of giants, for the petroleum market is truly dominated by the largest and most powerful companies in the world. We welcome competition from these giants on an equal basis. Unfortunately, we have been placed at a severe competitive disadvantage by the oil import controls instituted in 1959, which cut us off from foreign supplies; and, of course, the majors control the domestic supply of No. 2 fuel oil. Thus, our competitive situation vis-a-vis the majors has steadily worsened, particularly over the last three years and the struggle to remain in business has become more difficult. In 1969 even some of the strongest independent deepwater terminal operators began to show significant losses in their domestic No. 2 fuel operations. Attrition in our ranks due to absorption by major oil companies has been substantial, and was documented in our submissions to the Cabinet Task Force on Oil Import Control.

Rather than take up the Committee's time with a detailed analysis of our competitive problems, I ask your permission to include in the record copies of our July 15 and August 15 submissions to the Task Force which describe these conditions in some detail.

The work of the Task Force has given us great encouragement. Both the majority and minority reports recognize our competitive problems and the need for increased imports.

The majority report[1] concluded that "National security does not require regulating import volume so precisely as to deprive buyers—including independent refiners and marketers—of significant access to alternate supplies." (p. 69). The Report describes our problem as "a competitive squeeze upon independent marketers vis-a-vis their supplier-competitors, the forward integrated refiners." (p. 77).

The Task Force rejected a prohibition on product imports altogether stating that this

[1] Attachment B contains Comments on Appendix L of the Task Force.

would "deprive independent marketers—of No. 2 home heating oil, gasoline and other products—of sources that might otherwise serve as a competitive restraint on refineries integrated forward into distribution". (p. 82).

The minority report took note of our specific problem and recommended "allocations of No. 2 heating oil imports for terminal operators in District I on a basis equal to that allowed to oil refiners." (p. 364).

In brief, there has been widespread recognition, due in large measure to the efforts of this Committee, of the general problem of East Coast No. 2 fuel oil imports and the more specific problems of the competitive squeeze upon the independent deepwater terminal operators.

That competitive squeeze can be described in a few brief sentences.

1. Although we have the physical facilities to import oil, we are forbidden under the present control system from importing No. 2 fuel oil.

2. We are forced to oepend, for our supplies of this product, on domestic refiners, largely major oil companies.

3. These same oil companies who supply us with products also compete directly with us at the wholesale and retail level, thus creating for us the classic problem of competing directly in the sale of a product with the same people who supply us with that product.

4. The major oil company refiners have been cutting back steadily over the past few years in supplies made available to independent terminal operators on long-term (1 year or more) contracts or at competitive (i.e. posted) prices. Each year supplies available to us have been cut-back over the previous year. And indications are that the Winter of 1970–71 will be even worse, for even the few companies who in the past two years could be relied upon for substantial supplies are indicating that they will have less product. Their reason is clear: they are producing less No. 2 fuel oil from their domestic refineries, because of the obvious economic advantage in producing more profitable products, such as gasoline and jet fuel. And a dangerous supply gap in home heating oil is developing.

Thus, we will be forced to reduce our business volumes year after year, to the point where we will go out of business, because it will be economically unprofitable.

I might add that we do not blame the major oil companies nor do we contend they are engaging in anti-competitive behavior. They have simply taken advantage of a situation presented to them by a United States Government control program, which grants them, through an accident of time, a substantial competitive advantage. For the program gives them access to overseas supplies of No. 2 fuel oil and of crude oil while it denies access to us.

The Federal Government is to blame for the current situation, and the Government must provide relief if competition is to be restored in the East Coast No. 2 fuel oil market.

3. SUPPLY-DEMAND PROJECTIONS

Perhaps most disturbing from our point of view as marketers of No. 2 fuel oil, and from the point of view of consumers of No. 2 fuel oil, have been projections and statistics on No. 2 fuel oil supply and demand. As these have come to light only recently, I believe they will be of particular use to this Committee.

The November 10, 1969 issue of the authoritative *Oil and Gas Journal* projects a radical drop in the yields of middle distillates. Middle distillates include No. 2 fuel oil and diesel fuel. According to the *Journal*, this drop will primarily be brought about by the installation of hydro-cracking equipment. Hydro-cracking equipment enables a refiner to increase his yields of gasoline and jet fuel from each barrel of crude oil.

The projections are as follows:

CRUDE YIELDS OF U.S. REFINERIES

[In percentages]

	1968	1980
Gasoline	45	52
Jet	8	13
Middle distillates (No. 2 fuel oil and diesel oil)	22	15
Residual	7	3
Other	18	17

The critical figure is, of course, the drop of distillate yield from 22 to 15%. If these yield percentages are translated into volume figures based on the Journal's forecast of 17 million barrels per day of crude oil runs in 1980, the total domestic middle distillate output in 1980 is shown to be 2,550,000 barrels per day, compared to 2,297,000 barrels per day in 1968, an increase of only 11% in production over the 12 year period.

The critical question is how this production level compares with the projected demand for middle distillates to 1980. As I have indicated, the two components of the middle distillate market are No. 2 fuel oil and diesel oil, accounting currently for two-thirds and one-third respectively of the total sales. Diesel oil sales have been growing at an average annual rate of 5.7% since 1960. Authoritative projections show that it will grow annual rate of 4.5%—5% over the next 10 years.

Assuming that diesel demand will continue to be met from domestic sources, domestic No. 2 fuel oil supplies will consist of the difference between total middle distillate supplies and shipments to diesel oil markets. The following table indicates production at both a 4.5% and a 5.0% diesel oil growth rate.

ESTIMATED DOMESTIC MIDDLE DISTILLATE PRODUCTION

[Thousands of barrels per day]

	1968	1980 Amount	1980 Percent change
Diesels (4.5 percent annual growth)	756	1,282	69.6
No. 2 fuel oil	1,541	1,268	−17.7
Total	2,297	2,550	−11.0
Diesels (5 percent annual growth)	756	1,358	79.6
No. 2 fuel oil	1,514	1,192	−22.6
Total	2,297	2,550	+11.0

As can readily been seen, if projected deisel oil supplies are to be met, No. 2 fuel oil supplies must decline by 18%—23% from their 1968 level! This means a decline in production of No. 2 fuel oil between 300,000 and 350,000 barrels per day!

Whether one is optimistic or pessimistic about the outlook for No. 2 fuel oil, we believe it is totally unrealistic to assume a decline in demand of about one-fifth over the next decade when No. 2 fuel oil demand has grown at an average annual rate of more than 1.5% since 1960.

According to our own forecasts—and those, we understand of the major oil companies—heating oil demand will grow at the rate of 1.5% to 2% per year for the next 10 years, given moderate increases in promotional sales and technical efforts. If these efforts are stepped up, we project a greater increase in demand. Even a relatively pessimistic forecast contained in *Energy Outlook for 1980* by the Chase Manhattan Bank, predicts no perceptible decline from the present level of sales.

Moreover, neither the Chase forecast nor our own forecast have tried to quantify the impact of one new factor which could cause a much sharper increase in demand for No. 2 fuel oil. I refer to the growing public demand for more stringent air pollution controls. No. 2 fuel oil has an extremely low sulphur content, and may be increasingly used as a partial substitute for higher-sulphur heavy residual fuel. In fact, within the last month Con Edison of New York put out a bid for 1.5 million barrels of No. 2 fuel. In this particular instance, there was simply not enough supply available to meet Con Edison's request, but should such requests become general, the overall demand projected for No. 2 fuel will surely be sharply higher than outlined in the above tables.

Turning back now to the basic supply-demand projections outlined in the *Oil & Gas Journal* study, we can see that perhaps the most significant factor, certainly that of more immediate concern, is the fact that this forecast has become a reality in the No. 2 fuel oil markets of the Northeast. Domestic refineries are already demonstrating increasing difficulty in keeping up with distillate demand. For example, in the first 11 months of 1968 compared to the same period in 1969, distillate oil demand rose by 2.8%, while the domestic refinery yield of distillates dropped by ½ of 1% (23.8% to 23.3% of total refinery runs). This amounted to a drop in total output of 3,675,000 barrels from 1968 to 1969. Even more significant is that a similar drop in yield has occurred in each of the last 5 years.

One example of the continuing increase in demand for No. 2 fuel oil in the Northeast is the fact that in New England, an area of high demand, the number of newly constructed one-family homes burning oil went from 28% in 1967 to 33% in 1968.

As this Committee knows, the U.S. oil refining industry is on record as opposing the need for imports of No. 2 fuel oil on the grounds that the product is produced in sufficient quantities from domestic sources. The projections and the facts of the market today, do not support that contention.

As marketers of No. 2 fuel oil, and as businessmen whose survival depends on a steady substantial supply of that product, we are deeply concerned. This is not a matter of a problem 10 years from now; it is a matter that is affecting us today and we believe it's a matter with which this Committee should also be concerned. For, if the change in refining yields projected by the *Oil & Gas Journal* are approximately current, a major supply gap in home heating oil supplies will develop during the 1970's.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to make it clear that while this data has and is resulting in a squeeze today on deepwater terminal operators, the real squeeze—the squeeze that this Committee should be most concerned with—is the squeeze that is going to occur for consumers in the Northeast. As you know, the majority of homes in the Northeast use No. 2 fuel oil. If supplies of this fuel are not available, the home-owner will have to convert his heating system to other energy sources. That means, since natural gas is already in short supply, that conversion will have to be made to electric heat. The initial installation in each case will represent a major capital expenditure by consumers and the day-to-day operating cost of heating homes will be substantially higher than costs today for heating with No. 2 fuel oil.

Given these facts, we are faced with two choices:

A. Continuing upward movement of No. 2 fuel oil prices as supply fails to keep up with demand, with continued attrition in the ranks of independent marketers; or

B. Increased imports of No. 2 fuel oil from lower cost sources, with provision that ample supplies be made available to independent marketers.

4. PROPOSAL

The Independent Fuel Terminal Operators Association favors the second alternative—a system which would provide regular substantial access, on a continuing basis, to independent deepwater terminal operators of supplies of No. 2 fuel oil from overseas.

We are prepared to accept the judgment of both the majority and minority of the Task Force that complete decontrol is not desirable. And we have taken no position between the tariff proposal of the majority and the quota proposal of the minority. We leave that basic decision to others.

However, we believe that under either proposal a workable system can be evolved to provide a greater measure of competition and arrest, and even reverse, the price escalation of No. 2 fuel oil that has occurred over the past six years.

If the quota system is retained, we propose that allocations of No. 2 fuel oil be given to independent deepwater terminal operators on the basis of a percentage of their qualifying terminal inputs with no quantatitive ceiling established. We suggest that 30% of our terminal input woudl be a workable level. Given the statistics I have cited above, 30% of our business would amount to imports of 75,000 to 100,000 barrels per day into District I.

This level would enable us to compete on a more equal basis with the major oil companies who already have access to overseas supply of oil and, most important, would result in the introduction of increased amounts of No. 2 fuel oil directly into the East Coast market to fill the supply gap I have outlined above.

If the independent terminal operator's position is strengthened. that is, at the wholesale level, the position of the independent retailer further forward in the market will also be strengthened. For the forward marketers who are also competing with the major oil companies can avail themselves of alternative sources of supply; and they will no longer be forced, as they have been increasingly in the past few years, to rely on the major oil companies alone for their products.

If a tariff system is adopted we strongly urge that the tariff on No. 2 fuel oil be established at a level which permits importation of product, to fill the projected supply gap. As the Committee, may have noted, we believe that the level of $1.55 per barrel on finished product recommended by the Task Force will not only prohibit any imports, but will actually result in price increases in the domestic market.[2] We estimate that a tariff level of $.84 per barrel could result in a consumer price reduction of 1 cent per gallon and therefore we would support the adoption of a tariff on No. 2 fuel oil at this level.

Mr. Chairman, again we appreciate the opportunity to appear before you and are most grateful for the effort which you and the members of your Committee have made toward a solution of the East Coast heating oil problem. We hope that a solution will be forthcoming soon, for, along with the consumers of the Northeast, we, as independent businessmen have been going through a difficult period. Unless relief comes and comes soon, our segment of the industry will dwindle and be phased out of existence as a competitive force.

ATTACHMENT A

Members of Independent Fuel Terminal Operators Association:

Belcher Oil Company, Miami, Florida.

Burns Brothers Oil Company, Brooklyn, New York.

Cirillo Brothers Petroleum, Bronx, New York.

Colonial Oil Industries, Savannah, Georgia.

Deepwater Oil Terminal, Quincy, Massachusetts.

Eastern Seaboard Petroleum Co., Jacksonville, Florida.

Gibbs Oil Company, Revere, Massachusetts.

Meenan Oil Company, New York, New York.

Northeast Petroleum Corporation, Boston, Massachusetts.

Northville Dock Corporation, Northville, L.I., New York.

Patchogue Oil Terminal, Brooklyn, New York.

Ross Terminal Corporation, Bayonne, New Jersey.

Seaboard Enterprises, Boston Massachusetts.

Tappan Tanker Terminal, Hastings-on-Hudson, New York.

Union Oil Company, Revere, Massachusetts.

Webber Tanks, Buckport, Maine.

Wyatt Coal and Oil Company, New Haven, Connecticut.

ATTACHMENT B—COMMENTS ON APPENDIX L TO TASK FORCE REPORT (PP. 315–328)

The discussion in Appendix L is quite general and unspecific, and does not arrive at any firm conclusions; almost no factual data is provided to support the general observations. In large part, the Appendix raises a number of questions.

It does, however, make a number of observations that support the position taken by East Coast independent deepwater terminal operators:

1) On the question of inadequate supplies to independent deepwater terminal operators, the Appendix states that this matter may reflect the fact that "the prices at which refiners are prepared to sell and those at which large terminal operators expect to buy, differ". (pp. 315–316).

2) Wholesale prices have been going up in New England in recent years (p. 316). More particularly, that "the disappearance of a seasonal pattern . . . would change the effective supply price enjoyed by many of the terminals . . .". "Similarly . . . distress product sales may have become less important" and "a permanent reduction in the frequency of distress sales would tend to raise average supply price to Northeastern independent marketers in particular." (p. 317).

3) The import quota system has had an adverse effect on the Northeast. "No. 2 fuel oil is probably in artifically short supply in the Northeast relative to the rest of the country because the quotas have had their greatest effect there." (p. 318). This has reflections in prices in the Northeast. "There seems to be general agreement that with free importation, No. 2 fuel oil would retail for about three cents per gallon (about 17 per cent) less in New England than it now does . . ." In a basic long-run sense, fuel prices are now higher in the Northeast, relative to what they might be, than is the case in other fuel oil consumer areas." (p. 318).

4) There is evidence that the integrated oil companies may be in a position to force a price "squeeze" on independent terminal operators. "There can be no doubt that freer importation of fuel oil would make a squeeze less likely". (p. 319). This is, in part, possible because "The import quota system certainly does make independent distributors more dependent on refiner-competitors because it cuts off foreign alternative sources of supply . . ." (p. 319).

5) The discussion is inconclusive on the question of whether independents are disappearing, but it is not, to the extent that disappearances have taken place, due to failures, but to acquisitions. "The long-term rise in percentage margins does not suggest that disappearance would be due to failures."

ATTACHMENT C—COMMENTS ON POINT NO. 15 OF THE APPENDIX TO SECRETARY SHULTZ' STATEMENT TO THE SENATE SUBCOMMITTEE, MARCH 3, 1970

Point No. 15 deals with a relatively secondary issue in a memorandum circulated by the Independent Fuel Terminal Operators Association namely, that the tariff levels on No. 2 fuel oil recommended by the Task Force are so high as to, in effect, encourage an increase in the price of No. 2 fuel oil in New England.

It should be noted that the Appendix discussion does not effectively deal with the central issue: that the level of proposed tariff is so high as to prohibit the importation of No. 2 fuel oil into the United States under present (and foreseeable) circumstances. This is the central point that has to be made, for it is only through permitting such importation to some degree that adequate supplies can be made available in the northeastern United States and that supplies of No. 2 fuel oil can be made available to independent distributors who, alone, have the potential for maintaining competition vis-a-vis the integrated companies. This being the case, the Independent Fuel Terminal Operators Association in their memorandum, pointed to the danger that a shutting off of imports of No. 2 fuel oil would reduce the degree of effective competition as well as supplies available and that the combination of these two factors would tend to induce an increase in price.

The discussion of Point No. 15 of the Appendix thus, in a sense, sets up a straw man and fails to deal with the substantial issue which is the fact that the recommended tariff would effectively bar imports of No. 2 fuel oil. Nor does the discussion under Point No. 15 gainsay the contention in the Independent Fuel Terminal Operators Association memorandum that the net effect would very well be a rise in prices. The following specific comments on the Appendix discussion of this question should be noted:

1. The Appendix asserts that the domestic price of No. 2 fuel oil is determined by domestic cost factors alone, and that the ability to import lower priced No. 2 fuel oil "results not in a lowering of the domestic price, but in unearned 'rents' to the few historical importers now permitted to import No. 2 fuel oil." The Appendix concludes that, since the domestic price of No. 2 is independent of the price of No. 2 imports "under the present quota system," a higher tariff could not affect domestic price.

These comments on the Appendix, if anything, underscore the importance of modifying the oil import control system to bring about greater competition through increased imports of No. 2 fuel oil. We agree that the small volume of imports permitted entry now have little affect on domestic prices. But, if a low tariff were set on No. 2 imports, then independent deepwater terminal operators would be in a position to provide competition to the integrated oil companies. Clearly, the integrated companies are not responsive to supply and demand factors in their pricing policies on No. 2. The only way to resolve the problem is to provide them with competition.

The implications of the Appendix discussion seems to be that such competition can never be forthcoming, but this is clearly not so. What the discussion indicates is a need to revise the persent quota system to provide an opportunity for independent distributors to acquire adequate supplies of imported No. 2 fuel oil at low prices. The fact remains that, under the tariff proposal of the Task Force, the supply of No. 2 imports

---

[2] Attachment C contains Comments on Point 15 of the Appendix submitted by Secretary Schultz to the Senate Anti-trust Committee on March 3, 1970.

would be reduced and, more important, the integrated companies would enjoy the certainty of protection of their price levels accorded to them by an established government decision to maintain higher tariffs on No. 2 imports.

Under the present quota system, there always exists the uncertainty that, if they raise prices, increased quotas would be given to independent distributors; whereas, under a high tariff system that uncertainty would be removed and the integrated companies would be freer to maximize their profits without the danger of sanctions. What this discussion points to clearly is (1) that there is a need to revise the program and (2) that the revision proposed by the Task Force report would not serve to accomplish the public policy objectives that are desired.

2. The Appendix discussion notes that the proposed tariff on crude oil imports would "tend to lower the domestic price of No. 2 fuel oil by reducing the cost to refiners of domestic crude oil."

Given the pricing behavior of the integrated companies, discussed above, there is no *a priori* reason to assume that the result envisaged by the Appendix would in fact take place. Nor does the historical record support such a conclusion: one need only examine the time series data on prices for No. 2 and crude oil to see that there is little correlation between the two.

3. The Appendix discussion notes that the proposed tariff on No. 2 was designed to achieve two objectives: first, the retention of refining capacity in the United States and, second, "keeping the cost of product imports low enough to exert some competitive pressures in the domestic market and aid in relieving temporary shortages." Setting aside the fact that the second objective noted seems to contradict the observation earlier in the discussion that imports do not seem to have any significant effect on the domestic price of No. 2 fuel oil, it should be noted that the Appendix discussion seems to have second thoughts, at this point, about its own proposed tariff level. It notes that achieving this second objective, "requires a much finer tariff adjustment" and that the Task Force recommendation was only "tentative". Apparently, the recommended tariff level may, after all, be too high to permit imports to enter the country and to allow them to exercise a beneficient effect on prices and availabilities of supply. We are left then at the end of the discussion with the same problem with which we started: the Task Force recommendation of a tariff level on No. 2 fuel oil imports too high by the test of what is required in terms of the public policy objectives desired. In fact, we are told in the very last sentence that the gradual phase-out of the historical product import quotas "should be sufficient" to prevent any significant shortages or price rises (sic!) with respect to No. 2 oil due the institution of the tariff system recommended by the Task Force.

What emerges from this discussion are the following two conclusions: one, the existing quota system which is not allowed to affect the price of No. 2 fuel oil must be revised; and, two, the tariff proposal of the Task Force is not a solution to the price problem and in fact may aggravate it. We are faced then, as the Task Force was, with three alternatives: one, modification of the quota system; two, the substitution of the tariff system for the quota system; or three, substitution of an auction system for the quota system.

The substitution of an auction system can be rejected for the reasons spelled out in the Task Force Report, namely, that it would provide a means for the integrated oil companies, who have substantial financial resources and have a market strategy which they wish to pursue, to bid away supplies of imported oil from independent marketers. The fact that integrated oil companies have a market strategy with regard to No. 2 fuel oil has been amply discussed in the submissions to the Task Force of the Independent Fuel Terminal Operators Association. Their implementation of that strategy is also evident from their price behavior: evidence of this can be found in the fact that they appear never to be short of No. 2 fuel oil and are able to market it even when independent marketers cannot economically procure No. 2 fuel oil in the Gulf for delivery to New England destinations.

The independent terminal operators have no *a priori* preference between a tariff system and a revised quota system as long as each permits the entry of sufficient No. 2 fuel oil imports at a low enough price (including tariff) so that they can continue to perform their historic function as competitive marketers of this product to the consumer. A revised quota system however can be a more selective instrument in that it can permit making sufficient supplies of No. 2 fuel oil imports available to independent deepwater terminal operators without necessitating a wholesale change in the pattern of domestic production and importation of No. 2 fuel oil. In this respect, a revision in the quota system that provides allocations in sufficient quantities for independent deepwater terminal operators would minimize the disturbances that would result in terms of the objective, spelled out in the Appendix, of preventing "export" of significant refining capacity.

JAMES W. SYMINGTON SUPPORTS POSTAL PAY RAISE

HON. JAMES W. SYMINGTON

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 20, 1970

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. Speaker, the recent passage of a 6 percent pay increase for postal and many other Federal employees is an overdue but welcome victory in the continuing battle for pay comparability. But it is more than just a pay increase; it reflects a breakthrough in terms of coming to grips with the entire matter of comparability. The accord reached by Government and postal employee representatives following the recent postal strike was significant. Not only did it expedite the much needed pay raise, but it illustrated a new kind of negotiation at the Federal Government level. Both the strike and the subsequent accord were historic, and we cannot lightly regard the conditions which produced them: Conditions that require a man to work 21 years before achieving a maximum salary of $8,000; poor health and employee working facilities; inadequate promotion opportunities; pay schedules and adjustments that are subject to budget fluctuations and have no relationship to productivity or work rules.

Last fall Congress passed the Federal Salary Comparability Act, which I fully supported. That bill would have established a permanent method of adjusting salaries of many Federal employees; it responded to the unjust situation whereby the pay of Federal employees must suffer the effects of a budget limitation while pay comparability for them goes hand in hand only with a budget surplus; it provided for upgraded pay schedules and more rapid advancements within the postal service.

That bill has been passed months ago. Unfortunately, it was never reported out of conference. If it had been, perhaps we could have prevented the recent postal strike, the vibrations of which were felt by every sector of our society—by individuals, magazines and mail order businessmen, and the entire financial community. If we subscribe to the concept that experience is the best teacher, we must be prepared to consider the price we pay to learn. For many, whose cries of indignation resounded throughout the Nation, the price of this recent lesson was small. For some, it was quite high. Certainly it was significant for everyone. A strike should not have been required to turn the rusty wheels of progress in this case. However, we can hope that the results of the experience will inject more realism into our efforts to achieve pay comparability for Federal employees.

A strike by Federal employees is illegal. But we cannot legislate attitudes any more than we can expect court orders to dictate conscience. The recent postal strike was the first in the 200-year history of the Post Office, and the most massive one ever by Federal employees. It was the spontaneous expression of years of frustration, neglect, broken promises, and complacency. It has made the entire Nation aware of the desperate economic condition of the postal workers, and the danger of indifference to their plight. Perhaps most importantly, it has led the way to a procedure of collective bargaining at the Federal Government level.

The new pay measure, which was considered independently of postal reform, provides a 6-percent across-the-board pay raise for Federal employees, retroactive to December 1969. A second pay increase of 8 percent for postal employees only is to become effective when a postal reform measure is passed.

The passage of the pay bill, and the action which produced it, both represent a long-term commitment and a successful step in terms of pay comparability. They also underscore the need for further steps to change a system whose response to the legitimate aspirations of its employees is both inadequate and ineffective. It is my hope that these steps may be taken without walking over the collected bodies of defenders of the status quo.

LAW-AND-ORDER ALBATROSS

HON. ABNER J. MIKVA

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 20, 1970

Mr. MIKVA. Mr. Speaker, I have previously called attention to the reprehensible behavior of the Governor of Florida in connection with his refusal to obey the orders of a Federal court. I note that the Governor's activities have drawn criticism from many quarters. Not because of some regional vendetta, but out of

respect for the supreme law of the land, the Constitution, his conduct must be challenged.

Critics of lawlessness on the left should not brook lawless behavior on the right. That is one reason that I was pleased to read an editorial in the Wall Street Journal—a frequent critic of the militant left—denouncing Governor Kirk's defiance of the court. That the situation is apparently being settled in Manatee County should not blind us to the poor example that the Governor set. I commend the Journal's forthright editorial to the attention of my colleagues.

The editorial, which appeared in the April 10 Journal, follows:

[From the Wall Street Journal, Apr. 10, 1970]

LAW-AND-ORDER ALBATROSS

Just when we were beginning to think the need for law and order was once again being recognized more widely, albeit sometimes grudgingly, now we find Governor Claude Kirk of Florida defying the Federal courts over school integration. Because he did not approve of a busing plan ordered by the court, he removed Manatee County school officials on patently transparent grounds, took over the local schools himself on patently dubious grounds, and refused to carry out the court orders.

The important thing in this dispute is not the merits of the court's plan, which must be disputed through court appeals and not by unilateral decrees from governors. At this point, the plan has been duly adjudicated and the court has issued its decision. The important thing is respect for and loyalty to the process by which that decision was reached. If the Governor of a state does not treat court decisions as legitimate, how can other citizens be asked to do so?

Some of us try to take the phrase law-and-order as a high ideal, meaning decorous debate about any grievances and peaceful acceptance of decisions reached through the processes society provides to resolve grievances. That ideal is a pressing necessity today, whatever name you give it. It is an ideal hard enough to uphold under the best of circumstances, let alone when it is encumbered by the kind of albatross Governor Kirk is fashioning for its neck.

DEBBIE McCOOL WEEK

HON. PETER W. RODINO, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 20, 1970

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, April 19–May 2 has been proclaimed Debbie McCool Week by Mayor Kenneth D. Smith of Belleville, N.J. Debbie, a senior at Belleville High School, has been unable to attend classes because of a rare blood disease which necessitates blood transfusions and the latest in medical techniques.

The response of volunteers has been overwhelming in support of the door-to-door canister brigade throughout the town. And I wish to commend the veterans organizations, services clubs, schools, local churches, and the many individuals who selflessly gave of their time and energies for Debbie McCool. Their efforts have demonstrated community cooperation and dedication of the finest caliber. I salute them and join with them in their hope that these efforts will result in a rewarding and successful Debbie McCool Week.

PROPOSED VOLUNTEER ARMY

HON. JOHN T. MYERS

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 20, 1970

Mr. MYERS. Mr. Speaker, a perceptive column by Col. R. D. Heinl, Jr., was carried in the Indianapolis Star recently. This column is especially significant because it discusses in detail two of the most frequently cited criticisms of a proposed volunteer army, and refutes these criticisms in equally precise terms.

Having determined that these major objections are not sufficient to prevent the adoption of a volunteer army concept, Colonel Heinl concludes that, in fact, our society cannot "afford not to be rid of the draft." I insert this column in the RECORD:

[From the Indianapolis (Ind.) Star, Mar. 20, 1970]

VOLUNTEER ARMY WON'T BE ALL-NEGRO OR MERCENARY

(By Col. R. D. Heinl, Jr.)

Washington.—Before proceeding to abolish the draft and returning to our traditional Anglo-Saxon volunteer system, the country seems to want answers to two, and possibly three, important questions.

1. Will an all-volunteer army become an army of "mercenaries" isolated from and unresponsive to the parent civilian society?

2. Will this army of so-called mercenaries end up as an all-Negro army?

3. Is it safe to cut loose from the draft until we know for certain that the various changes and incentives proposed by the Gates Commission will recruit at least 75,000 more true volunteers a year than the Armed Services are now getting?

An army of mercenaries?

The primary answer to this question is that, if an all-volunteer army means a mercenary army, we practically have one already. According to the Gates Report, at least 250,000 of the 500,000 men who now volunteer for the Armed Services are "true volunteers" who want to be soldiers, sailors, Marines and airmen anyway.

Of the four services, the Air Forces has never yet had a draftee, the Navy only a few, and the Marines only when war has required the Corps to expand to the enormous size (for the Corps) of over 300,000. Even the Army, which now does depend on a "peacetime" draft, has a large and respectable component of volunteers.

To maintain pre-Vietnam-size Armed Forces (2.5 million) calls for not more than 325,000 new enlistments a year, possibly less. If we already are getting 250,000 true volunteers, then all we need are 75,000 more men from among the 1.5 million who attain age 19 every year.

That these people would necessarily come from the bottom of the barrel is questionable. Present eligibility standards (which could probably be substantially raised in a volunteer army) already exclude a high percentage both of would-be volunteers and draftees from just such backgrounds. Higher pay (part of the Gates package) would—just as in industry—attract a higher grade of man.

In any case, the responsiveness to society of the Armed Forces is through their leadership, not their rear ranks. Corporals rarely engineer coups d'etat; generals and colonels are the offenders.

American generals and colonels (all volunteers, incidentally) are, if history means anything, docile to a fault in the face of civilian authority. Otherwise, how could Robert S. McNamara have terrorized the whole Pentagon? In Latin America or Asia, a junta of generals would have put him on the first airplane for Lower Slobovia.

Among the existing base of "true volunteers" now in the services, the percentage of Negroes (12.7) almost exactly equals that of Negroes in the total population. There is no reason to believe that, in an all-volunteer force, the percentage would differ sharply.

In past years, it is true the rate of Negro re-enlistments has been notably higher, not only because the Armed Forces have given Negroes a fairer shake, but—significantly—because re-enlistment eligibility standards for Negroes have been kept lower than for whites.

Despite all this, the number of Negro re-enlistees in the Army has dropped exactly 50 per cent in the last five years.

In 1965, Negroes were 22 per cent of all re-enlistees; today, they are 11 per cent. If the same re-enlisment criteria (equal-opportunity rehiring, one might say), applied equally to both races, there would be even fewer Negroes in a long-term volunteer Army.

For an all-volunteer force of 2.5 million, the Gates Commission and its computers predict, in any case, that not more than 15 per cent of it would be Negroes.

Is is practicable or safe to break away from the draft just yet?

One of the most attractive of the Gates proposals is that the all-volunteer system would be prudently backed up by standby draft machinery which could be invoked at any time by Congress—a feature which, incidentally, tends to restore war-making power to Capitol Hill and curb the Executive.

A great deal of loose arithmetic has gone around to the effect that all-volunteer Armed Forces would cost $7–$8 billion more per year than we now pay. But the tightly computed figures of the commission say that a 2.5-million force would require only $1.74 billion more annually. That is a cheap price for getting rid of the draft.

The Central point in all this—and it had better be understood by the country—is how can we not afford to be rid of the draft?

The draft has polluted American society, corrupted youth and education, spread sedition through the Armed Forces and alienated an entire generation from its own government.

No hypothetical fear or reservation that has so far been expressed against a volunteer army can offset the clear and present evils, to the country and to the common defense, which demonstrably spring from continuation of conscription on its present terms.

LATEST CASE TO FACE JUDGE HOFFMAN

HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 20, 1970

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, national attention was focused on the so-called Conspiracy 7 trial in Chicago before Federal Judge Julius Hoffman. Equivalent interest may well be produced in the conspiracy case soon to be heard by Judge Hoffman against the Weatherman faction of the SDS.

In a very timely and precise editorial on Tuesday, April 7, WBBM radio comments on this latest case to face Judge Hoffman:

JUDGE JULIUS HOFFMAN

Entirely by chance, Federal Judge Julius Hoffman has again been assigned to the duties of trial judge in a controversial case.

It is one which may produce outbursts from those on trial. Judge Hoffman will hear the conspiracy case against 12 members of the so-called Weatherman faction of the Students for a Democratic Society.

The United States Supreme Court has now ruled on the question of courtroom conduct. The high court has ruled that when a person on trial disrupts the proceedings repeatedly, he can be bound and gagged to prevent outbursts. Or such a person can be removed from the courtroom entirely and the trial can proceed without the presence of the defendant.

Regardless of exactly how it is done, the chief point of the Supreme Court ruling is that the trial judge has a right to maintain the dignity of his courtroom. Indeed, he is duty-bound to protect the proceedings so that no one can disrupt the fair and impartial trial of a case. We have said before that in our opinion Judge Hoffman was right when he had Bobby Seale bound and gagged.

In the coming Weatherman case, Judge Hoffman now has a clear directive from the Supreme Court that allows him to maintain the dignity of the trial and court. We hope that the defense lawyers will impress this upon their clients so that the conspiracy trial will be tried on its merits.

RESOLUTIONS RELATING TO ENVIRONMENTAL MATTERS

HON. JOHN D. DINGELL

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 20, 1970

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, the board of directors of the Michigan United Conservation Clubs, at a meeting in Grand Rapids on April 12, 1970, adopted several resolutions relating to environmental matters.

The MUCC is one of the Nation's truly outstanding conservation organizations and I feel that the resolutions of its board of directors will be of considerable interest to my colleagues in the House. Therefore, I insert the resolutions at this point in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

RESOLUTION RE CLOSING OF GREAT LAKES FISHERIES RESEARCH LABORATORY AT ANN ARBOR, MICH.

Whereas, the U.S. Department of Interior has stated its intention of closing the Great Lakes Fisheries Research Laboratory at Ann Arbor, Michigan; and

Whereas, this laboratory has proved its need and competency by developing a lampricide that effectively controls the lamprey which had virtually eliminated the lake trout, rainbow trout and whitefish in the Great Lakes; and

Whereas, these fish and the recently successful introduction of coho and chinook salmon in the Great Lakes are needed to control the nuisance alewives; and

Whereas, there are other factors which continue to threaten the reproductive ability and edibility of these game fish; and

Whereas, there is concern regarding the effect of thermal pollution from atomic energy facilities being built and planned on the Great Lakes shores:

Therefore be it resolved that Michigan United Conservation Clubs represent to the concerned authorities that the closing of this laboratory would be false economy and urge that its valuable and necessary research activities should be maintained.

RESOLUTION RE: EXTENSION OF ANADROMOUS FISH CONSERVATION ACT

Whereas, coastal streams of the United States have historically produced large runs of anadromous fish; and

Whereas, the runs of anadromous fish have been damaged and/or destroyed through the construction of dams and other diversions and as a result of water pollution; and

Whereas, the restoration of these anadromous fish to both coastal and inland waters has broad recreational and economic public benefits; and

Whereas, technical knowledge has been improved, both in the management of anadromous fish and in the abatement of pollution; and

Whereas, the "Anadromous Fish Conservation Act of 1965" (P.L. 89-304) already has been of great assistance to the States in perpetuating and enhancing runs of anadromous fish; and

Whereas, that Act will expire on June 30, 1970 unless extended:

Therefore be it resolved that the MUCC Board of Directors, in meeting assembled at Grand Rapids, Michigan on April 11-12, 1970, hereby urges and appeals that the "Anadromous Fish Conservation Act" early be extended for an additional five years.

RESOLUTION REQUESTING FEDERAL ASSISTANCE FOR RECREATION, FISH AND WILDLIFE MEASURES IN RESOURCE, CONSERVATION AND DEVELOPMENT PROJECTS

Whereas, Section 102 of the Food and Agriculture Act of 1962 authorized the organization of Resource Conservation and Development projects, and these projects have proven to be of significant importance to resource conservation and development; and

Whereas, the people of the State of Michigan and this nation are increasingly having the time and resources to travel and enjoy the outdoors; and

Whereas, the demand from local citizens and those from more remote areas for recreation and fish and wildlife is increasing at an accelerated rate within Michigan and the nation, and additional areas to serve these people are not adequate; and

Whereas, the Congress has recognized in legislation that it is in the public interest to provide federal financial assistance in development of projects and areas for recreation and fish and wildlife purposes; and

Whereas, the present law does not allow Federal financial assistance for recreation and fish and wildlife measures in Resource Conservation and Development projects, thereby hindering or suppressing the development of measures for such purposes in these projects:

Therefore be it resolved that the Michigan United Conservation Clubs hereby endorse and support an amendment to the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act to provide for Federal financial assistance in Resource Conservation and Development projects for recreation and fish and wildlife measures comparable to the assistance being provided in other Federal legislation.

PAY BILL

HON. CLARENCE E. MILLER

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 14, 1970

Mr. MILLER of Ohio. When I opposed moving the question of House Resolution 909 last Tuesday, I fully acknowledged the need for immediate and appropriate action in correcting the salary inequities of our postal employees, but I questioned why we should include as a provision of this legislation wording which would provide congressional employees an equivalent pay raise at the same time.

Only last July, congressional staff members were the beneficiaries of a generous 10-percent wage increase. In the name of reason and responsibility I could not support bringing this measure to the floor in its proposed form.

I reiterate, I wholeheartedly endorsed the much needed increase being provided our postal employees and supported this measure on the subsequent vote for final passage. However, I opposed moving this question in the hope my colleagues before acting on House Resolution 909 would send this bill back to committee so that the objectionable provisions of this legislation, that section dealing with congressional pay raises, could be deleted.

ROBERT Y. BUTTON DAY

HON. JOHN O. MARSH, JR.

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 20, 1970

Mr. MARSH. Mr. Speaker, this past Saturday was designated "Robert Button Day" in Culpeper County to honor the distinguished former attorney general of the State of Virginia, Robert Y. Button, of Culpeper, who recently marked the completion of 8 years of outstanding public service to the Commonwealth of Virginia as its attorney general.

This was a fitting tribute by a home community to a worthy son, and I would like to cite here some of Bob Button's background which entitle him to this honor; however, I would first like to insert in the RECORD the resolution of the Culpeper Town Council proclaiming April 18 as Robert Y. Button Day:

Whereas Robert Y. Button has been a lifetime resident of Culpeper and has practiced law in this community since 1922; and

Whereas during his career as an attorney, Robert Y. Button served the Town of Culpeper as Town Attorney; served his State as a member of the Parole Board and the State Board of Education; and, in 1946, was elected to a seat in the Virginia Senate, which he dutifully filled until 1961 when he was elected Attorney General of Virginia in which office he served with distinction for two terms of four years each; and

Whereas Robert Y. Button has brought honor and distinction to this community through his outstanding service and achievement as he devoted himself to the people of this community with honor, integrity, and as a good and faithful friend; it is, therefore,

Proclaimed that April 18, 1970 be designated as Robert Y. Button Day to express the affection and appreciation felt by the people of Culpeper for this outstanding Virginian.

Concerning his career, Mr. Button entered the law firm of Hiden & Bickers in June of 1922, immediately upon his graduation from the University of Virginia Law School, and is now senior partner

in the firm. His political career began in 1935 when he was appointed to the State board of accountancy. In 1942 he was appointed a member of the first Virginia Parole Board, and in 1945 to the State board of education.

Mr. Button was elected to a seat in the Virginia Senate in 1946, which he dutifully filled until 1961 when he was elected attorney general of Virginia, in which office he served with distinction for two terms of 4 years each. While in the senate, he was chairman of the Virginia Advisory Legislative Council, chairman of the senate welfare committee and a high-ranking member of the senate committees on finance, general laws, privileges and elections, and counties, cities, and towns. He served on both the Gray and Perrow Commissions which charted Virginia's course in desegregation. He was a member of the Potomac River Commission for Virginia, which negotiated a new Potomac River compact with a Maryland commission.

When Mr. Button agreed to enter the Democratic primary as a candidate for attorney general in 1961, his announcement was brief:

If nominated and elected I promise to devote my best energies to the faithful and impartial performance of the duties of the office.

When he announced for a second term, the statement was even shorter:

I will be a candidate for reelection, subject to the Democratic primary.

It has been said that these 12 words may have set a record for brevity by a candidate.

He married Miss Antoinette Cheape of Charlottesville, Va., in August of 1931 and they have two children; Mrs. Kathleen B. Ginn of Richmond, Va., and Robert Y. Button, Jr., an insurance agent in Culpeper. They have five grandchildren. A member of the Jeffersonton Baptist Church, he also serves on the board of directors of the Second National Bank of Culpeper.

Robert Y. Button, through his achievements, has not only contributed much to his hometown and county and to his native State, but he has made a distinguished contribution to his country.

EULOGY TO L. STOREY STEMMONS DELIVERED BY DR. LUTHER HOLCOMB

HON. OLIN E. TEAGUE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 20, 1970

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include a eulogy to L. Storey Stemmons of Dallas, Tex., delivered at his funeral on April 16, 1970, by a mutual friend and acquaintance, Dr. Luther Holcomb:

MESSAGE DELIVERED BY DR. LUTHER HOLCOMB

Storey Stemmons was a man of many dimensions. He brought to his work high gifts of mind and spirit.

He was trained to be a lawyer. He was a man of the law—a warm, vibrant, open man. His very being depicted the largeness of the West. It was natural and comfortable for many of us to call him "Judge." He would have made a truly great judge.

Storey Stemmons was a man of honesty. His honesty was total, complete, simple—a matter of course.

He was a man of essential humility—the humility of the brave, free and brilliant.

Even though possessing a legal mind, the appellate robes were not meant for this one. They would have been like a halter on an eagle.

The law gave him a foundation for business. His delight was in putting a business transaction together. He would look at them upside-down, inside-out, right-to-left and left-to-right.

Such was the genius of this man—a genius for the law and for business.

Let us think about another side of your friend and mine:

One had to be with him in Tower East at 2700 Stemmons Freeway to fully appreciate and understand this one. There was the view of the city that he loved and one could see the relationship with his staff that was characterized by respect, loyalty and genuine affection.

No one who has ever been on a fishing or hunting trip with him will forget the personality of Storey Stemmons. By a campfire or in a boat, Storey reflected something special. He would bring this "something special" into every situation. This was true even during the long months of his final illness. When the doctors told him recently that the end was near, he was still the gracious host wanting to offer them refreshments and escort them to the door.

Yes, the inspirational qualities of Storey Stemmons—his buoyant disposition, his enthusiasm for life, his courage and determination will forever live in our hearts.

These traits were a part of his being. I believe they came from his heritage, his abiding faith in God, his dedication to the simple, old virtues and his unfailing belief in and love for his country.

Storey Stemmons had an exceptional capacity for love and devotion for his wife, Grace, and his brother, John.

I know Storey would have me say today that the greatest lady ever is the one named Grace. Grace, you have responded with a love and devotion that is akin to the greatest romance ever.

No two brothers could have a greater understanding and respect for each other than did Storey and John. Their devotion, each for the other was a way of life with them.

Let us pray,

With lasting gratitude in our hearts for Thy servant, Storey, knowing that the peace he sought is now forever given him, for he dwells with Thee and so do we, O Thou holy bridge of all eternity. Lord, let Thy servant be in peace according to Thy word, for mine eyes have seen Thy salvation which Thou hast prepared. Glory be to the Father, and to the Son, and to the Holy Ghost, as it was in the beginning, is now, and ever shall be. Amen.

HANOI'S DEAR AMERICAN FRIENDS GO BROKE AND DISBAND

HON. JOHN R. RARICK

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 20, 1970

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, an admitted defeat by Hanoi's "Dear American Friends" forcing them to regroup, has been relegated to an inside page of the local newspaper, with no indication that the wire services feel it important enough to tell to those outside of the city.

I refer to the bankruptcy and dispersal of one particular bunch of Hanoi's "Dear American Friends"—The Vietnam Moratorium Committee here in Washington.

Two comments are at once appropriate. First, only one of the enemy's friends seems to have wangled her way onto the public payroll—and this is an improvement over the usual pasturing out of characters of this type.

And second, to the extent that the gullible are more interested in, and hence more easily manipulated through, such ideas as "Earth Day"—the International Communist Celebration on April 22 of the anniversary of the Red Butcher may do over fighting men in Vietnam less harm both on the home front and through Hanoi's propaganda media.

I include the article in my remarks:

[From the Washington Star, Apr. 20, 1970]

VIETNAM MORATORIUM PANEL FACING APATHY, CLOSES SHOP

The Vietnam Moratorium Committee, whose success in mobilizing Americans opposed to the war was viewed with awe and fear by high government officials only six months ago, has fallen upon hard times and is going out of business.

To a great extent, the same elements which brought so much success to the Moratorium last autumn—the continually changing intangible known only as "public opinion" and the tendency of the mass media to focus on new stories—proved to be its downfall this spring.

The anti-war cause, both popular and newsworthy last fall, has been supplanted in the minds of many by a new campaign—the struggle for a cleaner environment, a crusade expected to reach a crescendo Wednesday on "Earth Day."

BORED OR ANGERED

There also are increasing indications that many Americans are either bored or angered by the anti-war movement's principal technique for presenting its case to potential sympathizers—marches, vigils, rallies and other forms of public demonstrations.

Moratorium leaders talk about finding "new forms" to dramatize their concerns to the country's voters—but they freely acknowledge that they have not yet been successful in their quest.

Meanwhile they have gone into debt—more than $50,000.

In recent months, their difficulties have been compounded by the relatively small but highly visible groups of young radicals determined to engage in street confrontations with law enforcement authorities.

Last week, for example, the fact that hundreds of thousands of persons turned out for Moratorium-sponsored anti-war rallies in scores of cities across the country was almost obscured by the violence provoked by splinter groups in three cities—Berkeley, Calif., Cambridge, Mass., and Washington.

Finally, the Moratorium leaders grudgingly acknowledge that President Nixon, the principal target of their organizing efforts, deftly neutralized the campaign for immediate—or at least greatly accelerated—withdrawal of all U.S. troops from Southeast Asia.

By effectively mobilizing the "silent majority" as a counterference to the Moratorium in a televised speech Nov. 3, then by adopting the twin strategies of "flexible withdrawal" and Vietnamization," Nixon successfully contained the anti-war effort.

CONVINCED OF CAUSE

Although the Moratorium is closing its headquarters at 1029 Vermont Avenue NW—a series of cluttered and sparsely furnished rooms—the youthful organizers of the effort remain convinced that their cause is still a popular one.

In a letter being mailed this week to approximately 10,000 local organizers in communities throughout the nation, the four Moratorium coordinators say:

"After a period of dormancy, dissatisfaction with the President's policies is again growing. The last Gallup poll indicated that approval for the way in which Mr. Nixon is handling the war has dropped a dramatic 13 points. The expanding war in Southeast Asia and the rising death toll are also contributing to the country's uneasiness."

"The drama and national attention that characterized the autumn has never returned," the letter said. "But much of the substance of our effort—the concentration on local organizing—has become more solid and widespread during the intervening months."

RELUCTANT COSPONSOR

Although generally identified with the anti-war rally at the Washington Monument grounds last Nov. 15—which attracted a crowd of 250,000 and was the largest mass demonstration in the city's history—the Moratorium was only a reluctant and subordinate co-sponsor of that event.

Its leaders feel that their principal success was the series of grass-roots rallies Oct. 15 in hundreds of communities, many of which had never before experienced anti-war demonstrations. Those events reached 2 million persons, according to Moratorium estimates.

After that nationwide protest, the President took the calculated risk of preparing his now-famous Nov. 3 speech. The letter released yesterday by the Moratorium describes what has happened since:

On April 15, the second largest series of protests in this nation's history occurred. Although nearly 1 million people demonstrated their opposition to the current policies, there is little prospect of immediate change in the administration's policy in Vietnam.

"A new direction and focus are needed for anti-war activities. Our strategy has been used, has been temporarily successful, and now is in need of renewal. Our maximum effectiveness has been reached. We do not seek permanence of its own sake.

"One of the major complaints which many of us share relates to the nature of institutions in this country—unresponsive, afraid of change, more concerned with perpetuating their structure than their function . . . We as an institution no longer fill the need for which we came together . . .

"We have made the decision to disband the national office of the Vietnam Moratorium Committee. Local committees and offices will continue to function as they always have—independently. We will continue to mail a newsletter to all those who have worked with us in the past."

ANTI-WAR WORK GOES ON

The four Moratorium coordinators will continue their work in anti-war activities, as will most of the other staff members in Washington and regional offices. Many plan to campaign for "peace candidates" seeking House and Senate seats and other political offices.

Sam Brown will remain in Washington temporarily to raise funds to wipe out the Moratorium's current debt of more than $50,000.

David Hawk will organize concerts in major cities, to help eliminate the debt and raise new money for the peace movement.

David Mixner will move to Denver to do political organizing in the Rockies.

Marge Sklencar will go to work for Sen. Charles E. Goodell, R-N.Y., one of the most outspoken opponents of the war.

"We genuinely believe that the real work that's going to get done to end the war is not the work that needs to be done out of an office in Washington," Brown said yesterday. "It's the work that needs to be done in local communities."

LIBRARY OF CONGRESS SURVEY OF STATE LAWS ON EXPLOSIVES FINDS WOEFUL INADEQUACIES

HON. CHARLES A. VANIK

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 20, 1970

Mr. VANIK. Mr. Speaker, during the last several months, this country has seen a dramatic—and tragic—increase in bombings, bomb scares, and bomb threats. The number of these bombings and threats has pointed out the fact that highly dangerous explosives are sold across the counter to anyone—including the mentally incompetent, felons, and fugitives from justice.

I recently asked the Library of Congress to make a survey of the various laws of the 50 States relating to the sale of dangerous explosives. The study revealed that in 22 States there are virtually no controls over the sale of explosives. Those States include some of the most heavily populated and industrialized, such as my own State of Ohio. The study shows that even if one State attempts to keep explosives out of the hands of dangerous persons, criminal elements can merely cross a State line and freely purchase high explosives in another State.

Because of the importance of this study, I would like to enter it in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD as follows:

THE LIBRARY OF CONGRESS,
Washington, D.C., April 7, 1970.

To: Hon. CHARLES A. VANIK.
From: American Law Division.
Subject: State Legislation Pertaining to Explosives.

This is in reply to your letter of March 9, 1970, requesting a compilation of the laws of the several States which regulate the sale and transfer of explosives and to the telephone conversation pertaining thereto.

A survey of the codes, compilations, and consolidations of the laws of the several States indicated that provisions dealing with explosives (dynamite and similar chemicals) were scattered throughout many sections of such codes. Such provisions included those which make the use of explosives in certain areas or for certain purposes illegal. Thus the laws of every State prohibit, in some way, the illegal use of explosives. However, there is no uniformity as to exactly what is proscribed and, in some States, no statutory requirement or restriction on the sale or transfer of such items.

In some cases the State statutes provided general authority for a specific state official such as the state fire marshall, the state chief of police, the state insurance commissioner, the state secretary of labor, the state mine inspector or some other official to promulgate rules and regulations with respect to the storage, transportation, possession, transfer or sale, or use of explosives. In addition, many of the "codes" authorize local governments to enact ordinances to restrict or even prohibit explosives within said local jurisdiction. Without a detailed examination of the rules and regulations that may have been promulgated or without conducting a survey by questionnaire to each of the several states, we can only render an opinion as to those states which do not have effective statutory control over the sale or transfer of explosives. It should also be remembered that even though several of the states require licensing for persons who manufacture, deal in, store sell, possess or use explosives, unless such licensing does in fact pertain to the sale and transfer of explosives and provide for the regulation of the many explosives and component parts, those licensing provisions, upon close examination, may prove to be ineffective.

With those limitations it is felt that the following states do not have general statutory restrictions on the sale or transfer of explosives: Alabama, Alaska, Arkansas, Colorado, Delaware, District of Columbia, Idaho, Indiana, Iowa and Louisiana.

Maine, Massachusetts, Michigan, Minnesota, Missouri, Nebraska, New Hampshire, New Mexico, North Dakota, Ohio, and Oklahoma.

Oregon, Pennsylvania, Rhode Island, South Dakota, Tennessee, Texas, Utah, Vermont, West Virginia, Wisconsin, and Wyoming.

A brief summary of the type of control or restriction on sales or transfers of explosives in the other States follows:

Arizona: (Arizona Revised Statutes, 27–321 to 27–325). Requires records of all transactions including name, date, amount, disposition of explosives. State mine inspector to promulgate rules and regulations pertaining thereto.

California (West's Annotated California Codes, Health and Safety Codes, § 12100 et seq.) Permits are required for the manufacture, receipt, storage, possession, transportation, and use of explosives. State fire marshal issues regulations as to the form and content of applications. Applications for permit to use are made to local fire chief.

Connecticut (Connecticut General Statutes Annotated, State Police, § 28–29 to 29–95). Requires every person selling explosives to keep records with respect to each transaction including name, address, quantity, and business of purchaser.

Florida (Florida Statutes Annotated Chapter 552). Provides for the licensing of persons who manufacture, deal in, or use explosives in accordance with regulations of the State fire marshal.

Georgia (Code of Georgia Annotated, Title 92A, Public Safety). Provides for the licensing of persons who manufacture, transport, store, sell, or use explosives under regulations promulgated by the safety fire commissioner.

Hawaii (Hawaii Revised Statutes, § 376–21 to 376–34). Provides for the director of labor and industry to issue rules and regulations concerning permits for persons who manufacture or deal in explosives and certificates of fitness (with positive identification) for persons who may use explosives. Monthly reports of the names of purchasers are required.

Illinois (Smith-Hurd Illinois Annotated Statutes, 93–143 et seq.). Requires record of name, address, and business of every purchaser of explosives to be kept by dealers.

Kansas (Kansas Statutes Annotated, § 21–2444). Requires records with respect to the sale or transfer of explosives.

Kentucky (Baldwin's Kentucky Revised Statutes Annotated, § 433.470) Requires suppliers of explosives to keep a register showing the amount, to whom, date, and purpose of all transfers of explosives.

Maryland (Annotated Code of Maryland, 38A § 25 to 38A § 36) Provides for the licensing of persons who manufacture, possess, or deal in explosives and prohibits sales to unlicensed persons.

Mississippi (Mississippi Code Annotated, § 7015–31). Requires every person who sells explosives to keep record of the name and

address of the purchaser, to quantity sold, and the purpose of use. Requires reports of sales or removal to the local sheriff within 24 hours of the transfer.

Montana (Revised Codes of Montana Annotated, 69–1901 to 69–1930). Records and receipts with respect to every transaction involving explosives.

Nevada (Nevada Revised Statutes § 476.010 to 476.060) Requires signed order stating purpose and use before transfer of explosives may be made. Prohibits "unusual" or "excessive amount" sales.

New Jersey (New Jersey Statutes Annotated, 21:1A–128 et seq.). Permits are required for persons who manufacture, store, transport, deal in, or use explosives.

New York (McKinney's Consolidated Laws of New York Annotated, Labor Law, § 450 et seq.). Requires license to purchase, own, possess, transport, or use explosives.

North Carolina (General Statutes of North Carolina, § 14–284.1). Requires purchaser to have written application containing purpose before purchase can be made. Records of sales for use required.

Virginia (Code of Virginia, § 40–20.1 et seq.). Permits required for the manufacture, storage, handling, selling, or use of explosives.

Washington (Revised Code of Washington Annotated, § 70.74 et seq.). Provides for the licensing of persons who manufacture, store, transport, sale, purchase, or use explosives. Prohibits any sale to unlicensed persons.

It is pointed out that the above analysis and summary is based on a survey of the laws of the several States as found in the codes or similar compilations and pocket parts thereto which, in general, included enactments through 1969. It is understood that several States have amended and strengthened their laws during the current year. In addition, this analysis is based on an interpretation of the several statutes. It is entirely possible that some of the States we indicated as not having adequate controls over the sale or transfer of explosives have an effective regulatory system under a general delegation of powers to promulgate rules and regulations dealing with explosives and that other States, indicated as having effective statutes, have failed to promulgate or enforce those controls which would effectively prevent the sale of explosives for an illegal purpose.

In accordance with our telephone conversation we are attaching hereto xerox copies of the general "explosives" laws which we feel will provide a representative sampling of enactments which appear to provide adequate statutory authority for the control of the sale or transfer of explosives.

OEO WILL NOT PROVIDE LEGAL SERVICES TO POVERTY STRICKEN

HON. CHARLES S. GUBSER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 20, 1970

Mr. GUBSER. Mr. Speaker, I submit for the attention of my colleagues a letter addressed to the Legal Aid Society of Santa Clara County by Barbara E. Fisher, Acting Deputy Regional Legal Services Director of the Office of Economic Opportunity. I also submit a copy of a communication written by the president of the Santa Clara County Bar Association to the president of the State Bar of California.

These items of correspondence clearly show that the Office of Economic Opportunity has now determined that it will not provide individual legal services to persons in poverty across the Nation. In my opinion, this is an absolute violation of congressional intent.

Mr. Speaker, I am not opposed to class action suits and have repeatedly made that position clear. However, I am opposed to a one-sided interpretation of the law which goes exclusively to the filing of class action suits, to the detriment of the individual poor person who desperately needs legal assistance. I reiterate that this is contradictory of congressional intent as I understood it.

The correspondence referred to appears as follows:

OFFICE OF ECONOMIC OPPORTUNITY,
San Francisco, Calif., February 13, 1970.

JAMES ONO,
Director, Legal Aid Society of Santa Clara County, San Jose, Calif.

DEAR MR. ONO: I have just been notified that the Board of Directors has chosen you to be the new Director of the Santa Clara program. Therefore, this is an appropriate time to outline OEO philosophy in regard to legal service programs.

While the initial thrust of OEO was toward providing individual legal services, it was soon discovered that a single test case or class action could affect the lives of many more poor people for the amount of money expended. And it was also clear that the amount of money Congress was willing to spend for legal services was not unlimited.

This is the reason OEO now insists that legal service programs limit their caseload of individual service cases to free up attorney time for test cases. We require that your program, like all others, start working out effective methods of cutting down the number of individual cases handled. We also insist that you investigate the problems of the poor in your county and work toward legal solutions to those problems. Another requirement is that you create an effective community legal education program which will reach the poor in Santa Clara. This program should inform the poor of the ways legal processes can be used to solve the larger issues of poverty.

These OEO requirements should be implemented at once so that you will be able to discuss your progress with our evaluators who will be at your program in March. I will send you more information about the evaluation when the final plans are made.

Sincerely yours,

BARBARA E. FISHER,
Acting Deputy Regional Legal Services Director.

SANTA CLARA COUNTY BAR ASSOCIATION,
San Jose, Calif., April 1, 1970.

J. THOMAS CROWE,
President, the State Bar of California, Visalia, Calif.

DEAR MR. CROWE: The Board of Trustees of the Santa Clara County Bar Association unanimously adopted the following resolution at its meeting held on March 12, 1970:

"Resolved: That the State Bar of California be requested to coordinate sending a delegation representative of California Bar Associations to the Office of Economic Opportunity, Washington, D.C., to express concern with the change in Guide Lines to local legal services agencies and to explore possibilities for the restoration of funding for representation of individual cases."

The resolution followed a discussion of the immediate impact of the enclosed OEO directive of February 13, 1970, upon the poor who need individual legal services and the ability of local attorneys in private practice to meet that need. In the case of Santa Clara County, the Legal Aid Society has stated that it will no longer provide legal services to indigents in matters concerning family law, bankruptcy law and juvenile law. It is anticipated that these cases will amount to approximately 3600 per year.

We earnestly request that the State Bar Board of Governors consider the matter in the light of the above resolution and inform us of its action thereon.

Very truly yours,

RICHARD J. WYLIE, *President.*

JUDGE HARRY A. BLACKMUN

HON. ALBERT H. QUIE

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 20, 1970

Mr. QUIE. Mr. Speaker, Minnesota is doubly honored by having two men nominated for the Supreme Court from our State. One is now the Chief Justice and I anticipate that the second will be an Associate Justice in the near future.

The President has wisely nominated Circuit Court Judge Harry A. Blackmun for the current vacancy on the Supreme Court. Judge Blackmun lives in Rochester, Minn. in my congressional district and I wish to draw the attention of my colleagues to the editorial in the Rochester Post Bulletin of April 11, 1970.

Having known Judge Blackmun for many years, I can vouch for the excellent personal recommendation given Judge Blackmun in the editorial. I hope the Senate moves quickly to confirm this man who is so eminently qualified to serve on our highest court.

The editorial follows:

JUDGE BLACKMUN FOR HIGH COURT? HE'D BE SUPERB!

When a baseball pitcher goes into the late innings of a game with a no-hitter in progress, the radio-TV broadcasters are sometimes reluctant to even mention that fact on the air, for fear of "jinxing" the pitcher's chances of reaching baseball's charmed circle.

We feel a bit that way in trying to editorialize on the news that U.S. Circuit Judge Harry A. Blackmun of Rochester is one of evidently only two or three jurists being considered by President Nixon for appointment to the U.S. Supreme Court.

We know nothing of the qualifications of the other men being considered. No doubt either or all of them would be outstanding nominees, particularly since Mr. Nixon's last two nominees were rejected by the Senate and the President simply must do a lot better the third time around.

We do know a good deal about Harry A. Blackmun. Not first-hand about his legal and judicial competence, of course, since editorial writers are seldom lawyers or judges. But on that score there is a mountain of testimony from lawyers and judges, who do know, that Blackmun is a superb legal scholar. We are confident his professional record will stand tall in any investigation.

But, in these days when a Supreme Court nominee's personal and community life is also so important, an editorial writer who has known Harry Blackmun for 20 years is qualified to say a few things on that score.

First of all, he will be embarrassed by words of praise, for he is a very modest and unassuming man. So we'll keep it short. We know of no man in Rochester, or indeed in Minnesota, who is more respected by close friends and casual acquaintances alike; who has a

higher reputation for integrity; whose judgment is more respected.

While his academic and professional record is "a matter of record," so to speak, let it be added that just as a man—a man of personal integrity—none can rate higher.

It is hardly a secret that when Richard Nixon was elected in 1968 many Minnesotans had high hopes that Judge Blackmun might be elevated to the Supreme Court. But when another outstanding Minnesotan, Warren Burger, was named Chief Justice, those hopes seemed to be extinguished since as a practical political matter two Minnesotans (who are close personal friends) are unlikely to be named to the High Court virtually at the same time.

This is still a drawback to Judge Blackmun's chances, of course. But the usual "rules" no longer apply in the wake of the rejection of two straight Southern nominees. Now Harry Blackmun is very much in the running.

Those in a position to know far better than we, say Judge Blackmun qualifies as a "strict constructionist" of the Constitution. We know him to be a man of moderate, commonsense views. If nominated, we believe he would be confirmed by an overwhelming margin in the Senate.

For Judge Blackmun, such nomination would be the highest honor that can be accorded a jurist; for Rochester and Minnesota it would be a "feather in the cap." But most important, we believe, he would serve with real distinction on the Supreme Court and thereby benefit all Americans.

Needless to say, we sincerely hope that President Nixon does select Judge Harry A. Blackmun for nomination to the U.S. Supreme Court.

THE TAMARIND DECADE: 1960–70

HON. THOMAS M. REES

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 20, 1970

Mr. REES. Mr. Speaker, under the leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following:

THE TAMARIND DECADE: 1960–70

The Tamarind Decade: 1960–1970 will be celebrated in Los Angeles on April 28, 1970, at famed, experimental Tamarind Lithography Workshop, Inc., of Los Angeles. At that time announcement will be made of the formation of the Tamarind Institute, a permanent professional training center to be operated jointly by the University of New Mexico and the Tamarind Lithography Workshop, Inc. This is the first time that any institution other than the Ford Foundation will participate in the basic support of a Tamarind activity.

Focus of a nationwide renaissance in fine art lithography, Tamarind operated for 10 years as a pilot program through grants from the Ford Foundation. This, plus its own earnings, brought to nearly $2 million the figure so far dedicated to a multifaceted attack on the problems faced by an art form which was almost extinct in the United States 10 years ago.

In its first decade, the workshop gained international recognition as the germinal source of the current resurgence of lithography in the United States. Artists of every genre are now at work with a new generation of master-printers trained at Tamarind.

The Ford Foundation saw Tamarind as a rescue operation for an art that was near extinction in this country and fading fast in Europe. Although the 1950's saw considerable artist interest in etching, serigraphy, and the woodcut, little was being done in lithography due to this art form's need for master-printers capable of processing lithograph stone. Artists who wished to work in the medium were obliged to go to Europe to find the artisans they needed. Among these artists was June Wayne. In 1958, en route to Paris to create lithographs, Miss Wayne attended a meeting with D. McNeil Lowry, director of the then newly-formed Program in Humanities and the Arts of the Ford Foundation. At that time, the Ford Foundation was deepening its still new commitment to support the arts. Miss Wayne pointed up the problems of artists who were interested in lithography. The suggestion was made that Miss Wayne indicate how she thought the art of lithography could be rescued in our country. This she did. By late 1959, the Foundation felt that her views were worth testing. With the Foundation's support, Miss Wayne set up Tamarind Lithography Workshop, Inc., a non-profit organization named for the Los Angeles street on which it was located.

To create conditions under which a genuine flowering of lithography could take place, her design for the Workshop set for itself six goals:

1. To create a pool of master-printers in the United States;
2. To develop artists of all styles into masters of the medium;
3. To accustom artists and printers to collaboration so that each would respond to the other and thus to the expressive potential of the medium;
4. To stimulate new markets for the lithograph;
5. To guide the printer to earn a living outside of subsidy or dependence directly on the artist as a source of income;
6. To restore the prestige of lithography by creating a collection of extraordinary lithographs.

The resulting collection of several thousand lithographs has done much to establish in the public consciousness the worth of lithography as an art form.

From 1962 on, exhibitions and one-man shows by Tamarind artists have been seen in art galleries, museums, and universities across the country and in various parts of the world. "TAMARIND: HOMAGE TO LITHOGRAPHY", a four-month exhibition during 1969, at the Museum of Modern Art in New York, included selections from the preceding nine years.

How well the Workshop fulfilled its original six goals is reflected in these facts. From July 1, 1960, to April 1, 1970, Tamarind gave grants to 103 artists, who, in addition to 252 guest artists, curatorial grantees, staff members and printer-trainees, used approximately 3,000 editions of lithographs containing some 90,000 individual original works of art. A conservative estimate of the aggregate value of these art works now is *upward* of twenty million dollars.

At the Workshop artist-fellows working directly with artisan-printers produced images in limited editions of twenty each. The artist owns these twenty impressions which reach the public through the artist's gallery or agent. Nine additional impressions were pulled on different paper for Tamarind of which seven have gone to various museums and institutional subscribers that acquire one impression of every print made at Tamarind. The remaining two complete folios are used by Tamarind for reference, teaching purposes, and public exhibitions.

Original prints pulled from the stones at Tamarind Workshop have soared in value. Clinton Adams reminds us that "where in the 1950's it was unusual to find an artist who *had* worked in lithography, today few American artists have not done so either at Tamarind or at workshops resulting from its program."

Thus, the threatened death of art lithography in the United States has been turned today into flourishing creativity. Printers who have passed through the Workshop program have established free enterprise workshops of their own around the country. Many important artists in communities where access to the complex techniques, equipment, and talents were unavailable, now have entered the medium.

This ability of Tamarind-trained master-printers to work closely with artists of many styles "when paper kisses stone," seem evident enough that the Tamarind idea has succeeded. The fact of the existence of a 40 million dollar "Art of Lithography Industry" which is growing each year, further attests to the impact the revival of lithography has had on the art-collecting public. New collectors have found that these works of fine art are within their relatively modest means, and also are good investments for the future.

Many letters from former artist-fellows in Tamarind files praise the Workshop and their experiences there. Their comments make it apparent that artists are happy about the revival of lithography.

H. C. Westermann called his Tamarind experience ". . . the most harmonious working period of my life."

Japanese artist Masuo Ikeda reflects the high standards set by Tamarind when he wrote ". . . since Tamarind I have made lithographs in Europe and Japan and have been very disappointed: the quality cannot begin to compare with that now in the United States."

Many internationally known artists did their first extended series of lithographs at Tamarind. These include Josef Albers and Herbert Bayer as well as Louise Nevelson among dozens of U.S. artists. From abroad there were Gio Pomodoro of Italy; Canogar and Bru of Spain; Turnbull and Jones from England; Levee, Butor, Avati and Masurovsky from France; and from south of the border, Cuevas, Tamayo and Gego. In addition guest artists from many other countries made lithographs at Tamarind during briefer visits.

Louise Nevelson, noted artist commenting on the Tamarind Decade 1960–70 said:

"One of the great creative experiences was my good fortune to have been in Tamarind to make lithographs. The climate and intelligent help I received was a perfect experience. I loved it."

Also pointing up Tamarind's success in accomplishing what it set out to do are the remarks of Virginia Allen, in her introduction to the Museum of Modern Art exhibition catalogue for "Tamarind: Homage to Lithography." Miss Allen notes the rebirth of the art of lithography in the United States in the 1960's and says, "Tamarind is at once the product and progenetrix of this renaissance."

In his preface to the catalogue, William S. Lieberman chose to quote Tamarind founder-director June Wayne, who once had told him: "The importance of Tamarind will depend on what happens long after this decade is over. If artists who never heard of us, and master-printers we'll never meet, create marvelous works of art in this medium, then we are a success."

Now after ten years of intense work, Miss Wayne feels that the Tamarind idea has proven its point and that the time has come for a new phase in its development.

She notes that there are three professional workshops on the West Coast alone; many others across the country are the result of the Tamarind program. The free enterprise base of the art now demands more printers and curators than there are professionals to fill the positions. Wages are comparable to teaching levels, and in the case of exceptional masterprinters, higher. Demands for these professionals will increase as the years go on: so there is urgent need for an ongoing professional training center.

Tamarind hoped to stimulate a market of 100,000 print collectors by 1970. Today, that

mark probably has been exceeded. The value of signed original prints, in limited editions, rose dramatically in some cases several hundred times, to a point where there is an adequate economic base for this form of art. The rise in price also recognizes that original prints often are more difficult and more expensive to create than a drawing or a painting. This is due to the complex nature of its processes.

Original prints are being welcomed by the American people at a level of connoisseurship well above that accorded most art forms. Appreciation is for the unique beauty of their own nature, not merely as a substitute for painting and sculpture.

Another active member of Tamarind's Board, Calvin J. Goodman, a management and industrial engineer, says that the Tamarind program points the way to how some business techniques can be used to support the arts. "The knowledge that produces missiles and lands men on the moon can be adapted to the protection of our cultural resources." Mr. Goodman also points out that the tax-exempt dollars used by Tamarind during the last decade are rapidly, increasingly, coming back into the national treasury in taxes paid by dealers, investors, artisans, artists, and many other job holders who can earn their living as a result of the Tamarind experiment.

"There is," he says, "a recognizable (however modest) segment of the growth of the gross national product that derives from the burgeoning interest in original prints."

This renaissance certainly was assisted by the double nature of Miss Wayne's original plan which linked creative opportunities with hard-headed support by management techniques. She calls this "understanding the jungle and making it support, not strangle, you."

And what about June Wayne, who is "progenetrix" of the Tamarind idea? She will continue to direct Tamarind Lithography Workshop, Inc. and its many national activities; she also will serve as program consultant and on the executive committee of the Institute. But she is becoming much more visible again as an artist and has a backlog of nine years of art works to release. More are in preparation in her studio, including six large tapestries to be woven in Poland, Mexico, and France. "There are," she points out with a certain annoyance, "no tapestry artisans available in the United States for U.S. artists to collaborate with."

PANEL OF SELECTION OF TAMARIND LITHOGRAPHY WORKSHOP, INC.

Clinton Adams, Dean, College of Fine Arts, University of New Mexico, Albuquerque.

Dr. E. Maurice Bloch, Director, Grunwald Graphic Arts Foundation, University of California, Los Angeles.

Kenneth Callahan, Artist, Long Beach, Washington.

John Entenza, Director, Graham Foundation for Advanced Studies in the Fine Arts, Chicago.

Ebria Feinblatt, Curator of Prints and Drawings, Los Angeles County Museum of Art.

Alfred Frenkenstein, Critic, San Francisco, California.

Harold Joachim, Curator of Prints and Drawings, The Art Institute, Chicago.

William Lieberman, Director, Department of Painting and Sculpture, Museum of Modern Art, New York.

Douglas MacAgy, Director, National Exhibition Program, National Endowment for the Arts, Washington, D.C.

Dr. Peter Selz, Director, University Art Museum, Berkeley, California.

James Johnson Sweeney, New York.

Gustave von Groschwitz, Associate Director, Museum of Art, University of Iowa, Iowa City.

Carl Zigrosser, Curator Emeritus, Philadelphia Museum of Art, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania.

BOARD OF DIRECTORS OF TAMARIND LITHOGRAPHY WORKSHOP, INC.

Dr. E. Maurice Bloch, Director, Grunwald Graphic Arts Foundation, University of California, Los Angeles.

William Brice, Professor of Art, University of California, Los Angeles.

Rudd Brown, Pasadena, California.

Dr. Sims Carter, Dean of Academic Department, Art Center College of Design, Los Angeles.

John Entenza, Director, Graham Foundation for Advanced Studies in the Fine Arts, Chicago.

Ebria Feinblatt, Curator of Prints and Drawings, Los Angeles County Museum of Art.

Calvin J. Goodman, Management Consultant in the Arts and to Tamarind, Los Angeles.

Allan J. Greenberg, Legal Counsel for Tamarind, Los Angeles.

Elizabeth Hanson, Pasadena, California.

Harold Joachim, Curator of Prints and Drawings, The Art Institute, Chicago.

William Lieberman, Director, Department of Painting and Sculpture, Museum of Modern Art, New York.

James Johnson Sweeney, New York.

Gustave von Groschwitz, Associate Director, Museum of Art, University of Iowa, Iowa City.

June Wayne, Artist, Los Angeles.

Edward H. Weiss, President, Edward H. Weiss and Company, Chicago.

Clinton Adams, Program Consultant to Tamarind Lithography Workshop, Inc.

Garo Antreasian, Technical Consultant to Tamarind Lithography Workshop, Inc.

GERMAN SOCIETY OF MARYLAND AWARDS MEDALS

REMARKS
OF

HON. EDWARD A. GARMATZ

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 20, 1970

Mr. GARMATZ. Mr. Speaker, organized originally to help the German immigrants in the United States, the German Society of Maryland has changed its policies to meet current needs. At its annual dinner it now presents a German Society Medal to persons who have distinguished themselves in education or public service.

At the 187th anniversary dinner, held in Baltimore on April 10, awards were made to Charles F. Stein, Jr., a distinguished lawyer and the author of several books dealing with history and law; and to Dr. Ernst Cloos, professor emeritus of geology at the Johns Hopkins University, a former president of the Geological Society of America and now chairman of the Commission for Maryland Geological Survey.

The president of the German Society of Maryland is Kurt H. George, and those participating in the program were Henry P. Thau, chairman of the dinner committee; the Reverend Friedman H. Penner, who gave the invocation; and the Reverend Martin A. Schwalenberg, pastor of St. Charles Catholic Church. Folk singing was led by Dr. Johann H. Eltermann.

The toastmaster was the former Governor of Maryland and mayor of Baltimore, Theodore R. McKeldin, who also made a brief address to the group. I believe his remarks will be of interest to all Members and, therefore, I am inserting them in the RECORD for their perusal:

The greatness of a nation, like that of a person, radiates from its being. It is expressed by the thinking of its collective mind and displayed in its lasting contributions to the rise and the progress of civilization.

The genuineness of Germany's greatness is demonstrated by the survival of her influence in the world, after lapses into times of evil leadership, in which the German people, intent on their culture, their inventiveness, their arts and the humanities, neglected to attend to the affairs of politics. They trusted Government to the wrong hands.

The greatness of Germany is particularly emphasized today in much of the leadership that is given by her sons and by Americans of German origin and descent in America's contributions to the progress of the great new sciences which inspire scholarship throughout the world and hold the interest of all thinking people.

It was through German immigration to these shores that the great values of the German way of life were brought to bless America. British and Spanish and French and Italian—whatever may be the origin of our American families, we have all profited by what Germany has contributed, as we hope German-Americans have profited by what the rest of us have to give.

It is the great good fortune of the American that, in things of the mind and spirit, he inherits from all nations, regardless of his own descent. His ancestors may have roamed the Scottish highlands, or the Russian steppes, or have built their homes around the Irish lakes or in the African jungles. No matter. As an American, he has fallen heir to the music of Bach, to the philosophy of Kant, to the science of Leibnitz and the poetry of Goethe. For those Americans who came originally from Germany have brought with them the riches of the German mind and spirit, to add to the common treasure.

All of us are under an obligation to preserve this treasure, but I think you will agree that a special obligation lies upon each group to preserve first of all the contribution that our own people brought.

Certainly Beethoven must be studied by an Italian-American musician, Mommsen by an Anglo-American historian, Ehrlich by a Spanish-American physician. But while those great names must command the respectful admiration of an American named McKeldin, it is reasonable to suppose they aroused not only respectful admiration but also a warm glow of pride in an American named Eisenhower. A German-American should be duly grateful for all that other nations have given us, but he must be particularly proud of what Germans have given us.

Among the gracious gifts that have come from the Fatherland, none is better worth preserving than the tradition of compassion for the helpless that is conspicuous in the German character. The Christmas Tree is an importation from Germany. It is the most beautiful of all symbols of our belief that the strongest of claims upon our generous sympathy is the claim of sheer helplessness. In the case of the Christmas Tree it is the helplessness of youth. Children cannot command, they can only appeal; yet the glittering tree is evidence that their appeal has moved the German heart in a way that the command of great Caesar never could.

Love of family and parental respect are outstanding virtues of the German people, and here in America, among the people of German descent, we find the young and the old in particularly close communion. In German families, the aged are cared for—not as a mere duty—but as a product of love.

I am sure there are among us the sons and daughters of men of German blood, but whose mothers are descended from people of other lands—or vice versa. I am sure that they have learned to love and respect the great German traditions—even as they love

and respect the qualities handed down from the lands of the other parents' origins.

There are here non-German husbands and non-German wives with spouses whose family roots are in the Fatherland—learning even today of the greatness into which they are wed—and filled with a new pride for this America which makes possible the blending of so much that is fine in all the world.

The task of Americans, if we are to achieve our high destiny in the years ahead, is to select the best from all the national cultures that have been brought to this land. We have among us representatives of all traditions, of all manners and customs, of all intellectual disciplines. In each of them there is something excellent; and if we might select the excellent from each, we could weave them all into a tapestry of such brilliance and beauty as the world has never seen.

But to be able to do that we must first learn to recognize the excellent when we see it. And if we wish to recognize the excellent in an alien culture, the best preparation is to study carefully what is excellent in our own. This is why it is first-rate Americanism for Americans of German blood to study, and practice and strengthen all that is fine in German tradition, not for itself alone, but in order that America may profit. The German-American should study other cultures too, but he will appreciate the others sooner if he first learns to appreciate all that is best in his own.

And all this blending and all this sharing never will obliterate all that is great in the German nature.

Down through the years and through the centuries we will find German names among the great artists and musicians, the surgeons and physicians, the lawyers and the writers and all the rest. And often if the great one's name is O'Neil or Adkins, or Semanski or Donato or Jones, it will not be at all unlikely if his mother were a Speicher, or a Pramschufer, or a Thau, a Schneidereith or a Franke. I might add, when the name is McKeldin, the mother's name was Grief and the grandmother's was Cunigunda Vinzel.

Yes, and now that this period of trial and error in the launching of man's great new adventure in the exploration of outer space has settled down to an era of real accomplishment among the stars, we know that Dr. Wernher von Braun leads this tremendous undertaking, and the first man to step on the moon was Neil Armstrong, who, I understand, has the same ancestry as I, he comes from German and Scot blood. No doubt many of the planning boards and many of the ships of space will be manned by keen and courageous Americans whose names would have familiar rings in Berlin, Hamburg or Heidelberg.

Yes, we of America—you and I and all our neighbors—are thankful for the Germans among us and the German within us—and all they have done for these United States and a better world.

OTHER DEVELOPED NATIONS ASSISTING IN SHARING WORLD'S PROSPERITY

HON. JOHN C. CULVER

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 20, 1970

Mr. CULVER. Mr. Speaker, the International Development Conference, which was held in late February here in Washington, brought together some of the most informed and knowledgeable persons on the subject of foreign assistance from all over the world. The conference provided the occasion for a provocative exchange of ideas between representatives of often widely differing points of view.

I was privileged to participate in these meetings and was deeply impressed, in particular, to learn of the sustained efforts being made by the other developed nations of the world to assist other countries in their quest for a meaningful share of the world's prosperity. I believe that the American public would benefit from an understanding of the strides which are being taken in this direction.

Therefore, I would like to insert in the RECORD two speeches delivered at the conference, one by the Right Honorable Judith Hart, Member of Parliament and British Minister of Overseas Development, and the second by Ambassador Edwin Martin, chairman of the Development Assistance Committee of the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development. The first explains the British program of foreign assistance and the second relates the steps being undertaken by other developed countries:

TEXT OF SPEECH DELIVERED BY THE RIGHT HONORABLE JUDITH HART

I want to start by saying what a pleasure it is to be addressing you today. Over the last few days I have been completely immersed in the subject of aid and development at conferences in New York and in Canada. Experts, specialists, decision-makers in development, we have had valuable and, I hope, fruitful discussions and exchanged useful ideas. The size of the audience this morning shows that there is a world of interest in overseas development outside the professionals' field.

I am one of those who believe that the vast problem of development in the poorer world is the most challenging issue of our time.

In this nuclear age many of us have been, and are, concerned about the survival of mankind. But looking at the human state of the world today, I am drawn to the conclusion that conditions exist which could be as explosive as any nuclear bomb, and which we dare not ignore.

As the advance of technology and communications reduces this planet to the dimensions of an island, we can no longer tolerate in our midst the vast scourge of poverty that today affects two-thirds of human kind. We of the developed nations must not continue to behave as if the world ends at the edge of our own affluence. The Pearson Commission Report put it in a telling phrase. It said: "Who can now ask where his country will be in a few decades without asking where the world will be? If we wish that world to be secure and prosperous, we must show a common concern for the common problems of all peoples."

The whole point about aid for development, it seems to me, is that it is an essential strategy for securing the well-being of "us" as well as "them". And it is not a case now of not knowing how to organise this strategy. The conferences, meetings, and seminars I have attended here in North America and elsewhere have each arrived at the clear conclusion that economically, scientifically, and in every other way we know what to do, and we largely know how to do it. What is needed now is the will.

This is the value of the Pearson Report. Exploding upon us as The Second Development decade is about to begin, this Report is above all a call for action. In its analysis, it brings together what is now known about the whole development process. Although we know a great deal, much more detailed study has to be undertaken, as Mr. McNamara pointed out in New York last week. But our knowledge of the development process and our machinery of aid management is large enough for us to act in confidence.

We would however be making a mistake if we of the developed countries were to believe that development depended exclusively upon our efforts. The Pearson Report brought home most forcefully that development is primarily a matter of self help by the people of the developing world. It is they who carry the burden; it is they who have to set the pace. We in the developed countries cannot do it for them. What we can do, and what we must do, is to help them to gain the extra strength they need to increase significantly their standards of life. The aid effort of the developed world, though small in relation to the total needs, is vital in enabling our friends in the less developed countries to make a breakthrough.

I came into office as Minister of Overseas Development only three or four days after the Pearson Report was published. There could not have been a more exciting or challenging time to take on such a job. I was at once plunged into the discussion of all the key issues of aid policy which confront us today. How could we best respond to the challenge of development needs? On what lines can the Second Development Decade be most fruitfully and effectively organized? How and by what time can we live up to our pledge, made at the second UNCTAD Conference in 1968, to move towards the provision of total financial flows to the developing world of 1% of our gross national product? In particular, what should be the future level of our official aid programme? One thing can be said about the Pearson Report, there was no beating about the bush; the objectives and targets it set us developed nations were coherent, unequivocal.

You would like to know where Britain stands in relation to the major fields of action set out in the Pearson Report. It had a great deal to say about the terms and conditions of development assistance. On this Britain's performance has been good. Our gross aid programme has been running for a few years now around, or a little above, 200 million pounds ($480m). Not many of those in Britain who press us to do even better in the field of aid, realize that over half the British aid programme (53%) is in great form—that is, non-returnable money. Only 47% is in loan form, and of these loans over 90% are today provided free of interest, with pay-back periods of about twenty-five years, and with about seven years grace period when no repayments are made at all. We were driven to the conclusion in 1965 because of the mounting burden of debt on past loans, particularly in the case of India, that some initiative had to be taken to alleviate this burden. We realize, however, that many more steps have yet to be taken, not only by Britain, but by all donor countries in softening the terms of aid.

Then there is the question of the relationship between aid and trade. Some people talk as if they were alternatives. I believe that in the present state of under-development they are complementary. Both are important strands in the net-work of relations between the developed and developing world. But I think you know that British trade policies have traditionally been inspired by outward-looking principles, and that we have done our best to avoid protectionist devices and to give as free access as possible to the products of the less developed countries. This is an attitude which is deeply ingrained in British thinking, and I have no fear that it will alter significantly as we go into the next Development Decade.

We richer countries were asked in the Pearson Report to increase the proportion of our official aid programmes directed towards the multilateral institutions. In Brit-

ain, we have for a long time given support to the multilateral idea, and while the major portion of our development assistance will continue on a bilateral, government-to-government basis, we are determined to increase our multilateral contribution. I am happy to say that the proportion of our aid programme going to multilateral assistance will increase from just over 10% (at which it has been for several years) to about 14% by next year. We confidently hope to maintain an upward movement in multilateral aid in the years to come.

But of course, we all know that in the dialogue that has surrounded the Pearson recommendations the dominating question has been one of the volume of aid. The target of 1% of GNP has become a somewhat magical figure. It has to a large extent been so since the second UNCTAD in 1968. Let me say, here and now, that while the one percent is of course important, I believe that the proportion of that target figure which comes from official aid is of greater significance. Pearson was right to give a figure for official aid, because if we are going to go in for targetry then we ought to be aiming at a figure of financial assistance which governments can control. Private investment is largely out of the control of governments, and is sometimes difficult to quantify in terms of statistics which can be understood.

We, in Britain, accept the need to reach higher targets in the provision of official aid. We recognize, as you will, our difficulties in doing so against the background of the economic situation through which my country has been passing.

At the 1968 UNCTAD we gave an undertaking to reach one percent of GNP for aid. Because of balance of payments difficulties we were, at that time, unable to give a date for reaching it. But I am happy to say that this situation is now changing. In our Parliament toward the end of last year I was able to give an indication of a date when we might reach it.

As an outcome of a review of the whole range of public expenditure, home and abroad, carried out by the British Government last autumn, the aid programme is going to rise over the next four years. From about £220m. ($528m.) in the current financial year, our aid will rise to £300 million ($720m.) by the end of the financial year 1973/74. If we carry the rate of progression of these figures forward beyond that time, we could well reach the one percent UNCTAD target just after 1975 (given that private investment was at a high rate), but in any case we fully untend to reach the one percent by 1980.

Against the background of the doldrums through which Britain's aid programme has been passing in recent years, taking into account our very recent economic difficulties, and the priorities in home spending which my Government have to weigh up carefully, it is a significant measure of the British effort of will that over the next four years the air programme will be rising faster than almost any other public expenditure in Britain, moving to an acceleration of 13 percent.

I cannot say to you that the British aid programme is yet anywhere near the recommended target of 0.7%. But I am confident that if we can continue to increase our aid programme beyond 1974 at the same rate as up to that year, we shall be on course for reaching that target by the end of the Second Development Decade.

There are several other major donors who have farther to go than we in Britain. Our percentage for aid in relation to GNP is at the moment 0.42. That of the United States is somewhat lower. Both of us have tended to have a gradually diminishing grap line of aid in relation to GNP. The Pearson Report recognized that Britain and the United States, together with Belgium and Italy, would find it difficult to meet recommended targets. So we were urged as a first step to arrest the downward trend and create an upward movement in our programme. My country's rising aid programme over the next four years does just that. I hope that may be able to be matched by this great country of the United States and by the other donor countries in the same position.

We can look at this whole problem in terms of the cold statistics of world inequality. We can compare the per capita income in Britain of about 620 pounds ($1.488) with that of Malawi with a per capita income of 15 pounds ($36). Or the United States with a per capita income $4,650 with India where the equivalent figure is 35 pounds ($84). We can follow the League tables which show the rich world growing richer much faster than the poor world and we can look at the stark figures of malnutrition, and ill health. But behind the statistics are people and the distress of people. And the involvement of the rich developed world is vital to them.

It is not that if we hold back on development assistance the free market forces of the world will gradually even things out. The operation of free market forces indeed, would be likely to widen the gap, sharpen the inequalities, deepen the relative poverty of the developing world. The mushroom growth of communications and mass media in our own highly literate and sophisticated societies brings the full and vivid picture before us. There they are, the men, the women, the children, on our television screens and in our newspapers. We cannot escape into the complacency of not knowing or of not caring. Oh Calcutta, is one thing on Broadway but it is a cry of anguish if you stand in the "bustee" areas of that tragic city.

So, knowing all this, how much do we care? How much do people want their governments to care? We are confronted again with the question of will.

In this whole business of aid and development and in our discussions on how to achieve an increase in the volume of aid, we will largely be wasting our time if we leave out of account public attitudes to this whole operation.

Development economists and administrators may, with great profit, exchange views and ideas which can bring better understanding of what needs to be done on the professional level, but the end-game is inevitably played out by the ordinary man in the street. It is he who has to be convinced, in terms he can understand.

It is true that governments can give the lead in policy matters which in their judgment are important even if they are not nationally popular. It is equally true that no government functioning under a democratic system can get too far ahead of public opinion. The people have to be carried along with government policies and be increasingly convinced of their rightness and their necessity. That is why I, as a politician in a democratic country attach such importance to information and public relations in the matter of aid.

There is a direct relationship between public attitudes to aid in the richer countries and the amount of extra assistance developing countries can expect over the period of the Second Development Decade.

And developing countries must understand that when, in international discussions, we of the developed world sometimes draw attention to the state of our public opinion, we are not raising a red herring, or making excuses. It is because we know that no major upward spurt in aid allocation is likely without public sympathy.

Concern to inform public attitudes cannot and should not be confined to the richer countries alone. Development assistance is a partnership operation; we are involved one with another and the public, especially the literate public, in developing countries ought to have the same sense of involvement that we are trying to communicate to the peoples in the developed world.

The Sixties, the first development decade, saw a growth in disenchantment about the giving of aid among the people in the richer countries. Today, following the broadening of the dialogue of this subject over the last two or three years, aid weariness is receding.

I am in fact optimistic, and I get this feeling when I look at the attitude of the young people today. The drop-outs and the addicts get the headlines, but the great mass of youth today, certainly in Britain and Europe, care about the world they live in. And one of the increasing passions of young people concerns the injustice and the indignity of world poverty.

The young in America also are expressing their concern about injustices—in the social sphere. Youth today are right to concern themselves with the quality of life. But concern for the problems we see around us can know no national boundaries. And no government anywhere will claim the support of the young unless it manifestly exercises the will to fulfill their ideals. Among our young in Britain, the issue of world poverty has a high priority.

This is why I am optimistic. The young in our countries will not allow us to fail in providing more resources for development of the poorer world.

TEXT OF SPEECH DELIVERED BY AMBASSADOR EDWIN MARTIN

I have been asked to discuss the development assistance prospects of donor countries other than the UK, on which Mrs. Hart has just reported so ably and encouragingly.

Before getting specific, I should warn you that I have little confidence in most kinds of forecasting, and less than that with respect to most economic matters. I can only hope that my errors on the side of optimism will at least be matched by those of too great pessimism.

Forecasting is particularly risky at this time since, in addition to the just completed UK review Mrs. Hart has described to you, half a dozen of the other DAC countries, including several of the major donors, will be completing thorough reexamination of their programs this year, most of them before July 1.

In the U.S., as you will hear later, this reflects the need for a new assessment as a result not just of a new party in the White House, but also to take account of new attitudes toward the outside world and the U.S. role in it.

In Canada and Germany new governments with new outlooks on social problems at home and abroad and new conceptions of what is the most appropriate way for their countries to participate significantly in international relations have been restudying thoroughly their future lines of action.

In the Netherlands, Norway and Denmark, all countries with strong support from the public for help to the developing world and pressure from their legislatures to do more and do it better, active reexaminations have been initiated to find ways to meet these pressures.

In Japan a growing recognition of the international role Japan must play if she is to achieve a position in international affairs consummate with her new economic path has stimulated a series of basic studies of how her aid effort can best be expanded.

This coincidence of so many reappraisals has arisen not just from a new climate of general concern about quality of life of all peoples and appreciation of the planet as seen from the moon, but it also has received strong impetus from the injuncture of the publication of the powerful Report of the Pearson Commission on International Development and of the need to take bold decisions to launch the Second Development Dec-

ade with a real sense of partnership among all nations, no matter where they stand on the wave of development and modernization. These actions have also been stimulated by the adoption at UNCTAD II in 1968 of a new target of 11% GNP, 25% on the average higher than the old one, and by the approval by DAC a year ago of a new more ambitious target for softening the terms of aid.

With this background it is safe to assume that in all cases except the U.S., the outcome will be improvements in the quality and quantity of the aid effort. The issue is how much. Whether this will also apply to the U.S. Review, Paul Clark can tell you much better than I. What I can do is underline the fundamental importance to everyone of the U.S. decisions.

Of total public and private net flows in 1968 of around 13 billion, the U.S. contributed 45%, though it had over 50% of the GNP of DAC members and is the richest of them on a per capita basis. This was a new low percentage wise and put the U.S. in 11th place as percent of GNP.

Though the GNP 11% target was not yet applicable to 1968 disbursements, it is interesting to note that all DAC countries net flow was 77% of combined GNP, that of the U.S. .66 and that of all 15 other counties 89%.

In dealing with volume forecasting I will address myself only to what we in DAC call "Official Development Assistance," concessional loans or grants with development as their primary objective and I agree entirely with Mrs. Hart on its primary importance. This excludes two categories which count toward the agreed 1% of GNP target—official export credits and net private flows.

Some inferences about future volumes can be drawn from performance in the recent past. For this purpose it is necessary to group France, of the countries I have been asked to discuss, with the U.S. and U.K. as large donors with stagnate programs. For the remaining 13, providing 29% of net flows of ODA in 1968, the record of the past five years encourages optimism about the future. Whereas the dollar total of the US, UK and France was five percent lower in 1968 than five years earlier in 1963, that of the other 13 had grown by 90%. I am convinced that their growth will continue at a substantial rate for the foreseeable future. It will be useful to review their prospects, to see why I am so sure of this.

Germany reached a record level of $550 million net in 1968, but as .42% of GNP it was not as high as she reached several times during the '60's. The net dollar volumes, helped by the revaluation of the mark, is expected to increase 10% in 1969 and again in 1970. The Social Democratic Government which took power after the September elections has paid high tribute to the Pearson report as the basis for their development policy. As a result future programs are being actively reviewed and a 11% annual increase in appropriations and, subsequently, disbursements has been announced as the government's objective.

Japanese net ODS has been on a rising scale, though disbursements in 1968 fell nearly 12% from the 1967 figure to about $350 million or only .25% of GNP, the lowest percentage since 1964. We expect substantial increases in 1969 and 1970 as there was a 36% increase in aid appropriations in FY 1969. Both the Finance and Foreign Ministers made speeches in 1969 in which they stated that Japan's expanding economy and improving balance of payments would not only permit but require a rapid expansion of the Japanese official assistance program. This gives an assurance that this growth will be maintained in 1970 and 71, after which time the level will depend primarily on the outcome of the review referred to earlier, to be inspired, announced the Prime Minister, by the Pearson Report.

Canada has built up a considerable pipeline as a result of various obstacles to rapid disbursement, by no means all Canada's fault, which limited official development assistance expenditures in 1968 to $175 m. It seems pretty firm that the 1969 figure will reach somewhere between $250 and $275 million. The level should continue to improve somewhat in 1970. Again 1971 and beyond figures will be determined largely by the outcome of the current review.

Of the remaining donors, Sweden, Netherlands, Norway and Denmark are all operating now under firm long-term programs for large increases in volume. We in DAC are in favor of this technique for two reasons. First it helps to insulate aid appropriations from the pressures of temporary budget or balance of payments pressures, especially the former. This is because so large a percentage of most national budgets reflects continuing legal obligations and the pressure to cut is concentrated on the few unprotected programs. Secondly, in most cases this forward planning has been accompanied by authority to commit future year appropriations up to certain levels, thus enabling developing countries, at least in theory, to do better forward planning of their investment programs. I say "at least in theory" because for some reasons which are not yet wholly clear to me, this authority has been little used thus far.

Australia has not such a commitment but has been and expects to continue to raise its volume above present high levels and keep it an all-grant program, currently the only one. Italy, Austria and Portugal are still somewhat special cases of relatively low income countries still working toward effective and adequate assistance policies and programs.

To finish on volume, I must say a word about the stagnant French effort. France started the '60's with a very large program which equalled about 1.4% of GNP. This was to some extent a carryover from the pre-independence period. The actual level of disbursements has fluctuated up and down since, settling in 1968 at almost exactly the 1960 level of some $850 million. But by then the % of GNP had fallen to .68, still close to the Pearson goal of .70. Given the financial and social problems with which France is currently wrestling, I fear that the most one can hope for is a maintenance of this % of GNP. But if other major donors, and especially the US, do not start closing the gap between their performance and that of France—the US was about .4 in 1968—French volume is apt to stagnate and her % fall.

The existence of a large and growing pipeline of committed but unexpended funds, up a billion in bilateral hands in 1968, is often referred to as another insurance that future net disbursements will be increased by a gradual reduction of this backlog of available but unused money. It is, of course regrettable that funds which have been made available by taxpayers for development assistance should be in banks in developed countries and not converted into resources contributing to a higher quality of life in developing countries. The amounts are not at present knowable, but probably are equivalent as a minimum to a year's net official flows or $6–7B. Drawing upon funds not only from donors but from private capital markets and other sources, the multilateral financial institutions have a pipeline of something like another $3–4B. It is a much higher percentage, some 3 or 4 years disbursements, primarily because this lending is usually for large capital projects which take several years to complete.

On balance I fear one should not expect a significant impulse to disbursements as a result of pipeline reductions over the coming years, though for a year or two these can be a small cushion against temporary fluctuations in appropriations, as has happened in the last couple of years in the case of the US. But barring an unexpected increase in administrative efficiency of both donors and recipients or major changes in program structures the commitment-disbursement timelag should not be expected to improve significantly overall.

On balance then I would expect disbursements of net official development assistance of these 13 countries to increase in 1969, 70 and 71 by several hundred million dollars a year. Whether with the UK pretty much level in '69, '70, and up a little in '71 and with the US falling, there will be an overall increase is very doubtful. In any case the % of GNP is sure to fall.

Beyond 1971 U.S. decisions will be crucial. This is not only because of the importance of U.S. volume but also because of its effect on the attitudes of others. To a considerable extent the rapid expansion in the latter part of the '60's in the programs of these 13 countries, except for France, was a response to U.S. leadership in the preceding years. If the U.S. lags behind the rest in the '70's some of the others may well lose some of their present enthusiasm, as progress in raising living standards becomes more and more difficult on the ability of donors as a group to put enough into the development effort to maintain its dynamism.

But it is easy to concentrate too much emphasis on the volume of resource flows and disregard various vital aspects of its quality. There is in a good many cases an unavoidable trade off between the two which demands wise judgment if a proper balance is to be achieved. Among the many quality factors, I wish today to mention only three—terms, tying, and the distribution between multilateral and bilateral.

For all countries there was a minor fall in the grant element from 76% to 75% between 1967 and 1968. The major change was the fall in US grant commitments of about $1B, primarily reflecting replacement by soft dollar loans of loans repayable in local currencies, and classed with grants under the PL 480 program of food aid.

This left the US in 8th place among the 16 DAC countries with the overall concessional element in its program at about the DAC average. It is no longer the leader in this matter, as it once was. To keep the overall change so small in spite of the U.S. broadening required a considerable softening of terms policies of most other donors in a number of directions.

While accidental factors such as the proportions of different kinds of aid committed in any one year have resulted in rather wide variations from year to year in the proportion of outright grants in most of the countries, the majority moved up in 1968 while the U.S. and U.K. were moving down. As a result grants were 51% of total commitments but only 45% for the U.S. A 40% increase in grants by Japan over the average of the preceding four years to just over 60% of their total commitments was most encouraging and there is good reason to hope that it will not only be maintained but extended further.

Australia continued her 100% grant program and Belgium and Norway committed over 90% of their assistance as grants. As in previous years France had the largest grant percentage among the major donors, though it has been declining and is now just over 70%. Almost all of it goes to former colonies.

I believe strongly that the burden of debt in relation to repayment capacity of many countries, including several of the largest, can only be met if a substantial flow of grant aid is maintained. Terms hardening of official aid in recent years has resulted far more from turning grant programs into loan programs than from any stiffening of loan terms, as I shall show in a moment. I regret that recent reports on development policy and the debates in UN forums discussing

DDII strategy have concentrated so heavily on loan terms and almost disregarded the grant percentages, still a major component whose further reduction would be costly.

The most important element in the debt burden is the interest rate. There has been little overall change in interest rates charged but this has included a tendency toward hardening by the U.S. and softening by several other donors. By 1968 the average for official development assistance commitments was 2.4% and for the U.S. 2.5%.

A similar trend has been followed for maturities and grace periods but in these cases the US loan program is nevertheless still significantly softer than those of other donors with average maturities of 37 years and grace periods of 9 years against 27 and 7 years. Japan again improved substantially those aspects of her terms in 1968.

No data are yet available on 1969 commitments but one or two helpful policy decisions have been made. Especially important was the German announcement early in 1969 of their intention to make future development assistance loans at 2.5% interest, 30 years maturity and 8 years grace period.

The Netherlands is compensating in part for an increased emphasis on loans instead of grants by lengthening the maturities of loans to certain of the overseas parts of the Kingdom to over 30 years. They are also meeting the new DAC terms targets adopted a year ago on loans to India, Pakistan, and Turkey.

Sweden is now planning to convert earlier loans made at 2% interest to the new target of 25 years maturity and 10 years grace period. She is also expanding her program of loans at IDA terms, some for joint projects with IDA and some independently.

Another of the important conditions of assistance is aid tying. Procurement policies of Member countries have remained virtually unchanged over the last few years any modifications being in the direction of tighter tying. As far as the share of untied assistance is concerned, there was no clearly discernible trend from 1966 to 1968, the major new initiatives taken by Member countries aiming at mitigating the adverse effects of procurement restrictions rather than untying.

In the past 12 months, however, we have seen a slight but encouraging thaw, the first relaxations in a long time and no tightening. The German Government adopted the principle of permitting procurement in developing countries under otherwise tied-aid contracts, the United States abandoned the highly restrictive "additionality rule" for procurement under AID assistance and authorized procurement within Latin America out of AID funds to that area; Canada and the US for Latin America liberalized their local content rules, and Japan and Netherlands opened the way for untying in part certain classes of loans.

The only countries with no tied loans in 1968 were Norway and Sweden. This is not a satisfactory position, though it is clear that much of tied aid would be spent in the same countries and at the same prices if untied. The relaxations of the past year may provide a start on which more significant progress can be built. It is a major item on the current DAC agenda.

Another subject of interest is the distribution of official flows between bilateral and multilateral channels. The Pearson Report, as you know, called for 20% through multilateral channels by 1975, or about a doubling of the current proportion. The U.S. in 1968 was a little below the DAC average with several countries several times the U.S. percentage.

There is undoubtedly a swing of sentiment in this direction, especially among several of the major donors, but whether it will be large enough to do more than keep up with rising total volumes is not at present clear. Much will depend on the outcome of the current negotiations for the Third IDA replenishment and the consideration in the UN of the recommendations of Sir Robert Jackson on what is required to expand UN capacity to provide technical assistance to developing countries. Unless his principal points are dealt with effectively, there will be wide reluctance to increase UN resources.

The capacity of not only the IBRD family but also the regional banks to accept and use much larger volumes of official funds is largely dependent on their ability to get a substantial portion of them on a grant or very soft basis to use through a soft window. Not only is the demand for hard loans limited but such money can and should come largely from the private capital markets and not from taxpayers.

Disbursements by multilateral banks of course substantially exceed donor payments to them, largely because of other sources of funds, including repayments, earnings and the private capital market. The net total first passed $1 B in 1967 but fell back sharply in 1968 as a result of declines in net outflows by the IDB and IDA. They should grow substantially in 1969, 1970 and 1971 as they possess both a large pipeline of committed but undisbursed funds and substantial cash reserves as yet uncommitted. Beyond 1971 the state of our private capital markets may be the key intervention of their multilateral.

I hope I have made it entirely clear in the course of this review why all those involved in the development effort throughout the world are watching so closely what happens next in the U.S., about which you are about to hear from Dr. Clark.

APRIL 15—TAX REFORM NOW?

HON. LEE H. HAMILTON

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 20, 1970

Mr. HAMILTON. Mr. Speaker, I insert a series of articles from the Christian Science Monitor entitled "Are You Taxed Fairly?"

I believe my colleagues will find this series on tax reform very much worth reading. They will gain many insights into problems and questions they encounter daily from constituents.

The articles follow:

[From the Christian Science Monitor, Mar. 14–16, 1970]

ARE YOU TAXED FAIRLY?—I: 1775 AND ALL THAT

(The problem with a tax on tea, to mix metaphors is that it mushrooms. In Revolutionary times the Yankees were out to reform the tax policies of George III. Today many Americans sense a similar need to rethink and reshape the taxation and spending system at all levels of government.)

(By Richard A. Nenneman)

WASHINGTON.—"The power to tax involves the power to destroy."—Chief Justice of the United States John Marshall, in McCulloch v. Maryland, 1819.

But long before 1819, taxes were playing an important role in American life. The American Revolution was fought in part over the colonists' resentment at being taxed by a power located 3,000 miles across the ocean.

This series does not set out to prove that the taxers are about to destroy present-day America. What this series does contend is that the question of an equitable tax system is far too important to be left solely to legislators, tax lawyers, and economists.

The United States spends roughly $300 billion, or 31 percent of expected 1970 GNP, through the public sector. (In the fourth quarter of 1969, government receipts, including nontax revenues, were actually running at least 35 percent of GNP.)

Last year, about one-third of this was spent by state-local governments on purchases of goods and services ($113 billion), one-third by the federal government for the same purpose ($102 billion), and one-third by the federal government through transfer payments ($90 billion), such as social security.

AVERAGE NEAR 30 PERCENT

For the average individual, close to 30 cents of every dollar he earns flows through the coffers of some level of government. (One popularly touted figure is 27 cents, which leaves the citizen with the 73-cent spendable dollar shown above. In terms of recent trends, though, 73 cents is on the high side.)

Government spending is not necessarily less purposeful than what we do with our own money. A properly conceived national defense, good roads, and schools for our children are all as essential as food and clothing that we purchase privately. But once government is committed to a course of action, even if it benefits each citizen, it still deprives him of part of his individual economic choice.

The short-lived taxpayers' revolt last year, which helped push Congress into the Tax Reform Act of 1969, ended all too quickly, if taxpayers actually think there is no more major reform to consider.

If we think a progressive income-tax system is the final word in tax equity (fairness), it may be surprising to learn how slight the overall progression actually is. (Progression refers to tax rates which rise on incremental amounts of income, commonly called tax brackets.) This series will question whether the progressive tax is indeed the fairest one.

DUAL SOVEREIGNTY A PROBLEM

Last year's tax debate didn't begin to consider the tax problems that arise because of the dual sovereignty (federal-state) under which Americans live.

The public may be excused for being numb from paying taxes first on what it earns (income taxes), then paying more taxes on what it spends with its so-called after-tax money (sales taxes), and finally paying taxes on what it owns (property taxes). Yet, we may not get very far into the '70's before being told we either need to raise some of these taxes still more, or find new ones.

In America's last pre-World War II year, 1940, total tax collections of $16.9 billion equaled 18.3 percent of the net national product. This was divided about half and half between the federal and local-state governments.

By 1950, tax collections had grown to $67.1 billion; government was taxing 25.2 percent of our increased yearly production. During the World War II period, the federal government had necessarily grown. But the cold war and then Korea kept the federal level of spending high.

STEADY INCREASE NOTED

Then, as public employees began to get competitive wages and many social service functions of government increased (much of this at the state-local level), total taxes edged up another 5 percentage points and by the late '60's had crossed the 30 percent line. By this time, the federal government was collecting about $2 for every $1 collected by state-local governments.

From 18 percent of GNP to 25 to somewhere over 30 in 1969. There doesn't appear to be any natural stopping place for tax receipts as they gobble up more of our earnings. Those who think the government should be doing still more than it is point to the social democracies of Europe, where the government sector typically accounts for up to 40 per-

cent of the GNP, and a high of 42 percent in Sweden.

But for those who still believe an essential element of the American experience is the freedom to plan one's own life within the context of some inescapable degree of interdependence, today's size of the public sector represents an absolute limit from which we must try to pull back.

High taxes in themselves become the cause of economic misallocations. They spur the efforts to escape (legally) taxes, and in the process of doing this create inequities between taxpayers. Tax lawyers or accountants are required for growing numbers of tax returns.

HOW ECONOMICS ARE DISTORTED

The law is so complex that expert help is required to make sure one takes full advantage of the law. When tax avoidance takes precedence over normal business judgment, as it often does even in an individual's decision, economic decisionmaking is distorted.

As one measure of the extent to which taxes have changed our lives in just one generation, Victor Ferrall, general tax attorney for American Telephone and Telegraph Company, notes that until the mid-1930's lawyers still told their clients to distribute their property as they wished in their wills and "let taxes take care of themselves."

Now, a man may pay a penalty in heavier taxation if he leaves his property as his emotions dictate. Estates and trusts have also been altered from their original intent (to provide for management of property) to one governed by tax considerations.

In business likewise, the tax specialist has risen quickly. Shortly after being accepted as an important professional staff function to assure compliance with the law, the tax department in many corporations rose to the status of a profitmaking function.

Mr. Ferrall ended a speech he made as president of the Tax Institute last November with these searching questions:

1. Do the various tax incentives actually help the people they were meant to help, or just put into the law "new opportunities for peripheral tax savings devices that, skillfully packaged and marketed, will redirect the benefits to persons other than those for whom they were intended?"

2. Is the net effect of the tax industry actually to save taxes, or only shift the tax burden back and forth?

3. What is the business distraction with taxes doing to the economic fiber of America?

4. Can we educate the populace "away from the almost vengeful insistence" that the rich and the corporations be "tagged" with taxes in the upper brackets, when in reality such rates "are illusory and are paid only by the unfortunate or the poorly advised?"

In trying to make sense out of taxes, this series performs such an educative function. And it tries to point the way toward a simpler system which would discourage today's economically wasteful search for tax shelters.

SIMPLICITY NOT ONLY VALUE

The search for simplicity shouldn't be overdone, however. There exists some kind of trade-off between fairness and simplicity. Of the two, fairness is more important. Yet we have become overly concerned, at least at the federal level, with equity, while achieving only minor progress in improving the whole tax system. These articles contend that we can gain much in simplicity and perhaps at the same time pick up some ground in equity too.

Prof. Richard A. Musgrave, Harvard University economist and expert on taxation, says: "Complexity can become such that it isn't enforceable. But this is a complex economy. The law would be simpler if there were no depletion allowance, no tax exempt interest; but do you hear people asking to do away with these in the name of simplicity?"

Professor Musgrave also noted that while the system is "far from optimal" it may be the best one in the world.

One also has to take notice of the effect of change itself. Edwin S. Cohen, assistant treasury secretary in charge of tax policy, notes that the transition to a new tax can be as important as the substantive issue itself.

CHANGE MUST BE GRADUAL

Business and the public are conditioned to whatever rules exist. Investment decisions have been made on the basis of them. Thus, major tax changes should be phased in only gradually.

Moreover, reform by definition starts with where we are. Ideas which are interesting in theory but have little chance of being meshed into the U.S. tax system are little more than conversation pieces.

There are at least four criteria that economists apply to a good tax system. First of all, it must raise an adequate amount of revenue. If a nation and its subdivisions cannot collect enough taxes to do the job the public sector has defined for itself, whatever the system's other merits, it is obviously deficient.

On this score, the United States tax system must be judged a huge success.

A second test of a system is the cost of administration and compliance. While certain parts of the U.S. tax system are better than others—the federal income tax, for example, costs only four-tenths of one cent for each dollar collected—the entire U.S. revenue system rates high on this score.

While we complain about taxes, most of us pay them without hesitation or argument. Whatever the combination of basic honesty, respect for government authority, or generally high business standards that accounts for this, compliance is not the problem here that it still is in many developed countries.

Third, taxes should be economically neutral. That is, they shouldn't affect decisions as to how resources are allocated. When tax considerations override economic ones, some misdirection or misallocation of economic resources generally occurs.

The present tax system is deficient on at least two scores here. Individually, the available tax shelters (or loopholes, in popular jargon) distort the economic decisions of taxpayers, particularly the wealthy ones.

Too often tax shelters have outlived whatever justification they originally had. A tax shelter ought to support some general good greater than that of the individual taxpayer; when it doesn't, the economic misallocation it encourages is inexcusable. The extent to which many of the loopholes were closed in the 1969 tax reform, as well as what remains to be done in this area, will be discussed in detail in another article.

CORPORATE BURDEN—ON WHO?

On the business level, the corporate income tax also lacks economic neutrality. Few stop to realize who actually pays this tax. Even economists can't entirely agree. But in some combination the corporation income tax burden is borne by the shareholders, the workers, and the purchasers of the company's products—probably mainly by the latter group.

Yet, corporations make business decisions as if they bore the burden of the tax themselves. And too many of these decisions are shaped by the tax angles involved. One article will discuss the desirability of substantially reducing corporate income taxes as a means not to helping just the shareholders but also the public at large.

The fourth criterion for a tax system is equity, which the dictionary defines as "fairness, impartiality, justice." Because this series is devoted to fairness in taxes, the entire second article takes up the different concepts by which economists try to define equity.

These articles contain several specific recommendations which could greatly increase the fairness of the entire tax system. But none of them would do a thing about the escalating size of the public sector.

In talking with economists, tax lawyers, and government officials at all levels over the past four months, it has become clear how deficient the U.S. is in an overall strategy toward public finance.

The federal system has much to commend it. Dual sovereignty undoubtedly facilitated the development of a 3,000-mile-wide continent. Indeed, it is problematic whether any vast land-mass country, like the U.S., the U.S.S.R., or China, can be efficiently managed by a central authority.

But the raising of taxes by Washington, by the states, and by cities and many special districts (all told, we have 92,000 units of government) presents a nightmare for modern planning. For instance, with different types of decisions made at each level—such as defense, which is entirely federal, and elementary education, which is almost entirely local—no adequate means exists to weigh relative priorities.

Perhaps government spending needs to be more than 30 percent of GNP. One suspects, though, that one reason the many streams of public spending add up to even as much as they do is the lack of a unifying channel for comparative evaluation.

Americans have a strong preference for local control over the areas of government that touch them closely—such as education. At the same time, the lack of coordination in the present multilayer tax system exacts a price.

So, after looking at tax reforms in detail, we will return to this problem, which may be more important than any single issue of tax equity.

[From the Christian Science Monitor, Mar. 19, 1970]

ARE YOU TAXED FAIRLY—II: WHO PAYS THE TAX BILL? MIDDLE INCOME CARRIES THE LOAD

(One basic assumption in the U.S. is that it is "fair" for the rich to pay higher taxes than others. Yet as a percentage of income, most Americans carry an amazingly similar tax burden. This page explores some of the ideas aimed at equity in taxation.)

(By Richard A. Nenneman)

BOSTON.—Situation: You and your wife both work 40 hours a week. Many American couples do. Together, you bring in a comfortable yearly income of $15,000.

Across the street from you lives a young man who doesn't appear to work at all. But last year a rich uncle gave him $15,000.

Down the block are a retired couple who once worked very hard. They also get close to $15,000 today, but from a variety of sources—social security, some dividend income, savings, an annuity, and a company pension.

Question: Should you and your wife, the young playboy, and the retired couple all be in a similar tax situation because of the $15,000 that has crossed the threshold of each house?

Fairness—equity—in taxation, we quickly find, is as difficult to define as beauty.

But even if beauty exists foremost in the eye of the beholder, this has never discouraged those searching for beauty. Likewise, the attempt to build an honest, equitable tax system is too vital to be turned aside just because it is difficult.

Economists view tax equity from two perspectives—what they call horizontal and vertical. Horizontal equity attempts to treat all taxpayers in the same category equally. The problems in defining it lie in deciding what makes equals out of taxpayers. If income is the criterion, there may still be reasons to treat different kinds of income

in different ways, or to take cognizance of the taxpayer's age or family responsibilities.

DIFFERENT STANDARDS USED

Vertical equity determines what the degree of difference should be in the treatment of taxpayers in different categories. It is not as easy to find objective answers in this area.

Federal tax law presumes that income tests equality of circumstance better than what one spends or what his net worth is. (In the above example, the young fellow pays no tax on the $15,000 gift, only on whatever income he makes from it. His uncle, depending on what other gifts he has made, will probably have to pay a gift tax.)

Federal law does not, however, treat even every income dollar the same way. The personal exemption, the various deductions. the kinds of income not even included in the tax base all exist at least theoretically either to better define one person's situation vis-a-vis another or to further some particular social policy.

In the past, some of them, such as the exemption of municipal bond interest from the income-tax base, or the percentage depletion allowance, have encouraged the rich to conform their investment activities to those channels that would legally avoid some taxation. The pursuit of social policy through the tax system—whether it be lower interest costs for local governments or more oil exploration—thus complicates the pursuit of equity.

Just how effective tax avoidance can become was brought home by the Treasury's announcement early last year that 154 individuals with incomes over $200,000 were paying no federal income tax at all. This became the rallying point for federal reform.

The additional taxes a relatively small number of rich might pay are not too significant. But at the same time inflation was eating up after-tax dollars, and the belated Vietnam surtax had finally become law, the public—all the way from the lowest-paid worker to the upper middle class—became incensed that the system should allow anyone to escape taxation entirely.

INCOME LEVY HIGHLY VALUED

Of the three main direct taxes that individuals pay—income, sales, and property—there has been a predisposition in the United States to consider income taxes as socially superior. Richard A. Musgrave, economics professor at Harvard University and an expert on equity, noted approvingly, for instance, that "the U.S. tax system taken as a whole is more income-tax intensive than most."

The income tax also offers the easiest way to build progressivity into the system, through progressively higher rates on incremental amounts of income.

Sales taxes fall somewhat more harshly on lower-income taxpayers, who are more apt to spend all their income. There are ways to mitigate the regressive nature of the sales tax, though.

Purchases of essentials such as food and clothing can be exempted (as they are in Massachusetts, although this then reduces the amount of revenue the tax can raise). Or if the state has an income tax, it can give some kind of lower income credit on that tax which in effect rebates the sales tax.

PROPERTY COSTS CAN BE BURDEN

Property taxes are somewhat regressive, but for most persons they tend to be proportional to income. Up to a point, the more one earns the better the house he lives in. The harshest feature of the property tax is that it becomes part of the budgeted expense for housing.

And, as is presently the case, when the property tax rises too quickly, it creates a severe burden for those living on retirement incomes who thought they knew what their housing was going to cost them in their retirement years. (This tax is discussed in detail in a further article.)

Yet, in spite of the apparent fairness of the income tax and the definite preference it has enjoyed on equity grounds, the U.S. tax system as a whole is not highly progressive. The only major element of progressivity is in the federal income tax.

And even here, the sharp graduation upward in rates has challenged those with money to find all the legal ways to avoid the high rates. (The next article examines the extent to which changes in rates and the narrowing of loopholes in the 1969 reform may have discouraged this search in the future.)

A new study called "The Rich, the Poor, and the Taxes They Pay," by Joseph A. Pechman, director of economic studies at Brookings Institution, notes an amazing similarity of tax burden for most Americans. There was an exception in the group earning less than $2,000, because of increasing social security taxes and regressive local taxes. But for the great bulk of taxpayers—those earning from $2,000 up to $15,000 (in 1965), which included all but the top 10 percent of taxpayers—total taxes paid were between 26 and 27 percent of income.

Only in the group above $15,000 was the tax considerably higher, 38 percent. This group includes some extremely high incomes and large taxes, of course. Also, a previous study of Mr. Pechman's showed that when incomes went much above $100,000, the total taxes paid began to decline slightly as a percentage of income. This was mainly because of the big role of lightly taxed capital gains in such incomes.

SOME CONTRIBUTIONS QUESTIONABLE

More recently, one finds discussion of the very concepts of the two tax methods implying that sales taxes from an equity point of view may be fairer than income taxes.

What, after all, does income presumably measure? One's contribution to his society.

One may doubt this in the case of a ball player or a movie star (although their grossly exaggerated salaries are usually earned for only a short time span).

In general, though, we assume that a worker earning $5 an hour is doing something more valuable for society than one earning $3 an hour. And a junior executive making $20,000 a year is presumed to be doing something more important for his company than his secretary earning $7,500.

Of course the higher-paid individual is going to pay more taxes—no one argues that point. But, the question is asked, on what kind of equity grounds should he pay at a higher rate simply because he is contributing more to society?

On the other hand, purchase taxes represent a tax on what one takes out of the stream of production. "Noting that income is a measure of the contribution to production by an individual or by capital, some [economists] have argued that it is as logical, and more effective in promoting private saving and investment, to tax on the basis of consumption," says the First National City Bank of New York in a recent publication.

Whether one is an egalitarian economist who wants to use the system to level wealth, simple realism demands recognition of the fact that the overall tax structure is not highly progressive and that, barring major political upheaval, it is not going to be.

Realism may also demand that the overall system not be made much less progressive than it now is. If it were, raising the same amount of revenue might bear down too hard on the lower end of the income scale.

It is easy to say one is for progressive taxes if this means someone richer than us will pay a higher percentage of his income to the government. Yet no objective standards exist to determine the proper amount of progessivity. The Carter Commission, which reported on the entire Canadian tax system, noted that the rate of progressivity is essentially a subjective, or judgmental, matter.

A very clever challenge to the very concept of progressivity has been made by Norman B. True, a former Treasury economist now working with a private consulting firm, Planning Research Corporation. Dr. True, claiming there is no equitable way to determine the rate of progressivity, makes a persuasive case for a flat-rate income tax. That is, the rich would pay more, but not proportionately more.

FLAT RATE OF 20 PERCENT

In 1967, for instance, a 20 percent flat rate on all taxable income would have produced as much revenue as the present complex system.

As a matter of fact, 77 percent ($232 billion out of $302 billion in taxable income) of taxable income was taxed at marginal rates of 20 percent or lower. And some 76 percent of income taxes collected ($48 billion out of $63 billion) was collected at rates of 25 percent or less.

And only 4.4 percent of the total came in at marginal rates above 50 percent. "In short," claims Dr. True, "progressively graduated marginal tax rates can hardly be justified in terms of their contribution to the total revenues."

As an alternative to progressive taxation in theory, Dr. Ture suggests a flat-rate tax on a much wider income base. In the 1967 figures quoted above, he suggests broadening the tax base from the $302 billion it actually was to $600 billion by eliminating loopholes and broadening the definition of income.

In addition to a flat-rate tax on this wider base, though, he would give a much higher personal exemption. The result would be a tax that had some effective progressivity to it, which he thinks is all that is demanded by the public. But being in theory a flat-rate tax with few exceptions, it would be easy to figure, and many compliance problems inherent in the present complicated definitions of income, capital gains, and allowable deductions would be eliminated.

TURE FORMULA STUDIED

Looking at the 1967 returns, a flat rate of 14.5 percent on taxable income under Dr. Ture's widened base (with the then $600 personal exemption) would have produced the same amount of taxes collected for that year. But, increasing the flat rate to 17.5 percent and widening the exemption to $1,500, the same amount of tax would still have been collected and some effective progression would have been maintained.

For example: take three families, earning $8,000, $15,000, and $25,000 respectively. If each had four people in the family taxable income would have been $2,000, $9,000, and $19,000 respectively. The taxes collected, at a flat rate of 17.5 percent, would have been $350, $1,575, and $3,325, and there would have been considerable progressivity in those taxes. The three effective rates would have been 4.4 percent, 10.5 percent, and 13.3 percent.

Such a system, of course, would produce the greatest progressivity in income areas under $20,000. As incomes climb, the value of the exemptions would be relatively less, and the effective tax rates woud approach the stated rate.

Yet the fact of progressivity would be upheld for the vast majority of taxpayers, and there would be two net advantages to this approach. The system itself would be vastly simplified. With almost all income (including capital gains) in the new tax base, there would be greater economic freedom in deciding how to invest and less room for argument with the tax authorities. Second, the system would probably tend to encourage the accumulation of capital, which many

economists feel has been discouraged by the tax system.

Dr. Ture's idea for a flat-rate tax is certainly not shared by any wide number of academicians today. When talking with Dr. Ture, this reporter suggested that he perhaps occupies a place in the tax equity controversy similar to that of Dr. Milton Friedman regarding the influence of monetary policy on the economy. Fifteen years ago Dr. Friedman was almost a loner. Today economists are categorized according to how much of Friedmanite they are. Dr. Ture only smiled.

[From the Christian Science Monitor, Mar. 21–23, 1970]

ARE YOU TAXED FAIRLY—III: FEDERAL TAX LOOPHOLES PLUGGED

(Because the Tax Reform Act of 1969 cut federal revenues by billions, the common reaction was that real reform failed. Yet five major loopholes favoring the rich were narrowed. The system is regarded as fairer.)

(By Richard A. Nenneman)

WASHINGTON.—"We know the tax reform was a good law," a high Treasury Department official jested—"You should see the mail we're getting complaining about it."

He was referring to the Tax Reform Act of 1969, passed in a hurry before the Christmas recess of Congress. At first glance it looked more like a tax giveaway than a real reform.

Not everyone agrees with this man's estimate of the law. Dr. Arthur M. Okun, for example, former chairman of the Council of Economic Advisers under President Johnson, said: "I am disappointed with the tax reform act. . . . For every dollar we gained, we had to give up three. What we have left of the federal revenue system is better, but we lost some of it in the process."

These are the views, not only of Dr. Okun, but of many liberal economists who say the tax cuts in the act undermine the financial base for needed federal programs in the coming years.

REFORMS CALLED REAL

Joseph W. Barr, who was Mr. Johnson's last Treasury secretary, points out, however, that the reforms in the act are indeed reforms. He distinguishes these from the tax-relief provisions which, like Dr. Okun, he dislikes. (Mr. Barr now is president of the American Security & Trust Company in Washington.)

"You never pick up revenue on a reform bill itself," says another source, adding that rates can be boosted later.

"Just look at the major loopholes under the old law," said Mr. Barr. (It was he who last year called public attention to the 154 persons with incomes over $200,000 who paid no federal taxes at all.)

"There were six main loopholes that caused the inequities under the old law—capital gains, exemption of municipal-bond interest, accelerated depreciation, the unlimited charitable contribution, farm losses, and depletion. They closed up every one of them except municipals."

The muncipal-bond-interest exemption would have gotten changed, most observers say, if the nation's mayors and governors hadn't panicked and pressured Congress not to end the tax shelter for their indebtedness. So this remains for the "next time" around.

EXEMPTION HELD COSTLY

As matters stand, the holders of municipals save in income taxes far more than the municipalities save in extra interest expense. This is one of those social arrangements that helps rich individuals more than the groups it was meant to help. It is, in short, a costly exemption. The Treasury Department in 1969 estimated the municipal-interest exemption costs the government $2 billion annually.

As for the other five loopholes, they were indeed changed. Accelerated depreciation of real estate has been severely limited. Farm losses, that can be balanced against regular income, are limited to $25,000 annually. The oil depletion allowance was cut back from 27½ percent to 22 percent. And the unlimited charitable deduction was curbed, although at the same time the regular charitable contributions deduction was raised from 30 to 50 percent of income.

The change that may hit the greatest number of people is in the capital-gains tax. It previously had a top limit of 25 percent. That rate remains on the first $50,000 of capital gains in any one year, and then goes up to a maximum of 35 percent for individuals. (The rate was changed to 30 percent for corporations.)

ESCAPE DEVICES CLOSED

In cases where taxpayers also have substantial earned income, large capital gains may cause some to lose their 50 percent maximum tax bracket on the earned income and pay the old rate of 70 percent. (This is because "preference" income, from capital gains, for example, in excess of $30,000 takes away the 50 percent limit for an equal amount of earned income.) In extreme cases, the new capital-gains tax could be an effective 46.5 percent.

In dollars, these changes may not be terribly significant. The capital-gains change, for instance, is supposed to haul in only $275 million extra a year from individuals and $175 million from corporations.

This doesn't make the loophole adjustments unimportant, however. These were the main devices by which the rich escaped taxes. To the extent that they have been closed, it is now a fairer system.

Critics of the federal tax system previously have claimed that as fast as one set of loopholes was closed, tax attorneys found a new set. Some of those who worked on this law doubt that this now will be the case. They think not only that major progress was made in closing loopholes, but that the increase in the capital-gains tax will blunt the incentive to qualify as much income as possible as a capital gain.

LOSSES SET AT $9 BILLION

With capital-gains rates up and the maximum rates on earned income down from 70 to 50 percent, the maximum tax-rate differential between the two kinds of income is cut by two-thirds. The result is that both kinds of income tend to be treated more equally under the tax laws.

The staggering revenue losses, coming to $9 billion, under the total reform act are its most disturbing feature. When all the provisions have been phased in (by 1973), there will be an annual loss of $4.8 billion from the increase in the personal exemption; $1.6 billion from the increased standard deduction; $2.1 billion from the low-income allowance (which removes 5.5 million persons from the tax rolls); and $420 million from the adjustment of single-person income-tax schedule (although there is a considerable improvement in fairness here).

There is a further loss of $4.4 billion from the increase in social-security payments. The funds come from a separate trust fund, however, and social-security officials says there is no need yet to raise social-security taxes. They will doubtless go up in the course of time, though.

In general, there is a tendency here to minimize the importance of the tax-relief provisions. The main thing is that a major reform was passed. The revenue losses as noted above, tend to be regarded as the price of reform.

ACCOMPLISHMENTS LISTED

Stanley Surrey, professor at Harvard Law School, Cambridge, Mass., summarized the improvements in the law:

The taxes on the poor and near-poor were reduced, through the low-income allowance. However, Professor Surrey asked, if we have decided that the poor shouldn't have to pay income tax, why do they still have to pay the regressive social-security tax?

A greater degree of equity exists for those earning up to $20,000 a year. The increase in the standard deduction to $2,000 tends to put apartment dwellers, who have neither mortgage interest or property taxes to deduct, on an even footing with their suburban home-owning cousins.

Some feel it might be more equitable for most of the personal deductions to be removed in toto. This is one of those simplifications of the law that would run into much organized opposition, however; much the same effect is gained by giving a larger deduction to everyone. The Internal Revenue Service expects an additional 11 million taxpayers to start using the simplified 1040 form next year instead of itemizing deductions.

The increased exemptions are most valuable to the lower- and middle-income classes. They also are more valuable to big families.

WAGE-EARNERS' EQUALIZER

The reduction in the maximum rate on earned income to 50 percent equalizes taxes for those whose main income is from wages —such as professional people or athletes— vis-a-vis those who have more opportunities to use tax shelters.

There is a new 10 percent flat tax on 10 classes of income previously exempted. This will bring in only about $600 million in revenues to start. But it should end the spectacle of very wealthy people escaping all taxation.

All in all, there will be somewhat less likelihood of those with similar real incomes paying substantially different taxes. (Economists call this horizontal equity.)

It isn't as clear what has happened to vertical equity—the relative equity between divergent income groups. It depends, in the first place, on how much of a load one thinks the rich ought to carry. But that consideration aside, it isn't even that easy to tell what has happened. The poor and lower-income groups get the most benefit from the reform as far as direct taxes go.

But this tax reform is being "paid" for largely by a higher burden being placed on the corporate-income tax. To the extent that this is really borne by the public, by increased prices, etc. (the next article takes up this point), it can be argued that what the poor gained in lower direct taxes has been put back on their shoulders through the corporation income tax.

The most significant thing about the law to this reporter is that the system has shown itself capable of at least being nudged.

DIRECTION RULED IMPORTANT

The degree of change may not be as important as the direction. If the oil industry is not hurt by the change in depletion allowances, it will probably be cut again. If the accumulation of capital does not suffer noticably, the capital-gains tax may be pushed up some more.

As a postscript, it is perhaps time for the public to become more aware of the role of capital formation by individuals in a capitalistic society. Is it passé or do we still need to encourage it?

Dale Wickham, a Washington tax lawyer who served as special counsel to the Senate Finance Committee last year, goes so far as to question whether we might not eventually tax capital gains as regular income. The use of income averaging, he says, would cushion the burden on anyone realizing large gains in any one year.

In last year's reform, we went a long step in the direction of his suggestion. Before going any further, we need to decide more clearly whether it is still meaningful to talk of a capital gain as some special kind of income. In the past, society has recognized a risk inherent in all capital investment. To

encourage that risk-taking, it held out a special incentive.

Whatever remains to be done with the federal income tax, one point should be remembered: it is the shining jewel among American taxes. This will become more apparent after the corporation income tax, sales tax, and the property tax have been analyzed.

[From the Christian Science Monitor, Mar. 26, 1970]

ARE YOU TAXED FAIRLY?—IV: PEOPLE, NOT THINGS, PAY TAXES

(The actual burden of corporation taxes falls in some combination on consumers, shareholders, and workers. The division of the burden is a key question of fairness. An alternative to the present corporation tax—the value added tax—is now getting some study in the U.S.)

(By Richard A. Nenneman)

BOSTON.—Suppose you bought a new Ford last year.

You paid $3,500 for it. This included a 7 percent excise tax on the dealer's cost. If someone asked you how much tax you paid on the car, you couldn't figure it out exactly, since you never are supposed to know the dealer's cost.

But it would probably surprise you to learn that this excise was not the only tax you paid on that new car. Last year the Ford Motor Company earned $1.1 billion before paying corporate income taxes of $569 million.

"What," you say, "has that got to do with me? Ford paid its own income taxes." Superficially, that is correct. But that's as far as the correctness goes.

Economists point out that all taxes ultimately are paid by people. In the case of corporation taxes, the burden—also called the incidence—often falls on persons in the form of higher prices. Corporations must of necessity make a return on their investment somewhat comparable to other types of business organizations. Management answers to the investors, the shareholders.

MOST-MISUNDERSTOOD LEVY?

Perhaps the public misunderstands the corporation income tax more than any other part of the tax system. An example was the minor flurry that blew up when in the autumn of 1969 the Nixon administration suggested that the corporation income-tax rate be lowered in steps to 46 percent of pretax income. A number of newspaper columnists, unfamiliar with the implications such a change would actually carry for business and the public, immediately interpreted the request as a giveaway to corporations.

Business disappointed the Treasury when it offered absolutely no support to this administration request. Business perhaps knew that in the long run this would have only slight effect on its profits.

Since the end of World War II, the corporation profits tax has amounted to roughly one quarter of the total of federal tax collections, or about one-half of the individual income tax collected by the federal government. Considering its importance in the total tax system, we ought to know who bears the final burden of this tax. Without such knowledge, we are limited in the conclusions we can draw about the fairness of the tax system as a whole.

The main debate over the burden of the corporation income tax is whether it is shifted forward or backward. By shifting forward, economists mean that the corporation tax in effect is paid by the purchasers of the companies' products. That is, it is reflected in prices being higher than they otherwise would be. To the extent this is true, the corporation income tax amounts to a sales tax.

NOT EVENLY DISTRIBUTED

But the tax doesn't fall evenly on all products or services. For instance, public utilities can presumably pass all of the tax forward as a normal part of their costs, since they are guaranteed a certain rate of return on their investment. Further, the tax penalizes an efficient—that is, a profitable—corporation as opposed to an inefficient one. The inefficient corporation may not have to pay any tax.

Other economists claim that most of the corporation tax is borne by its shareholders—that is, is shifted backward. They get lower returns on their investment than they would if the tax didn't exist.

Dan Throop Smith, finance professor emeritus at Harvard, currently teaching at Stanford Business School, said, "To the extent the corporation tax is shifted to consumers, it is a thoroughly capricious excise tax of the sort that wouldn't be tolerated if it were enacted as an excise tax. And to the extent it isn't shifted, it is a discriminatory tax on capital and discourages investment." Professor Smith was deputy to the Secretary of the Treasury in the Eisenhower administration.

There is also a third way in which the tax burden may be partially shifted—in lower wages to labor.

Economists carry on a highly sophisticated and seemingly endless argument as to the incidence of the corporation tax. Most of them will admit that the tax burden is partially carried by all three groups—purchasers or the public at large, shareholders in the company, and the workers. So, when the Ford Motor Company pays its income-tax bill, these taxes are being paid for in the long run partly by the purchasers of Ford products, partly by the shareholders of the company, and partly by its workers.

The corporation tax burden varies from firm to firm and among industries.

An industry that faces severe foreign competition is not as free as some others to adjust its own prices to make up for part of the income tax. This seems to bolster Professor Smith's claim that the tax is a capricious one.

Yet, what does one do with a tax that is so successful a revenue raiser as the corporation income tax? What substitute would raise another $40 billion in revenue as easily? If it were shifted directly to individuals, personal tax brackets would climb enormously.

PRE-1913 DAYS RECALLED

One critic of the corporation tax, C. Lowell Harriss of Columbia University, said in a speech recently that "the corporation tax at a 50 percent rate is the work of the devil." This may be true. The question, though, is whether any alternative might not be a worse devil.

There was an idyllic day before World War I when total federal tax collections amounted to $660 million (1913). About half of that sum was raised from customs duties and half from excise taxes.

After passage of the 16th Amendment to the Constitution, the first income tax applied a rate of 1 percent to income of both corporations and individuals. During the course of World War I, the tax was successively raised until it reached a 12 percent level. It went down some after the war, but never to the 4 percent rate that individual taxes were lowered. In fact, from that time on, individual and corporate taxes went their own ways.

The tax reached its present level of importance during World War II. But even then the normal federal tax, exclusive of excess profits taxes, only reached the 40 percent level. It was reduced to 38 percent after the war. It was the Korean war that jacked the corporate rates up to the 50 percent and higher levels that the last generation has grown accustomed to.

MANAGEMENT THINKING AFFECTED

A tax as productive as this and as easily administered is not going to be lightly tampered with. On the other hand, if anyone wants seriously to reform taxes, consider this: the corporate tax falls with unequal burden on different industries; it penalizes industries that are heavy users of capital instead of debt; and it penalizes successful firms versus inefficient or unsuccessful ones. Is this the acme of tax policy?

Moreover, a corporation tax at 50 percent levels, regardless of its final incidence, is bound to have an effect on the immediate thinking of management.

SUBSTITUTE DESIRABLE

So abundant reasons exist for finding a substitute for at least part of the corporation income tax. And there is a substitute, or understudy, waiting in the wings to be called onstage: the value added tax (VAT). Developed in Europe, where people have had more experience in trying to evade taxes, it consists of a tax on the basic materials and the labor used by each company. It is charged at each stage of the productive process on whatever has been added to the value of a product at that stage—hence its name.

The VAT requires accurate bookkeeping; its critics say it would be a nightmare. Those who favor it claim that anyone who keeps books for tax purposes already has all the information available to figure the tax.

This tax may settle out in the Common Market countries at about a 15 percent rate. Its proponents in the United States don't assume levels anywhere near that high. Assuming that somewhere between half and three-quarters of the gross national product would show up in the base on which the tax is figured, each percentage point of a VAT in this country would produce between $5 and $7½ billion in revenue.

ADVANTAGES CLAIMED

The proponents of the tax say it has at least three advantages:

Compared with the corporate income tax, the VAT is neutral in its economic effects. It does not shelter the inefficient company. It is also neutral between those firms that use various combinations of debt and equity in their capital structure. It is neutral between capital-intensive and labor-intensive companies.

The VAT would give the U.S. an export advantage. The virtual disappearance of the U.S. trade surplus from its high of $8 billion in 1964 is no small matter. Yet the U.S. finds itself in a peculiar bind as one of the members of the GATT (General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade).

Under GATT, governments may rebate to their manufacturers direct taxes that are passed on to their customers if these goods are exported. Since the Common Market countries now use the VAT, their companies get a rebate on exports which is not available to U.S. companies that pay an income tax. A partial switchover to a VAT system would give our exporters some marginal advantage.

VAT offers a painless way to increase revenues. This is not the major reason for today's interest in the tax. But there are few untapped areas to turn to for future tax increases, if the need arises. VAT would offer one way to increase total government revenues without changing other existing taxes.

The proponents of the VAT concentrate on its preferability to the present corporation income tax. Eli Shapiro, economics professor at the Harvard Business School, has done a study for the Committee for Economic Development called "A Better Balance in Federal Taxes on Business." It concluded that with a low-rate VAT, corporate income tax rates could be cut back to their pre-Korean war level of 38 percent.

INCOME RATE REDUCTION?

Professor Smith envisions a combination VAT and corporate income tax that would ultimately get the income-tax rate down to the 25–35 percent area.

The major argument against the VAT is its alleged regressivity—hitting harder at lower-income groups. If the tax on each stage of production was added to the cost of goods, the public at large would be paying it. At best it would come out to be a proportional tax; at worst, somewhat regressive.

Proponents of the tax counter that from what is known about the incidence of the corporation income tax, the VAT would be an improvement.

Whether the VAT is finally adopted in some limited form as an experimental tax, we shall be hearing more about it.

Two final notes about the corporate income tax: however obnoxious it may be to some, there is little evidence that it has slowed economic growth. Professor Shapiro noted that on a 10-year average (which flattens out economic fluctuations), the United States has had a 3½ percent growth rate for the past century.

Since there was either no corporation tax or only a small one during most of this period, the tax does not appear to have adversely affected rates of growth. This is also one more piece of evidence in support of the theory that most of the tax is passed on to the corporations' customers.

Second, it's an efficient way of getting at accumulations of corporate wealth that would unfairly escape taxation unless the nation also had a periodic tax on unrealized capital gains. It thus preserves the integrity of the personal income tax.

An equitable tax? Not entirely. But a "successful" tax? Yes. There's the rub to changing this tax or any other.

[From the Christian Science Monitor, Mar. 28–30, 1970]

ARE YOU TAXED FAIRLY—V: MONEY TREES FOR STATE-LOCAL GOVERNMENT

(There's no lack of potential revenue in the tax orchard, despite the financial challenges confronting states and municipalities. The problem is in deciding which trees are overburdened and which can be made to bring a bigger yield.)

(By Richard A. Nenneman)

BOSTON.—Picture a State-local tax commissioner as a horticulturist, tending an orchard for state and local governments. His orchard has several kinds of trees.

First, there is the plum tree in the middle of the orchard. The juicy plums he has been growing on it are the local property taxes. Each year a little more is coaxed from the plum tree. Last year property taxes in the United States increased 9.6 percent to a record $32 billion. Almost all of this was collected at the local level.

The plum tree is overburdened. Our horticulturist only hopes it doesn't give out on him until some of the other trees have grown larger.

Then there is that old apple tree. These are the state and local income taxes. There are still eight states that don't ask for any fruit off the apple tree. Even those that do are fussy about the apples.

A few, like New York, tax personal income all the way up to a 14 percent rate. But for most states the personal income tax is still a bagatelle compared to the fruit it might bring in.

LEARNED TO LIKE OTHERS

The states are catching on though. With the need for fruit, they're learning to like apples, too. Last year the harvest from state-local income taxes went up 19.3 percent to $8.9 billion, and from state corporation-income taxes it climbed 28.7 percent to $3.2 billion.

There are other trees in the orchard. The peach tree started bearing back in the depression days of the '30's, when the states had to find new revenues. These are the sales taxes, which 45 states now use. (Only Alaska, Delaware, Montana, New Hampshire, and Oregon remain holdouts on the general sales tax.)

The peach harvest was up 19.4 percent last year to $14.2 billion (plus another $5.7 billion in gasoline taxes and about $2 billion in tobacco taxes from sister nectarine trees).

The newest tree in the orchard is a strange one. A combination citrus tree, it has grafted onto it grapefruit, lemons, oranges, and tangerines. A nifty space saver, this tree gives forth a constantly increasing supply of grants-in-aid from the federal government. At last count it actually had more than 400 branches grafted into it (which makes it very hard to keep track of each branch of aid).

A SPEEDY FAVORITE

Perhaps it's a strange tree to have in an otherwise tidy little orchard. But its abundance of fruit has made it a favorite of the "taxiculturist." Last year it increased the total supply of fruit from the orchard by $25 billion, putting it right up there with the plum and apple trees.

These graceful fruit trees describe the present dilemma of state and local governments. Theoretically, they have available all sorts of fine taxes. But in practice it hasn't worked out that way.

State-local government today is close to crisis in some areas of the nation, and the tax collectors are out there imploring that horticulturist, "Which tree can you get to bear more fruit?"

It almost seems as if, while the federal government has increased its concern over fair taxes, it's a matter of just finding the tax money at the state-local level.

State-local government more directly serves the needs of the people than does the federal. As the population has grown, so has the need for schools and other public facilities, for police and fire departments, and so on. These are all service functions, whose major expense is payroll.

EMPLOYEES WANT TO SHARE

Public servants have wanted to share in the rising prosperity without being able to increase their own productivity substantially (this is true of most of the service industry).

Moreover, many public services, such as school teaching, were once rendered at reduced pay because of the protection they offered from layoffs in time of depression. With a nearly full-employment economy established, these groups began to want comparable wages.

Yet, there is only one tax in this country that automatically rises in large amounts. That is the federal income tax. For each 1 percent growth in gross national product (GNP) it is estimated that income-tax collections rise by 1.3 percent.

However, any substantial increase in federal aid to state-local governments would require some increases in federal taxes. There is considerable speculation that Rep. Wilbur D. Mills (D) of Arkansas was willing to see the large amount of tax relief in last year's tax-reform act as one means of actually cutting back on federal spending, thereby throwing the ball to state and local governments for the '70's.

STATES DIFFER VASTLY

Theoretically, the states could all have their income tax figured along the lines of the federal tax. It could even be collected by the federal government for them and then be distributed.

A problem arises because the 50 states cover areas of vastly differing geography, different economic emphases, and to some extent their own cultures. Each state has developed a hybrid, a unique combination of state and local taxes, that probably served its needs better before this last explosion of state-local spending.

Besides a natural reluctance to move until pushed hard enough by events, the states had another problem—to some extent real, to some extent imagined: They found themselves in competition with each other for industry. They have been reluctant to adopt the level of income taxes theoretically available to them, out of fear of driving out industry or even some of their wealthier citizens.

The result has been a hodgepodge of increasing sales-tax rates, some higher state income taxes, property-tax hikes every year, more and more aid from the federal government, and a big increase in state-local debt.

If things are bad for the states, they are even worse for local governments, which get their powers from the states and are considerably restricted in the kinds of taxes they can impose.

More important, many states make up a homogeneous economic unit; few cities do. If nationwide industrial organization makes a state timid to raise taxes, a city has even more reason to be afraid. Even a local business often can move a few miles farther out into the country to escape an increased property tax.

DEFINITION CALLED NEED

The solution to the dilemma lies not only in the tax system itself. It lies in a better definition of what responsibilities belong at each level of government in this final third of the century, and even of asking if all the separate units of government are necessary. (In the past decade, some 10,000 school districts were consolidated.)

Yet, the crisis in state-local financing may be the catalyst that finally wakes Americans up to take notice of the socio-political problem their particular federal structure has created.

One man who realizes the seriousness of state-local problems, but refuses to attach the label of "crisis" to them, is Lloyd E. Slater, the deputy commissioner for tax research in the New York State Department of Taxation and Finance. Dr. Slater has spent a career in public finance.

"What about this threat of competition between the states?" I asked Dr. Slater. "Is it real or just a convenient excuse for not raising enough taxes?"

"It's real," he admitted, "but it also can be exaggerated." Taxes can be a factor in the general location of an industrial facility, for instance, if everything else is equal. But everything else is generally not equal at all, he said.

OTHER IMPORTANT FACTORS

Business goes where it does because of its markets, its raw materials, and the labor supply. These factors will usually determine within a 50 to 100 mile radius where a plant will be built, Dr. Slater said. Thus, state taxes are usually not crucial to business, unless personal-income-tax rates make it hard to hold engineering and middle-management talent.

New York has taken vast strides in state programs—and spending—during Gov. Nelson A. Rockefeller's three terms. Yet it has managed its high income tax—highest in the nation—while its immediate neighbors, Connecticut and New Jersey, didn't even have one. This fact at least questions the strength of the competition argument some states hide behind.

If any state tax gets too high in relation to surrounding states, the state may have to mark time with that particular tax. Altogether 42 states have income taxes. Three were added just last year, in Illinois, Maine, and Washington.

"Business," continued Dr. Slater, "makes its decisions as far as taxes are concerned more on a hunch about the general tax and business climate in a state than on the basis of what tax levels are at that particular moment."

He admitted, though, that once a firm has picked a general location, the varying property tax rates in different communities can make a difference. Even here, though, it's not always possible to tell in advance just how high taxes will be. While tax rates are freely available, the assessing practices of each community are harder to fathom.

Property taxes will continue to climb, of course, as local governments must cover their budgets. But the extremes these taxes have reached make it all the more likely that the states will neither have to provide more of the funding for some local functions, or assume some of these functions outright, or that the cities will turn even more to Washington for help.

In Dr. Slater's view, Congress has outsmarted the states for the last 20 years. The federal grants-in-aid programs, now $25 billion a year in state-local aid, mostly require some local money in them, too. But Congress sets the priorities; this to some extent weaken local decisionmaking.

MAXIMUM USE URGED

If the urban areas are to stop their end runs around the 50 state houses, there has got to be more action initiated at the state level. There has to be a demonstration of will, to convince urban dwellers that the reapportionment of legislatures has not merely replaced rural dominance with a new rural-suburban bloc.

Dr. Slater's view is that local governments must do all they can with the property tax. What they cannot finance with it, should be left to state government. To aid big urban centers, he would sparingly extend the use of local sales and income taxes, but only to perhaps the 50 largest states.

He asserts that the compliance costs and administration of local sales taxes, unless the rates are all uniform, are too great to make them attractive. As for city income taxes, he thinks the problems involved in taxing people who live in one town, work in another, or hold two jobs in different places, or move in the course of a year, makes the tax unattractive for all but the biggest cities.

In Massachusetts, Mrs. Deborah Ecker agrees that state-local problems can largely be solved with the taxes already in use. Mrs. Ecker is chairman of fiscal policy study for the Massachusetts League of Women Voters.

Agreeing that in many cases the property tax has been overworked, she would lessen its burden by increasing state sales and income taxes. Most states already have a graduated income tax; they only need to shake that tree harder.

Secondly, she would use these increased states taxes to redistribute monies to local governments (which are the main collectors of property taxes) on a basis that would correct the municipal overburden of the core cities in each state. This would satisfactorily redistribute the state-local tax load everywhere except in a few "pathological centers," as one Washington tax expert referred to New York City.

INEQUALITY HITS CITIES

Inequality among the cities is one factor that sends mayors running to Washington. If the legitimately higher costs of running metropolitan centers could be equalized by moving more taxes to the state level, this would in itself tie local government more closely to the state house and end some of the trips to Washington.

Massachusetts is not untypical in its state-local tax mix. Last year 53 percent of its taxes were raised at the local level. This was only slightly higher than the national average of 47.5 percent.

Other percentages of local revenue as a portion of state-local revenues: Illinois, 52 percent; New York, 51 percent; Ohio, 53.5 percent; California, 50.5 percent; Michigan, 41.4 percent; Washington, 29.5 percent. If nothing else, these figures indicate that state government doesn't have a clearly leading role in the state-local partnership in most states.

POTENTIAL EMPHASIZED

The plain fact is: there is no lack of potential tax money in the state-local tax orchard. All the money that may come back in the form of grants from Washington comes from people in the states in the first place (excepting specific aid to low-income areas).

But there has been a serious lack of good leadership at the state level for years. Ambitious and undeniably smart people have been attracted to Washington, challenged by the scope of national problems that have to be dealt with.

Too little attention has been paid to the array of state-local services that are more intimately connected with the quality of living for most people—or to the best means of paying for them.

Now is the time to prune the orchard so that it will yield its full potential.

[From the Christian Science Monitor, Apr. 2, 1970]

ARE YOU TAXED FAIRLY?—VI: HOW MUCH MORE CAN PROPERTY TAKE?

(The property tax is unpopular with both those who pay it and those who administer it. It's beginning to pinch, it's complicated, and it has about been squeezed dry. Tax experts agree reform is needed.)

(By Richard A. Nenneman)

BOSTON.—The Property Tax, as it exists today, has few outright friends.

Most homeowners know the property tax from those annual notices they receive from the bank: "Due to an increase in your property taxes, your monthly mortgage payment has been raised $18." They often don't even think of this as a tax but as just one component of the shelter part of their budget.

Those who don't own homes pay a property tax indirectly. It's considered in the total rent a landlord charges, and is the main reason rents in major cities have climbed so fast the past five years.

While it is true that the property tax finances local public services (schools, police, etc.) which benefit the poor, it is also true that the poor usually pay a higher percentage of their income for shelter than do those in the middle-income bracket. For this reason the property tax is considered regressive.

Yet, the fact that it hits the poor hardest is not the chief complaint of critics. What they particularly don't like is the present slippery base for figuring it.

ABATEMENT DESCRIBED

What is grossly wrong with the tax may be seen in a typical abatement procedure in a Massachusetts town. (An abatement is a reduction in the assessment on one's property. The assessment is its valuation on the town's tax rolls—what the town says it's worth for tax purposes.)

A homeowner thinks the assessment on his two-year-old, $40,000 house is too high. He tells the assessors he has found that an almost identical house down the street, built a year earlier than his, was assessed for only $30,000.

"I should be paying the same tax he is. Cut my assessment by $10,000," he demands.

To be fair they grant his request. But they know that the $30,000-assessed home has just been sold for $45,000 and that therefore the new owner's tax bill will be figured on a $45,000 assessment.

So the assessors can expect the man down the street to be in next year, demanding his abatement.

Further complicating the outlook: The town is considering a general reassessment of all property.

Such juggling goes on continually in every assessor's office—if the town doesn't have a yearly reassessment, and few can afford that.

In this example, there was an attempt to be fair. But in many big cities, the assessor's office is the place where political favors are quietly paid off. And some big cities today make special, above-board tax deals with new commercial developments that would be lost to the city if it didn't offer special tax treatment.

This is why economist Rufus Perkins of Arthur D. Little, Inc., Cambridge, Mass., consultants, says the whole property tax ought to be scrapped.

CRITICISMS LISTED

The faults charged to it sound formidable: As the abatement proceeding illustrates, the tax is poorly, often amateurishly assessed. The result is a tax that isn't even fair on a horizontal basis—that is, it not only doesn't treat people with equal incomes the same (they may have different tastes in housing), but it doesn't always treat even equal houses the same.

It is a poor measure of a man's ability to pay. While most wealth was once in the form of tangible property, today only about 35 percent of personal wealth is accounted for that way. The property tax started as a kind of net-worth tax, which is a valid concept in taxation (after taxes on income and taxes on purchases). But it covers too little of total wealth to qualify as such a tax today.

It is best described as an annual excise tax on housing expense. Think of it either as a 3 percent tax on the value of your property, payable not once but annually, or as a 25 to 30 percent tax on annual housing expense. As the latter, it stacks up as a horrendous levy, compared with the normal 4 to 5 percent sales taxes on purchases in most states.

The property tax is most often levied in small districts. There may be gross unfairness in the way people in neighboring communities are treated. This could be somewhat remedied if assessments were made on a statewide basis (communities with considerable industry in them would still give a net advantage to private homeowners).

Because it taxes improvements on property as well as the land, it has been a deterrent to property improvement. Frederick D. Stocker, professor of business research at Ohio State University, describes it as the same as a stiff excise on improvements. It raises the cost of housing (and rents) and reduces the supply of homes.

It is an uneven tax on business. It has been especially burdensome on business, such as railroads which are heavy owners of property but have few friends among local tax assessing authorities.

As practiced in most states, the property tax works a hardship on the poor and on retired persons. Wisconsin and Minnesota have pioneered in an approach that exempts many of the elderly from the tax.

SOME GOOD POINTS NOTED

If a tax is poorly and unevenly assessed, if it bears no direct relation to one's ability to pay, if it is discriminatory even against business, and works against a need of the 1970's to rebuild the cities, what is there good to say about it?

It is highly productive. Raising probably $35 billion this year, it comes close to the corporation income tax in size. To replace it would add a big load to other taxes.

It is highly visible. The Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations (ACIR) notes, "It provides a direct linkage for many citizens between services provided by local government on the one hand and the cost of services on the other."

It is adaptable to small, year-to-year changes. Sales and income taxes are changed less frequently and by legislative process. Somewhere in the tax system a tax is needed

that can come close to "evening up" expenses with income at the local level.

However, none of these reasons condones a tax as large and at the same time as badly administered as the property tax generally is. In many large cities, it is common for identical properties to have tax rates as much as 20 percent different.

DRASTIC REFORMS PROPOSED

The critics of the tax would either come close to abolishing it or drastically reform it.

In the first category, Mr. Perkins of the Arthur D. Little firm would fund the school expense, which takes more than half the property tax, at the state level through a higher, graduated state income tax. Then he would pay for other local costs—fire, police, libraries, and so on—with a local income tax. He doesn't see any unresolvable problem in taxing the income of non-residents.

The ACIR doesn't advocate abolishing the property tax. But like Mr. Perkins, it would fund at least 90 percent of the school bill at the state level (leaving school programs, curricula, and the like in local hands). Then the property tax would remain, at rates less than half what they are today, to pay for local services more closely connected with property ownership than is education.

One Washington consultant proposes transferring the major part of school expense to the federal level, as is happening to welfare. All these proposals have this common thread: relief of the property tax; it must be relieved of its biggest burden—local education.

Those who would reform the property tax think of big changes in the tax itself but aren't as radical about touching the functions of government that are connected with the tax now.

LAND-VALUE APPROACH ARGUED

The reform proposal with the most currency today is to shift the property tax partially or wholly to a land-value tax. On the surface, it's a very attractive idea.

The argument goes this way: Central cities have become run-down partly because the property tax carries such a load. Owners of slum property have little incentive to improve them or rebuild. The tax on deteriorated buildings remains low. As soon as they are fixed up, taxes jump.

Those who want to tax mainly the land instead of what's built on it (this is a variant on the Henry George single-tax theory) argue, among other things, that this would tax city land at its true economic value and force the owners to erect structures in keeping with these higher values.

This theory has been analyzed in detail by L. Laszlo Ecker-Racz, senior fellow of the Washington Center for Metropolitan Studies. Taking a figure of $35 billion for total property taxes in 1970, he estimated that about $10 billion of this is accounted for by taxes on farmland and personal property.

Of the $25 billion left, about $10 billion represents taxes on land and $15 billion on buildings. If one assumes we have a currently average property tax rate of 3 percent of real value, it would have to be raised to 7½ percent if land alone were taxed.

If your community had to raise taxes 20 cents next year—20 cents for each $100 of assessed valuation—it would have to raise them 50 cents if land alone were taxed. Most assessors think that putting all the property-tax burden on the land would make their work of valuing property even trickier than it is today.

Proponents of site valuation, as it's called, say it could be phased in over several years, perhaps even a generation. Whatever the period, a land tax would tend to decrease the value of land and penalize its present owners.

Mr. Ecker-Racz concluded that a land-value tax system was best suited for a developing country "where high tax rates and urbanization are still in the future." For the United States, there is only the possibility of "some increased emphasis" on land.

An even more sophisticated approach to taxing property has been taken by Prof. Dick Netzer of New York University, one of the nation's authorities on the subject. In a Brookings Institution study, he suggested three new factors: a separate land-value tax; a tax on profits from the sale of land—a local capital-gains tax, in effect; and user chargers for municipal services. If these three were phased in, he thought it possible to bring normal property taxation down to 5 percent of annual expenditures on housing, making it similar to other consumption taxes.

COMPLEXITY A HURDLE

But the complexity of such a system makes it doubtful whether it will ever be seriously considered. And Professor Netzer concedes the problem of equity involved in shifting either to such a combination system or simply to a land-value tax.

As an absolute minimum, two things must happen to the property tax.

First, to the fairly large degree it will probably continue to be used, it must be administered by non-elected and professional assessors. Further, the ACIR recommends that any assessment practices on less than a statewide basis be conducted in accord with enforceable state standards.

Second, reliance on it—it presently accounts for close to half of all state-local tax collections—must diminish. Possibly as a consequence of more federal aid, but more likely through courageous use of the state income tax, the property tax must be played down.

The almost insuperable difficulties of assessing fairly and frequently enough make this necessary. Less reliance on the property tax would also reduce its deterrent effect on the redevelopment of core cities.

Finding a way out of this particular thicket in the tax forest would offer gains to all concerned.

[From the Christian Science Monitor, Apr. 4–6, 1970]

ARE YOU TAXED FAIRLY?—VII: REVENUE SHARING—NO TAXPAYER'S PANACEA

(The Nixon administration has proposed a system of federal revenue sharing to help state and local governments meet soaring costs. A close look at the concept, however, suggests that it may be only one of several avenues for possible help to the beleaguered U.S. taxpayer.)

(By Richard A. Nenneman)

WASHINGTON. — Revenue sharing — the phrase used to describe federal grants to state-local governments without any restrictions on their use—is the uncertain wave of the future.

Its proponents say it will cure the fiscal mismatch in America: steadily increasing revenue at the federal level, thanks to the progressive income tax, and steadily increasing needs at state and local levels, thanks to the expansion in both the number and quality of public services.

Against the apparent need for Washington to share more of its revenues with lower levels of governments stands the "pain and pleasure" concept of taxation: Whoever bears the brunt of collecting the taxes should at least have the pleasure of deciding how to spend them!

The issue is quite simple. The taxes on which state-local governments rely most heavily do not increase as automatically with economic growth as do income-tax-fueled federal revenues. One local tax in particular, the property tax, needs to be rolled back. Because of the mobility of the Ameircan people and the increasingly national scope of business organization, state-local governments fear to be leaders when it comes to increasing taxes. For high taxes tend to chase people and business elsewhere.

GRANTS CARRY STRINGS

Yet, the reaction of key congressmen to the Nixon revenue-sharing proposal—an idea first introduced by then Rep. Melvin R. Laird (R) of Wisconsin and then popularized in the early '60's by economist Walter W. Heller—has been cool.

But this reaction should alarm anyone who seriously considers revenue sharing the only viable means left to help the lower levels of government.

The federal government has, in fact, been helping the states and their subdivisions for some time through "grants-in-aid." These have federal strings attached—such as requirements that the states provide funds to match the federal grant and that they spend the funds for specific purposes.

There are more than 400 distinct grant-in-aid programs. They have grown in number every year and tripled in size since 1960, when they totaled some $9 billion. The current budget calls for grants-in-aid of $27 billion.

The complexity of this strings-attached aid is one of the incentives for finding something simpler. Many governmental units say they can't possibly be familiar with all the government programs.

Furthermore, the kind of aid given determines the spending of lower governments and does not necessarily always direct it in the right way. The highway program, for instance, has been financed 90 percent with federal money, while the welfare program has had only 50 percent, or matching funds, from Washington. Obviously, highway spending is easier for state or local governments to participate in than welfare spending.

Moreover, the misuse of federal grants is a constant specter. Congress—which votes grant-in-aid funds—does not have the personnel to adequately police the ultimate use of funds in every program it initiates.

Thus, the administration's proposal has several things going for it: the pressing needs of the states and their subdivisions; the better ability of the federal government to collect taxes; and the disillusionment with the complexity and control of the grants-in-aid system.

$5 BILLION LEVEL OUTLINED

The Nixon proposal is to share a percentage of personal taxable income—the income-tax base—with other levels of government. It was to begin with only one-sixth of 1 percent in fiscal 1971 and rise to 1 percent by fiscal 1976—about $5 billion. Income was picked as a base rather than a flat percentage of federal revenues so that mayors and governors would not be directly concerned with federal tax rates as such. What they got back from Washington would be determined by the level of personal income (which presumably will keep rising) regardless of what portion of that income Washington decides to take in taxes.

The administration had to solve two main problems: the distribution formula and the pass-through formula.

If the funds were to be distributed on a strictly per capita basis, this would get more money into local hands—but do nothing to encourage local tax effort. So it was decided that distribution would be made on the basis of both tax effort and each state's population.

The pass-through formula was more difficult. Here the federal problem comes into play at its prickliest. Were this a nonfederal nation, the money would simply be distributed for the next lower level of government to spend. But because the states have sovereign powers, they have set up levels of government underneath them, such as cities, counties and townships. The states also have

many special districts—fire, sanitation, and school, for instance.

The cities have been getting more than half the grants-in-aid directly from the federal government—some 56 percent this year, in fact. To persuade mayors that revenue sharing would actually benefit them and not just take the pressure off state financing, there had to be a formula that would bypass state government and channel some funds directly to the cities. The formula decided on would provide such a bypass:

Local governments collectively would be apportioned a share of funds equal to the total percentage they as a group had contributed to the local-state tax pool. This collective share would then be divided up among individual local governments on the basis of how each one's tax contribution compared with those of all other local governments.

There would be no limitation on how the funds were used, other than a requirement that no existing state aid to local governments be curtailed.

Murray L. Weidenbaum, Assistant Treasury Secretary for Economic Policy, makes an excellent case for the administration proposal. Admitting that the funds available now are small, he says it is better at least to get started, to accept the principle of the program.

The Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations (ACIR) has drafted its own version of revenue sharing. Its bill has been introduced by Sens. Edmund S. Muskie (D) of Maine and Charles E. Goodell (R) of New York.

Unlike the Nixon proposal, the Muskie-Goodell bill provides for (1) a cutoff on the size of the city being helped (units of government with fewer than 50,000 residents would get no aid), (2) the inclusion of special districts in the local-government category (this would make sure some of the funds got channeled to school districts), and (3) a combination of revenue sharing with tax credits.

BIG-CITY PREFERENCE

By giving a credit against federal income taxes of 40 percent of the state income tax paid, the ACIR bill would encourage the quick enactment of new state income taxes.

Such a tax credit would also cost the federal government $2.6 billion the first year. This lessens its chances of being adopted over the Nixon program.

But the ACIR package would aid big cities more, since it identifies them as being most in need. It might also encourage the merger of small, inefficient units of government.

As for aiding all governments Mr. Weidenbaum noted in a speech he made to the tax committee of the National Association of Manufacturers: "Over 45 percent of all city residents and 27 percent of all county residents live in . . . jurisdictions [of fewer than 50,000], and it would be patently unfair to exclude such a large portion of our population."

Furthermore, the administration is careful not to imply that grant-in-aid programs would be clipped if revenue sharing were adopted. According to Mr. Weidenbaum, $16 billion of the current fiscal year's aid programs goes directly to cities. This is a tacit recognition that they are the areas in most need.

OPPOSITION DESCRIBED

Another Treasury Department aide admitted that tax credits sound fine in theory. But, he said, the Treasury estimates that at most 50 percent of the available tax credits would be taken advantage of in passing new state tax legislation.

If the need is there, and revenue sharing could meet it, why the opposition to it?

One has only to travel the length of Pennsylvania Avenue from the Treasury Department to the halls of Congress to find out. Many members of the key Ways and Means Committee in the House have been skeptical about it. One of them, Mrs. Martha W. Griffiths (D) of Michigan, has three main objections:

"Congress will never send back enough money in revenue sharing."

Congressmen are naturally irritated at the thought of handing out no-strings-attached revenue and letting local officials take pride on election day in having spent the money. (This is only a slightly more "gut" description of the old axiom that the pain of taxing should not be separated from the pleasure of spending the tax money.)

Then there is the distribution formula. "In my state," said Mrs. Griffiths, "the people of Dearborn would get back more per capita than the people of Detroit (where needs are greater)."

She is probably correct in wondering if the precise formula both for distribution to the states and for the pass-through to local governments would not be under constant reexamination.

"There would be a tendency for state and local governments to let their own sources of taxation decay."

With the busy schedule the House Ways and Means Committee has this year, revenue sharing may not get taken up at all. When it finally does have its day in court, many observers predict, the outcome will be less significant for the revenue it sends back home than for helping politicize the plight of the cities.

"It won't be enough for a congressman to oppose revenue sharing," said John Shannon, assistant director of the ACIR. "He will be forced by his opposition to say just how he would help solve the problems of state-local financing."

Even if revenue sharing is adopted, by 1976—the year it is proposed to reach just $5 billion—the various grant-in-aid programs may be about $35 billion. This relegates the administration's revenue-sharing plan to something almost peripheral in relation to other kinds of federal aid.

Back in 1946, all federal grants-in-aid came to 6 percent of state-local spending. Today, at $27 billion, they have grown to 18 percent of state-local spending, and the revenue gap worsens.

ANOTHER AVENUE LOOMS

The ACIR, which has done yeoman service in sorting out possible solutions to intergovernmental relations in this country since its founding in 1960, has a four-part proposal to fill this gap:

Maintenance of existing grant-in-aid programs, while putting them into broader and fewer categories.

Tax credits against the federal income tax, to nudge the states into adopting more or higher income taxes.

Revenue sharing.

Assumption of the welfare load by the federal government.

The reason for this last proposal is that successful state-run welfare programs are self-defeating: They tend merely to attract more potential welfare recipients into the state.

This fourth category in the ACIR list—federalizing an entire program—also indicates one way Congress may turn if it rejects any major revenue-sharing program.

Mrs. Griffiths, for instance, notes that Congress actually has no access to any funds that the states don't also have access to—income taxes, for instance. But if, for competitive reasons, the states and other jurisdictions fail to act to raise the money they need and turn even more to Washington, Congress is apt to "reanalyze the responsibilities of the federal government and assume those that belong to it."

In the process of moving the welfare burden to the federal government, Congress is actually taking one step in such a reanalysis.

If state-local needs continue to press, it is entirely possible that the federal government will also fund at least some part of basic education expense. If this happened, the need for revenue sharing would disappear. For education gobbles up at least half of present local property-tax revenues.

While one could argue whether it would be good to federalize the education expense, it should be clear that Congress has more than one option open to it. What the revenue-sharing proposal has accomplished is to put Congress at an important crossroads.

Federal monies, in some form, are needed to pay for what are regarded now as local needs. This will get done through larger grants-in-aid; through a system of revenue sharing in which Americans finally turn their backs on the pain-pleasure concept of taxation and spending; or possibly through the federalization of what now are local services.

The issue at least has been joined.

[From the Christian Science Monitor, Apr. 9, 1970]

ARE YOU TAXED FAIRLY?—VIII: APPLE PIE, MOTHERHOOD—AND SOCIAL SECURITY?

(The goals of the American system of old-age insurance are laudable. But the present setup has two major flaws: (1) it provides insufficient benefits for many low-income retirees; (2) its cost is unfairly assessed. The following article suggests a way to boost benefits and spread the load.)

(By Richard A. Nenneman)

BALTIMORE, MD.—Social security today is almost in a class with apple pie and motherhood. But should it be?

It may come hard to some to question a program that, in the last generation, has become accepted as one of the facts of economic life in America and has helped change the outlook for the entire over-65 generation.

Currently, some $2.5 billion in payments go through the mails each month under various aspects of the Old Age, Survivors, and Disability Insurance Act.

In the fiscal 1971 budget, $50.4 billion goes for income-security programs. Two thirds of this, some $33.6 billion, is in social-security payments. The rest includes unemployment insurance ($3.2 billion), other retirement programs ($5 billion), public assistance of $7 billion, and some miscellaneous programs ($1.5 billion) for vocational rehabilitation and social services for the poor and elderly.

But it is not these results of the program that need to be questioned. The questions come regarding the financing of the program: Is the method of taxing payrolls the fairest one possible? Does the trust-fund approach—putting all the social-security taxes in a separate pot and paying the benefits from that pot—actually have some unfortunate effects on the rest of the tax system?

POCKETBOOK IMPORTANCE

Just as today's swinging grandmothers are hard to identify with Whistler's mother, so the method used to finance social security in its first generation may not necessarily be the best method to use forever.

To begin with, let's look at the payroll tax and its relation to benefits. It concerns us all at a most practical level, our pocketbook.

As Arthur E. Hess, Deputy Commissioner of the Social Security Administration (SSA), explains it, social security is a social-insurance system.

It has some of the aspects of individual insurance, in that the "risk" is shared all across the wage-earning spectrum. But the program is social in that it takes care of the basic group needs of the older generation, some of whom need a minimum benefit which their own contributions by themselves might not support.

Social Security was passed into law in 1935, when the United States was deep in depression and social crisis. Francis Townsend

was campaigning in California for a federal payment of $200 a month to every citizen over 60.

PURITAN ETHIC

To meet these challenges, Congress came up with a plan that was part welfare, part pension. Through the payroll tax, it would create the impression of an insurance system. Each one would earn his right to a pension. The Puritan ethic was thus satisfied that this was not a welfare program.

But it did, in fact, have its welfare side. For it provided a minimum level of payments to all who were included in it, whether or not they had been contributing for their entire working careers. Otherwise, the whole first generation under the system would have been deprived of their benefits.

Through it many refinements, social security has remained essentially a compromise. As a system of social insurance, it attempts to care for the retired elderly as a class (as well as the disabled, and the widows and children of workers who die before age 65). While this social goal is attained, the way in which it is attained isn't entirely fair by the standards of individual insurance.

Example: According to Dr. Elizabeth Deran at the Tax Foundation in New York, a person making the minimum payments into the system now can expect to get back 11.8 times as much in benefits in relation to his contributions as the person making the maximum contribution gets back in relation to his contribution. With each change in the law, this ratio has tended to go up—that is, the poor have been more heavily favored each time.

As long as the "contribution"—as the compulsory tax is euphemistically called—was small in relation to wages, there were few complaints. Now that it is up to 4.8 percent (including .4 percent for medicare) and the wage base is up to $7,800, there have been more voices raised that one might do better on his own with voluntary insurance or some other investment program.

Mr. Hess asserts that many comparisons about what one could do with the same money himself are inaccurate. For one thing, 28 percent of the employee's contribution is figured to go for disability and survivorship protection in case he is not around at age 65. That is, the whole program buys him more than old-age insurance.

STRONG CASE

For another, comparisons are generally made about what could be done with the contribution of both employer and employee. There is no certainty that the employee would get his employer's contribution in terms of higher wages if there were no social security; and, if he did, he would first have to pay taxes on it.

On the assumption that the employee could figure on having only his own contribution, the SSA makes a strong case that a worker can at least expect to get back what he put in, plus compound interest, and then some.

But two fundamental problems remain:

Those at the bottom still don't get enough, in spite of what Mr. Hess calls the "bent formula" which gives them proportionally more than they contribute.

Since no one is taxed on income above $7,800, the bulk of the money for those at the bottom is being provided in effect by the middle-income wage earner:

This is so in two ways:

First, upper-income workers are taxed only on the first $7,800, or a maximum of $374.40 a year. They bear no greater burden than the $7,800 worker, and a proportionately smaller one.

Second, the employer's share, which can be presumed to supply the funds for the lower-income benefits, is actually passed on to the workers in the form of lower wages and or to the public in the form of higher prices. Any tax thus passed on the public hits low- and middle-income workers the hardest.

As for the first problem—that the lower-income retirees still get too little—Dr. Robert J. Myers, chief actuary of the SSA since 1947, says that slightly less than 10 percent of those on social security need additional public assistance. This, he argues, is preferable to changing the whole system.

But the question arises: Should that 10 percent be subjected to the personal indignity of having to apply for welfare?

One possible way to pay more to the worker at the lower end of the scale would be to depart at least partially from the trust-fund concept. All retired workers could receive a basic monthly payment, either partly or wholly out of general tax revenues. Then they would draw social-security payments from the trust fund in a closer proportion to their contributions into it.

Many fear any departure from 100 percent trust-fund financing. Under the present setup, annual contributions into the fund, plus interest on its present $34 billion in assets, provide all the payout. Many conservatives look on any plan to change this as a liberal plot to destroy the "integrity" of social security. But the compromise upon which the present system rests is built on an integrity that is at least questionable itself.

Conservatives (and here this includes most SSA officials) contend that to fund any part of social security with general tax moneys would rob it of its soundness. Yet from the citizen's point of view, the actuarial soundness of this one part (16 percent) of the government's total budget is academic. Both social security and income taxes are withheld from his paycheck, and he is interested mainly in what's left for him, regardless of which government pocket gets the rest.

SEPARATE FUNDING

Besides being a way to raise the basic payment to those who need more than the present minimum of $64 a month, funding part of the payment through general revenues would tap those whose income is above the present cutoff of $7,800. Under the present setup, this group is paying proportionally less into the system than the middle-income wage earner, who one way or another foots the biggest part of the bill.

One objection to taking part of social security out of the trust fund is that Congress might spend too much on the older generation. This could happen. But just the opposite might also result.

Here the second major objection to the present system comes into focus. In the past two years all income-security payments have climbed from 20 percent of the federal government's budget (its average level for the past decade) to 25 percent.

Said Arthur M. Okun, former chairman of the Council of Economic Advisers, "Every economist will tell you that it's no good to fund each program separately. But that's the way to get the money."

And that is unfortunate.

Perhaps the younger generation is in relatively greater need today than the older. Or perhaps the environment of the core cities deserves first priority before the needs of any particular age group. Yet, it is almost impossible to assign priorities to government spending—to cut up the pie with logic aforethought—when part of that pie is baked separately.

If social security were subject to annual review, just like every other government program, would this make it a Yo-Yo, pulled up and down by whim? Not likely. The concepts behind it are well accepted. Said Dr. Okun, "Social security isn't meant to be a middle-income retirement program." Dr. Myers, in the SSA, refers to it as a "floor-of-protection" concept.

SOCIAL COMMITMENT

The implied commitment to the worker, said Arthur Hess, is to continue giving him a retirement income comparable to what retired workers today are getting. "If wage levels 30 years from now are three times as high as today, there is a social commitment to pay today's worker, who will then be retired, three times what he would get today." The higher payment would come from higher taxes being paid into the system as wages and the tax base go up.

None of this need be changed by putting some part of social security under the general budget.

But, to summarize, these beneficial results could occur:

There could be a higher minimum payment, thus ending the need for public assistance to some of the retired.

The trust-fund part of the pension payment would more directly relate to one's contributions.

The middle-income wage earner would no longer be taxed out of proportion to those earning more than the top tax base figure ($7,800 currently).

Social security would get a better review in conjunction with every other government program.

If these things could be accomplished, it is certainly premature to rush to the defense of the present system and claim it shouldn't be touched. It is, instead, time to take a long, hard look at it.

[From The Christian Science Monitor, Apr. 11–13, 1970]

ARE YOU TAXED FAIRLY?—IX: HOW TO SPEND $300 BILLION

(The U.S. tax coin really has two sides—where the money comes from and where it goes. So tax reform also includes adequate control over spending at all levels of government—local, state, and federal.)

(By Richard A. Nenneman)

BOSTON.—The most unjust tax is one that is badly spent. Spending is the other side of the taxation coin—and in the United States some $300 billion in taxes is spent every year by the different levels of government.

The big dollar on this page—the back side of the near-extinct silver dollar and literally the other side of the coin—shows where the $300 billion in taxes goes.

A reform of the tax system itself would not be enough. Somehow the public has to feel it has better control over the spending system.

This control includes, first, decisions about the total of government spending as a percentage of the whole economy and a related knowledge of future public-spending demands. And second, it includes allocations of public spending—cutting up the pie.

The steady climb of government spending as a percentage of gross national product (the total of goods and services produced each year) has reached a point where it needs curtailing. President Nixon himself recognized this in a December press conference, when he said: "Approximately 35 to 37 percent of the total income of the United States goes to taxes, that is in federal, state, and local taxes. I believe that amount is high enough. . . .

"When a nation takes a substantially larger portion of the national income than that for taxes, . . . that nation loses its character as a free, private-enterprise economy and turns over and becomes primarily a state-controlled and oriented economy.

"Therefore, while I believe that the United States can afford what it needs to do in many fields, including the environment, . . . I do not want to see a substantial increase in the tax burden as a percentage of our gross national income."

TWO DEVELOPMENTS CONSIDERED

Two developments make it at least possible that government spending will not rise as fast in the near future. One, the thrust of this administration is to look extra carefully at anything new coming under the domain of government.

The President's economic advisers are also aware of the unsettling role government had on the nation's economy during the Johnson years. In general, they would prefer to see government activity not fluctuate violently from year to year. With the best-run private sector in the world, the government can still create a lopsided economy.

Two, the various factors that have so swiftly expanded state and local spending show signs of slowing down. This isn't true for every community, but in the aggregate something encouraging is happening.

Let's look first at the federal level, where two-thirds of the tax dollars are either spent or redistributed in grants or transfer payments.

The President's annual economic report to Congress in February made a stab at the outlook for the next five fiscal years. This is something new in the annals of federal finance. The projections may be off, as they often are in looking ahead. But they at least lay out the general scenery against which decisionmaking will occur.

In this projection, the Council of Economic Advisers (CEA) first estimated the growth in gross national product (GNP) through 1975 (in 1969 dollars). Then they estimated the claims against this GNP from the government, from personal-consumption spending, and from business and residential investment.

They figured GNP growing at less than normal till 1972, as the nation tries to get over its inflationary binge; after 1972, at about 4.3 percent a year. This would leave the country with a $1.2 trillion GNP in 1975.

The CEA showed federal expenditures rising slowly—perhaps more slowly than will be possible—to $206 billion by 1975 (this, remember, in terms of 1969 dollars—the dollar figures will appear bigger in 1975 because of inflation between now and then).

With this rather slow growth predicted for federal spending, the CEA found room for only $15 billion in new initiatives by government. These include expansion in existing programs, plus the Nixon family-assistance program and the proposed revenue sharing.

This document frankly admits that these may not be the programs the public decides to "run with" into the '70's. The point it makes, though, is that unless the public sector is to have another big jump at the expense of the private sector, the room for new programs is severely limited.

If expensive urban programs are demanded, or faster pollution control, this would crowd out some of the other Nixon initiatives—or cut down some existing programs. This could happen.

This year, for instance, for the first time since Korea, the budget calls for more spending on "people programs" than it does for defense. It is not entirely impossible to change the direction of government. But it happens slowly.

The inference from the report is that this administration at least will be more cautious about letting federal spending grow. This would probably have some effect. But this administration is only two years away from an election that could change things. Moreover, with an independently minded Congress, spending could even go higher now than is desired.

What any administration has to keep in mind is that if too many things that need doing at the federal level are postponed, even for very good reasons of smoothing out the growth of the budget, there would be a political day of reckoning that could be followed by a new group trying to do everything at once. Thus, to be too cautious now might be good economics, but in the long run it could be disastrous both politically and economically.

On the state and local level, likewise, spending growth may taper off.

EFFECT OF LONG-BUILT-UP NEEDS

Dr. Elsie Waters at the Tax Foundation, a private, business-supported tax research group in New York, notes that spending for 20 years has been affected by the build-up needs created during the long depression of the '30's and then by the four war years in the '40's.

The '50's and '60's were two decades of catching up with public construction needs and raising the salaries of public employees.

For instance, from 1948 to 1968, the average wages of full-time state-local employees rose 166 percent to $6,815. Wages of those employed in industry went up only 138 percent to an average of $6,634. So at least the "catch-up" reason for public salaries increasing so fast is behind us.

How far today's better-organized public employees, especially those who are professionally trained—such as schoolteachers, will try to carry their salary schedules is another matter.

For the moment, demographic changes are also on the taxpayer's side. A lower birthrate has slowed total population growth; there are even some responsible estimates now that place the widely touted figure of 300 million Americans by the year 2000 in doubt.

But most important for the taxpayer will be the age of the population. Those groups on which most public funds are spent—youth and the aged—are at the moment growing more slowly.

ENROLLMENT INCREASE CONTINUES

About 30 percent of the tax dollar is spent on education and income-support programs (although not all of the latter goes to the elderly). Taken together, these two items in the public budget equal defense.

Elementary and high-school enrollment in the 1954–64 decade rose by 12 million. In the 1964–74 decade which we now are halfway through, Dr. Watters estimates a further increase of only 2 million school-age children.

At the other end of the spectrum, the number of elderly—those 65 and older—rose by 2.5 percent from 1955 to 1965, but will increase by only 1.6 percent in the 1965–75 period. Moreover, an increasing proportion of the elderly are covered by social security. They should put less strain on state-local governments for local welfare assistance.

Taking all these considerations together, and adjusting them all for inflation, Dr. Waters concludes there was a rise of 89 percent in spending in the 1955–65 decade, but that this can be held down to 66 percent in the decade ending five years from now. The dollar figures may appear much higher, depending on how much prices continue to rise.

Since spending for the young and the elderly ranks so high in total public expenditure, a slowing of the growth rate in these two groups, even if it is only a five-year breather, could have substantial implications for the taxpayer.

CHART CLARIFIES OPTIONS

So much for the relative level of public spending, the first element related to control of the spending system.

The second element, options for specific allocations of tax funds, can be clarified by a close look at the pie chart on this page.

First of all, this is a chart that is not found in too many books.

The public is accustomed to seeing the annual breakdown of federal spending, with more than half going for defense. And it knows in general terms that the biggest part of state-local spending goes for schools, with lesser amounts for highways, hospitals, welfare, and so on.

This chart brings together all the levels of spending (for fiscal 1968), which is what we have to look at to make better sense out of the system.

On the basis, we see that 60 percent, or three-fifths, of spending is in three categories—defense and international affairs, education, and income-support programs. Defense is about equal to the other two combined. Is this the way we want it?

These are the three items that can be "played" with. From income programs, at 15 percent of spending, we drop to interest on the debt, which we can do little about, and to highways, at 5 percent. Whatever is wrong with welfare or any other category, there is not as much leeway to decrease a relatively small budget item. On the other hand, if any of these smaller items should grow, or if there should be a redistribution among the "big three," the extra dollars would have to come mostly from the top three categories.

DEFENSE AND EDUCATION NOTED

Income-maintenance programs may be high in relation to other areas, such as the great needs in urban education. But few would contend they are too high in absolute terms. Thus, the only categories we really can consider are defense and education.

Almost one-third of every tax dollar at all levels of government is spent, all at the federal level, on defense. This is no place to make a decisive case for or against the level of defense spending.

Defense, however, is the one area most vulnerable to further cutback, if only because of its size. One need not be a pacifist, either, to question whether we need as many armaments as we now have, or whether a generation of growing military influence has not heightened the tendency, always present in America, to look at the world in terms of black and white—good guys and bad guys.

Fortunately, the post-Vietnam reassessment will give us time to think over whether some kind of enhanced moral authority in the world might not give us greater protection and influence than our reliance on arms has done.

On the other hand, while the public has begun to waken to the threat of the military-industrial complex, it is still asleep on education. "If you want to write about complexes," said an educator in New York who insisted on remaining anonymous, "be sure to include the suburban high school-state university education complex." He maintained he was shackled from even mentioning it in public.

WHERE TEACHING QUALITY DETERIORATES

For the past generation, America has poured it on for its children: new schools in the thousands of suburban-type communities, more money for equipment and teachers, college degrees for more and more until the degree has been partially demoted in significance.

At the same time, the quality of urban teaching has deteriorated. Children whose lives are warped by bad schools become the case loads in welfare departments tomorrow. If we are ever to make a big dent in welfare, it will be through the proper rearing and motivation of the young.

Education needs a new look as much as defense policy. The difficulties of raising enough taxes at the local level may soon lead to the states or even the federal government taking a more direct role in primary and secondary education. Something good would be lost, where local systems work well.

But educators have been slow to innovate. A conference of state-local groups last year, as reported in Nation's Cities, noted (1) the typical emphasis of school systems on reducing the pupil-teacher ratio as the main

evidence of good teaching; (2) the slowness to make widespread use of audiovisual techniques, which might make better use of unusually good teachers (the children certainly show at home that they are excellent TV viewers!) and (3) the lack of questioning of such basic things as the absurd spelling of English.

"Children in Italy, Spain, and Germany don't have to study spelling at all, because almost all their words are spelled just as they are spoken. But in America children from cultured families must still struggle with spelling in the sixth grade. . . . Millions of dropouts in the slums quit school because they still find English reading too hard in the 10th and 11th grades."

TOO MUCH—OR NOT ENOUGH?

We may be spending too much or not enough on education. This reporter does not pretend to know. But the way we are doing it should be questioned just as much as the defense budget. And the chances of questioning it are not so good as long as the nation has 18,000 atomized school districts each raising its own funds. In fiscal 1968, $30 billion (70 percent) of the $43 billion education bill was spent at the local level. Eleven billion dollars was spent by states, and $2.5 billion at the federal level.

This leads us back to the basic unresolved problem in public finance today—the overlapping of governmental jurisdictions. This is not a question of taxes or spending as much as it is a question of political arrangements. There is a great need to redefine who is responsible for what.

The solution might come in a basic turn toward more centralized control in Washington, with the loss of some valuable local controls. Or the federal government might turn to the states and say, "All right, there are 50 of you. You are grown up; you have the same potential taxes to work with that we do. Solve your own problems." and conceivably they could.

The solution will most likely be a compromise. Unlike defense, there is no need for education to be a federal monopoly. But Washington can lead, can set guidelines; it can mold public opinion so that education is lifted out of the quagmire it is in today.

[From the Christian Science Monitor]

ARE YOU TAXED FAIRLY—X: U.S. TAX SYSTEM NOT A MESS, BUT . . .

(. . . it does need a tune-up based on comprehensive knowledge. Reform suggestions in this final article in a series of 10 do not stem from either "liberal" or "conservative" viewpoints. They do stem from a desire to cull the best ideas available to build more simplicity and fairness into the tax system.)

(By Richard A. Nenneman)

BOSTON.—When in the mid-1940's I was learning that the newspapers contained more than Dick Tracy and Orphan Annie, the Chicago Tribune used to run a list of national goals underneath its masthead on the editorial page.

These included balancing the federal budget at $16 billion and bringing all the troops home from Europe.

The federal budget alone is now $200 billion and there are still troops in Germany.

Our tax reform goals mustn't be theoretical pie in the sky. So, first of all, we should go after something we can accomplish. With total annual public spending at $300 billion a year, no major revenue source is going to be given up.

Rather, as C. Lowell Harriss of Columbia University points out, it is a matter of change of emphasis. By increasing the federal income tax by 5 percent, for instance, could we decrease the bite of a tax that is less fair, such as the present property tax?

NO ONE LIKES TAXES

There is some advantage to having many kinds of taxes. For one thing, it makes it harder to dodge them. No one likes taxes. The poor feel that they pay too much. The middle class feels it bears most of the load. And the rich, as the lady in furs in the cartoon, invest considerable energy in trying to avoid their high taxes.

The higher a tax, the greater the effort to avoid it. The network of loopholes in the federal tax structure was put there by the lawyers of rich people, seeking to avoid the confiscatory rates written into the official tax bracket structure. An even greater reliance on the income tax, which would throw more income into higher brackets, would surely result in an even greater attempt to find legal loopholes out of some of the tax.

It really shouldn't shock us that rich people try to avoid taxes legally. Outside of reading about some occasional recluse who leaves all his money to the government, who do you know who has ever wanted to give his money to the tax collector?

Former U.S. Sen. Paul H. Douglas (D) of Illinois, writing in the American Scholar (in 1968) about his years in the Senate, seemed to find it sad that people tried to avoid taxes.

"I once heard an eminent public figure declare that it was a man's duty to pay the federal government as little as possible in the way of taxes . . . The large hearing room of the [Senate] Finance Committee seats 150 persons. When we considered a tax bill, the room was filled with prosperous lawyers, graduates of great universities, and of the top-ranking law schools . . . all working to hold what they and their clients had and to enlarge it."

And it is also natural that attempts to influence tax laws should concentrate on Washington, for the progressivity of the federal income tax hits harder at the rich than does any other tax.

CONSENSUS PROPOSED

In fact, a preliminary step before any more reforms are attempted should be to arrive at a consensus as to how much harder taxes should hit the very rich than the middle class.

The evidence in this series indicates that taxes are roughly proportional for most taxpayers except the very poor and those earning over, say $20,000.

After looking at the overall tax system, this reporter's own conclusions are that the field of taxation isn't the best place to further redress any wrongs done the poor. This isn't to argue that this nation shouldn't be doing much more to eliminate the causes of poverty. But rather than finding more ways to reduce taxes for the poor (which could be done through eliminating their social security contribution and giving a credit for property taxes paid), they should get whatever help they need in the form of direct government action. To the extent they get further relief through the tax system, the system becomes unfair for those taxpayers living just a shade above the poverty line.

As for progressivity—taking larger percentages of a person's income as it increases—there doesn't appear to be any overriding pressure for a highly progressive tax system. Prof. Dan Throop Smith of Stanford University noted, "In some instances an increase in progressivity may be an increase in unfairness."

EQUAL PROPORTIONS URGED

What the public was demanding before last year's tax reform was that the rich at least pay their share—that their taxes be as high a proportion of their income as they are for the rest of us.

It probably is a good thing that the federal rates are progressive. This counters the regressivity of many state and local taxes, which hit the poor relatively harder.

But we should be less concerned with fashioning a tax structure that theoretically penalizes a man for being rich, while at the same time giving him legal ways to avoid taxes. Then the crowds of smart young attorneys that bothered Senator Douglas won't have as much work to do for their clients.

As for the specific reforms needed, and their order of priority:

1. The property tax must be drastically reformed. The net result, in combination with raising other taxes, should also be to defuse it, to rely on it proportionately less than we now do.

In its present form, it is a deterrent to inner-city renewal. It is shabbily administered over a wide part of the nation.

If a shift to land-value taxation alone is impractical, we should at least have the courage to assess land in developed areas at its full economic value.

One of the simplest ideas presented in this series was to move the greater part of local education expense to the state level, finance it through higher state-income taxes, and free the property tax—at much reduced levels—to finance services connected with property ownership—fire, police, water, sewerage, and so on.

2. Widen the federal-income-tax base through further loophole narrowing. At the same time, reduce the brackets at the upper end. The main thrust of this proposal is to simplify federal taxation, not to increase revenue. A start was made in this direction in the 1969 reform.

Since any change may involve some new inequities, it is probably best to wait long enough to evaluate the areas that were changed before proceeding further. Municipal-bond-interest exemption was not touched; it is a good place to start—now.

3. Study the implications of further changes in the capital-gains tax. Under the 1969 reform, the difference between maximum straight-income rates and capital-gains rates was narrowed by two-thirds (from 70–25 to 50–35), leaving 15 percentage points difference instead of the old 45.

With generous enough income averaging—spreading out an unusual gain over several years of prior income—a separate capital-gains tax might no longer be necessary. On the other hand, the formation of new capital is a highly sensitive and important area. The results of the 1969 reform should be watched closely before doing anything more here.

4. Tax capital gains at death. This is a loophole that should be closed for reasons of fairness. It is also a potential source of revenue, but the plan under consideration would combine this with a decreased rate on estate taxes for little or no gain in tax revenues.

The addition of this tax would make the estates of older people more liquid, that is, they would be less hesitant to realize profits if their only reason for doing so was to leave a larger estate behind them.

5. Consider financing part of social security through general revenues. This is not of first priority; the present system is a well-run one. But bringing in some general revenues would make it possible to pay a higher minimum payment, thus ending the need for additional public-welfare payments to many present social-security recipients. It would also trap the portion of incomes above $7,800 or whatever ceiling the social-security contributions has at any given moment.

Two more reforms are more important than their position here indicates. They involve the way we do things rather than specific taxes.

6. Rethink the relationship of the federal government to state and local spending programs. The proliferation of grants-in-aid pro-

grams pleases no one. Federal revenue-sharing lacks a distinctness of definition, other than to get some money back to state and local governments. But as it is being sold to the Congress presently, it isn't apt to be much more than a token program in an area that needs more than token answers.

Revenue-sharing, with a more carefully conceived formula, might be one answer to match rising state-local needs and rising tax collections in Washington.

Assumption by the federal government of part of the education expense could be another answer. So could grants-in-aid, on a simplified basis—fewer strings.

Or the federal government could make a tacit commitment to review the tax-bracket structure every three to five years, so that rising income wouldn't result in federal revenues going up too fast.

7. The states must revitalize themselves. This is their last chance. If more power flows to Washington, the states in the not too distant future will be administrative appendages between Washington and merged urban governments.

REDISTRIBUTION STRESSED

The revitalization will be expressed in more than courage in raising taxes. But that's one place to start. Instead of allowing more and more cities to enact sales taxes and income taxes, the state should realize that this trend make a jungle of local taxation.

In general, state governments need to move in the direction of assumption of more of the local tax load and take upon themselves the politically difficult tax of redistributing the tax monies to local communities on a basis that recognizes both contribution and need.

In emphasizing ideas, this series has not developed any group's particular bias. Some of these ideas are typically welcomed by conservatives—questioning the need for highly progressive taxes, for instance, or pointing out the folly of high corporate-tax rates when most of the corporate tax is paid by the public in the end.

Others sound as if they came out of the liberal fold—such as trying to end the avoidance of capital gains taxes at death, which is a present exception to fairness, suggesting that part of social security could as easily be financed out of general revenues.

These ideas were among those highlighted, not because they have either a conservative or liberal label, but because they seemed to make sense. They would promote either the goal of fairness or the goal of knowing better just what our real taxes are. And this may show that people on both sides of the political fence do have some good ideas!

PERSONAL LIST

Anyhow, they make up a responsible list of reforms. But also a personal list—this reporter's. Every tax expert would have different priorities. It is the general approach that is important. What is the context within which Americans should improve their tax system—greater progressivity, or less? Greater emphasis on income taxes, or less? A bigger role for Washington, or hope for responsible government from revitalized and restructured state and local government?

If there was a major weakness to the 1969 reform, it was that it took place without consideration of the entire tax system (although the federal income tax is certainly the most important part).

Maybe it's too much to ask for the equivalent of a Carter Commission (the royal commission that examined the entire Canadian tax structure) in this huge, populous, and diverse nation. But somewhere in the process, before new laws are made, a quasi-public body—something with stature—should make a thorough survey of changes in public finance over the next decade or two and make a formal report.

There is a greater chance, then, that the changes on which there is some consensus will get enacted into law. As it is, staff committees wield enormous influence over overworked legislatures, whose members have minimum time for serious study of their own.

COULD BE BETTER

The U.S. tax system is not a mess. But it could be better. It won't get better if it is worked over only piece by piece.

There is a good degree of consensus already that the system should be progressive, but not overly so; that income taxes are the fairest, but not that they should replace other taxes. All that remains is to sort out the elements of specific reform that matter the most—in terms of both fairness and simplicity—and to work out the knotty problems of intergovernmental finance. The most immediate problems in the '70's are the finances of the states and local governments.

We cannot do away with taxes. There isn't even any promise we can reduce them. But it is in our power—and therefore is our duty—to have a fair system of taxation and one that raises enough money to escape the crisis aura that hangs over too much state and local finance today.

GLEN OAK SCHOOL STUDENTS ON THE 18-YEAR-OLD VOTE

HON. CHARLES A. VANIK

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 20, 1970

Mr. VANIK. Mr. Speaker, I have just received a very thoughful and well-reasoned letter from three of my constituents who attend Glen Oak School in Gates Mills, Ohio. The three students, Miss Robin Daiden, Miss Leslie Miller, and Miss Patty McVay, make some very good arguments for lowering the voting to 18—a change which I have long advocated. The arguments put forth in the letter are so sound that I would like to share them with the rest of the Congress and I insert their letter as follows:

GLEN OAK SCHOOL,
Gates Mills, Ohio.

To the Honorable Congressmen of the United States of America:

Regarding the extension of the Voting Rights Bill of 1965 and especially the provision extending the franchise to all U.S. citizens eighteen years old or over, we wish to make it known to you of our desire to have the full United States Senate version of that bill passed in the House of Representatives. In support of our request, we submit to you our reasons for favoring passage.

We have studied documents of our American heritage, in particular, the Constitution of the United States and the Declaration of Independence. We believe that the intent and literal interpretation of these documents support our contention that the franchise should now be rightfully extended to all United States citizens eighteen years of age and over, who are otherwise qualified.

In reviewing the Declaration of Independence, we found the intent to reflect a desire on the part of our founding fathers that all men who are subject to the most extensive duties of citizenship should be permitted to help determine the nature of those duties.

"That to secure these rights, Governments are instituted among men, deriving their just powers from the consent of the governed." Hundreds of thousands of young men within the age group of eighteen to twenty-one are required by law to fulfill a military obligation. This obligation is deemed necessary for the preservation of our democratic society. This obligation often results in serious injury, and in many cases, the loss of life. All men subject to this military obligation rightfully deserve a voice in determining that policy which controls their destinies.

We believe that all other powers exercised by our government which directly affect the lives of the citizens in this age group should be ratified by these citizens in direct relation to their numbers.

"For imposing taxes on us without our consent." Based on data supplied by the Gallup Poll Organization, of the 10.5 million citizens in the eighteen to twenty year old age bracket, 5.9 million of these are in the civilian labor force. Of these 5.9 million, 5.4 million are employed and are paying federal, state, and local taxes. We believe that this is a clear-cut case of taxation without representation. We believe this policy is inconsistent with the enumerated constitutional rights of these citizens.

The idea of the eighteen to twenty year old vote extension is not a new one. In 1963, the Presidents Commission of Registration and Voting Participation endorsed the idea of eighteen year old voting in all states.

To this date, four states in the Union, Alaska, Georgia, Kentucky, and Hawaii, have extended the vote to the eighteen to twenty year old group.

Forty-three nations allow their eighteen to twenty year old citizens to vote, thirty-five of which permit eighteen year olds to vote.

Of the 10.5 million citizens in the eighteen to twenty year old age group, 7 million have completed high school and 3.5 million are presently enrolled in college.

The educational system of the United States is such that it has produced an enlightened eighteen year old group which would provide greatly to the direction of the government of the United States.

Recent figures published by the Gallup Poll show that 53% of this college age group does not ally itself with either of our two national political parties. We believe this is a result of the frustration and alienation the youth have felt in attempting to help determine future policy through traditional party channels. If the eighteen year old citizen is given the right to help choose candidates and influence policy through his vote, we believe that the two party system will once again flourish in all age groups.

We respectfully request that you consider our arguments in support of the extension of the vote to eighteen year old American citizens and that you vote affirmatively on the issue when it comes up for a vote.

Respectfully,

ROBIN DAIDEN.
LESLIE MILLER.
PATTY MCVAY.

TRIBUTE TO OUR PRISONERS OF WAR

HON. OGDEN R. REID

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 20, 1970

Mr. REID of New York. Mr. Speaker, I would like to call to the attention of my colleagues in the House the tribute, which is to be held at Constitution Hall on the 1st of May, to our American servicemen who are prisoners of war or missing in action in Southeast Asia.

These young Americans have followed the call of the leaders of our country and we must support them and their anxious

families here at home. We must call on all peoples of the world to express universal concern over the safety and care of all prisoners of war. All nations should and must fully comply with the regulations for treatment of war prisoners as established by the Geneva Convention whether as demanded by international law or purely from human concern, and we ourselves must be deeply and morally committed to these regulations. We, as citizens of the United States, have a responsibility to let our voices be heard against unjust treatment by any nation of war prisoners. We must, as a nation, give greater priority to a negotiated settlement which should and can comprehend the safe return of all U.S. prisoners of war. While American casualties are now lower in number than in preceding years, more than 1,500 brave Americans are either prisoners or missing; yet we are still fighting in Southeast Asia and adding to the list. Our concern for these men must never waver and we must offer all the support we can to their wives, parents, and children who daily endure the burden of uncertainty.

I commend the participants of the tribute in their valuable endeavor to express their moral concern for the lives of the men and families of all POW's and MIA's.

THE FLAG BELONGS TO ALL

HON. JAMES H. (JIMMY) QUILLEN

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 20, 1970

Mr. QUILLEN. Mr. Speaker, one of the proudest moments of my life came when the House passed my bill making it a Federal crime to desecrate the American flag.

On April 14, an editorial appeared in the Johnson City Press-Chronicle, one of the outstanding daily newspapers in the congressional district which I represent, concerning the American flag and what it means to us as individuals.

I, too, feel that the article written by Mr. Atkinson and the views of the editor put the matter in proper perspective.

For this reason, I want the Press-Chronicle's article made available to readers of the RECORD:

THE FLAG BELONGS TO ALL

Flying the flag is, or should be, a way of showing one's love for his country.

It should be a reflection of his pride in being an American.

But it need not identify him with any particular group of Americans. Nor need it identify him with any particular cause.

The flag is a symbol of unity. Americans who differ sharply in their political philosophy can be one in their loyalty to their country. And they can be one in flying the flag.

Writing in New Republic Magazine, Brooks Atkinson, retired drama critic of the New York Times, puts the matter in perspective. He says:

"Who decides these idiotic things? What bigot decided that display of the American flag signifies support of the Vietnam war? I first encountered this nutty idea about three years ago when a married couple of my acquaintance who might be described as concerned citizens picketed a butcher who was displaying the American flag. Confused by this fatuous caper, I asked why. Because, they replied, flying the American flag indicated support of the Vietnam war, and the butcher was soliciting the custom of warmongers. It seemed to me that the lunatic fringe was expanding fast.

For many years I have displayed the American flag on my porch on Sundays and the holidays and on any day that promises to be less banal than most—like the day, for instance, in which we are expecting friends. I also have a decal of the flag on my window in my car. These rituals have no specific meaning that I am aware of. I enjoy the flag and the holiday feeling it gives me. The design and the colors are bold and gay. Displaying the flag also has a pleasant social connotation. It is like a wave of the hand to all Americans, no matter what they believe.

"But now it appears that people in my category have to defend themselves. To anyone passing my house and noting the flag I wish therefore to make a declaration: I have been appalled by the Vietnam war for years. I do not condone the ghastly casualty lists and the brutalization of American soldiers. . . .

"The flag celebrates a great many more things than the war, inflation, high interest rates and a depressed stock market. It celebrates the Grand Canyon, the sequoias and redwoods, Mt. Rainier and the Hudson River; it celebrates Harvard College, the New York Public Library and the Smithsonian Institution; it celebrates George Washington, Thomas Jefferson and Abraham Lincoln; it celebrates John Kennedy, Robert Kennedy and Martin Luther King and millions of other things, including you and me. It celebrates the common experience of Americans. No one can suborn the flag to promote his own causes and beliefs."

FERTILIZING OUR LAKES

HON. DAVID R. OBEY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 20, 1970

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, Wisconsin 5 years ago singled out laundry detergents as a big killer of natural waters. Now the State is after a key element of the common household detergent: Phosphate.

The Marshfield, Wis. News-Herald recently carried an Associated Press article describing the phosphate problem and reporting that about 20 of the pollution abatement orders issued by the State in recent months command cities to stop allowing phosphates to escape sewage treatment plants.

It is said that halting phosphate will slow down the natural eutrophication process and add perhaps 100 years to the lifetime of a normal lake—an impressive reason to stop fertilizing our lakes. I insert the article in the RECORD at this point:

[From the Marshfield News-Herald, Apr. 7, 1970]

DETERGENT SUDS BIGGEST WATER POLLUTANT

(By Peter B. Seymour)

MILWAUKEE.—The chief pollution threat to the fisherman's favorite lake or stream comes not from his employer's factory waste or his farm neighbor's pesticides, but from his wife's wash tub.

And it's not called pollution. "It's overfertility, or too much of a good thing.

Wisconsin is the first state to have singled out laundry detergents as a big killer of natural waters. That was five years ago, when the state legislature prohibited the chemical laundry agent that had caused mounds of suds to clog streams and sewers in the 1950s.

Now the state is after another key element of the common household detergent: phosphate, or the polyphosphates which make dishwater "soft," help cleansers remove grime from greasy hands, and lead the washing machine's assault on the trousers which dad stained during the weekend fishing trip.

However, phosphate is also a fertilizer. Geraniums thrive on it. So do algae which, when over-fertilized, clog streams and lakes even worse than the suds of the 50s. Then, dead and decaying algae use the oxygen needed by fish to survive, and hasten the environmental death of even big lakes—such as Lake Erie.

Wisconsin, concerned about the Great Lakes on its borders and the tourist economy of the streams in its northwoods, has begun steps to halt the flow of phosphate in its waters. Rep. Henry Reuss, D-Wis., is relaying the new campaign into Congress.

Lloyd Lueschow, chief biologist for the state's Environmental Protection Division, said an oversupply of phosphate, especially when coupled with nitrogen from natural rainfall, is the main threat to a lake because of its influence in algae growth.

"It seems unlikely we could get God into court," Lueschow said. "But we now have the legislation necessary to check the excessive emission of phosphates in household and industrial detergents."

The state has issued about 200 pollution abatement orders to factories and municipalities in the last four months. About 20 of the orders specifically order cities to cease allowing phosphates to escape sewage treatment plants.

Jerry McKersie, state Bureau of Standards and Services engineer, said the 20 anti-phosphate orders are the first of their kind in Wisconsin history.

The cost of meeting the new anti-phosphate policy of the Department of Natural Resources by improving sewage treatment facilities is, obviously, a problem for the taxpayers.

Reuss wants to get closer to the phosphate source, even closer than the washing machines and the dish pans which utilize most of the billions of pounds of detergent used annually by the nation. He has suggested phosphates be banned from detergents altogether.

He conducted congressional hearings last year on the phosphate problem, referring frequently to a special survey conducted by Limnetics Inc., a Milwaukee water research firm.

Brian Gallagher, head of the firm, reported that of 28 nationally known household detergents selected at random for the survey, 22 contained phosphates or—as expressed chemically—P04.

"P04 is the form that is most likely to enrich a lake," Gallagher said. "The six washing products without polyphosphates were more soap-like."

"If some detergent manufacturers can produce laundry agents without phosphorous, why can't they all? Reuss asked. Gallagher said his survey did not attempt to learn whether a detergent without P04 cleans less effectively.

The Soap and Detergent Association told Reuss' committee there is no adequate substitute for the inexpensive polyphosphates.

Gallagher and Gerald Rohlich, secretary of the Wisconsin Natural Resources Board, said careless legislation against phosphates might only force detergent manufacturers to substitute cleaning agents that could be even more harmful.

The new enzyme detergents, Gallagher said, generally have "a high amount of phosphate, which surprised us. What has happened is that more and more phosphate is being put into detergents."

Estimates are that up to 75 percent of the phosphates flowing into the nation's lakes and streams come from detergents in city sewage. Gallagher said 50 percent "would be a very conservative estimate."

Ecologists acknowledge having had difficulty determining the source of phosphate poisoning found in the average lake. Some of it comes from farm fertilizers; some comes from garden and lawn fertilizers; some comes from industrial cleansers. But evidently most comes from household cleansers.

Many industries are switching to silicate cleaners, which have no bearing on the growth of animal or plant life. Phosphate detergents are less abrasive and less expensive.

Gallagher said big producers of phosphates, besides the average home, include commercial laundries and public institutions, such as hospitals.

Phosphate, by itself, is not harmful as far as a lake or river is concerned.

"Phosphate is non-toxic, not harmful directly," McKersie said. "It is its stimulation of algae that causes the damage."

The public has become aware of the problems in recent years, especially when algae takes its toll of swimming and fishing areas.

"In previous years," McKersie said, "people were concerned about typhoid. Now that's not the big problem, and people can get concerned about swimming in algae gunk."

McKersie and Lueschow said it still isn't clear how rapidly a phosphate-soiled lake will recover once the phosphate flow is halted.

Madison, noted for two large lakes—Mendota and Monona—halted virtually all phosphate-laden sewage flowing into the lakes a decade ago. But the lakes still have occasional algae "blooms" in masses, Lueschow said.

Halting phosphate "will slow down the process" of lutrophication, or over-fertilization and add possibly 100 years to a normal lake's life, McKersie said.

Government agencies, particularly the Federal Water Pollution Control Administration, have said they would like to remove 80 percent or more of the existing phosphorous from sewage.

A concentration of 12 parts per million of phosphate is considered a danger level.

Small lakes and rivers are the most vulnerable, while Lakes Superior and Michigan have less to fear if steps are taken against phosphates in the near future.

At the moment, Lueschow said, Lake Superior—often cited as an example of a still-pure lake—has only .02 parts per million of phosphate "and no indication of any change in its phosphorous level."

Lake Michigan, he said, is a long way from the eutrophication that has afflicted Lake Erie, but is not as secure as Lake Superior.

Reuss said in February the Federal Water Pollution Control Administration is ready to endorse whatever recommendations his committee may come up with to halt deterioration of the Great Lakes.

Canada's Parliament was asked in February to ban detergent phosphates, and it set up talks with U.S. pollution agencies to determine the roll of phosphates in Great Lakes pollution.

The Wisconsin Legislature was asked last year to ban detergents. The measure, sponsored by 19 senators and 22 representatives, died in committee.

State agencies, however, were already annexing phosphorous to the list of items eligible for pollution abatement action.

MAJOR PROBLEMS FACING UNITED STATES

HON. GEORGE E. BROWN, JR.

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 20, 1970

Mr. BROWN of California. Mr. Speaker, a recent questionnaire which I sent out polled Californians concerning their view of the major problems facing us today. I am inserting my reply related to this question at this point in the RECORD:

MAJOR PROBLEMS FACING UNITED STATES

In addition to the questions concerning pollution and the environment, my recent questionnaire asked for your views as to which of the major problems facing us today were the most important. Pollution, Vietnam, taxes and crime were most often put at the head of the list. The statements below generally encompass my views on the major issues today.

VIETNAM AND WORLD PEACE

I have actively and publicly opposed the U.S. policy in Vietnam for the past five years—regardless of whether it was the popular thing to do at the time or not.

Now, all the tragic lessons we were supposed to have learned from our adventurism in Vietnam over the past decade are seemingly forgotten as we blunder into newer and potentially more serious entanglements in Laos and Cambodia.

Therefore, I recently introduced a broad resolution which would serve to repeal the Tonkin Gulf resolution—the Congressional authority which President Johnson interpreted as allowing a half million American soldiers to be sent to Vietnam. My proposal would also eliminate earlier similar resolutions and laws pertaining to the commitment of American military forces in foreign conflicts—and it would also put Congress on record as opposing the undercover activities and so-called secret warfare now going on in Laos.

I have also urged the President to reject the request of Cambodia for arms. This is, of course, the pattern of our present intervention in Vietnam—first arms, then "advisors", and then ground troops.

Broadly speaking, the major powers—especially the United States and the Soviet Union—are the greatest threats to world peace and stability today.

Instead of old-style political imperialism of the 19th century, the richer countries today practice a more sophisticated form of economic imperialism. The goal is to maintain the largest possible area into which the products and the capital of the rich nations can flow freely and safely. This is apparently the real meaning of the "freedom" which we have armed ourselves to the teeth to protect around the world.

Imperialism, whether old-style or new style—whether practiced by capitalist, socialist, or communist nations—represents denial of a people's most fundamental aspirations.

TAXES, INFLATION, AND THE ECONOMY

Despite last year's historic tax reform legislation, concern related to the overall tax system, the level of taxes, and inflation still remains quite evident.

A few pertinent statistics indicate why I think there is good reason for such concern. For example, since 1958, the average American paid 76% more taxes to all government units—Federal, state and local—while the average per capita income rose only 56% during the same period of time and consumer prices climbed more than 20%.

No wonder the middle income American—the man or woman who heads a family with a total income between $7,000 and $20,000—is upset.

True, over the same period, both the quantity and quality of services offered citizens by government have increased dramatically—per capita expenditures by all government units went up 85% between 1958 and 1968—but the rising cost of government has been a prime contributory factor to recent inflationary pressures. In addition, distribution of the tax burden has not been even, with middle and low income earners still carrying a heavy and unequal share of the load.

Although Federal taxes per capita have increased less than state and local taxes, I think that the cost of the war in Vietnam has probably contributed more to inflation than other spending.

Continual over-spending by the Federal government eventually *is* inflationary. Over the past four years, the record is clear that unrestrained Federal spending has been a prime factor behind spiraling price-level increases.

For example, between fiscal 1965 and fiscal 1968, Federal spending rose 52%—from a fiscal 1965 budget of $118 billion to nearly $179 billion in 1968—a jump of some $61 billion. Yet, of that $61 billion, almost $31 billion went for increased defense expenditures—largely for the war in Vietnam. As a comparison, over the same period, the education and manpower training budget rose $4.5 billion.

At the same time, social benefits to society are less from each dollar invested in defense than they would be if allocated to education, for instance. The end use of most defense spending does little to add to future economic growth and development.

This is why it was very hard for some of us to understand last year why the President considered the additional $1 billion which we attempted to add to the education budget as being so inflationary that he vetoed the bill Congress passed—while simultaneously defending an excessive and wasteful defense budget.

To elaborate, the huge need for resources to meet the expanding defense budget for both Vietnam and the myriad of weapons systems and programs has meant over the past five years that resources would be shifted from other sectors to the defense sector in order to meet rising demand levels.

As resources are shifted away from other sectors into defense, excess demand develops in nondefense sectors. This shifting means that nondefense production costs rise while, at the same time, consumers, having less nondefense goods available, tend to be willing to pay higher prices for these goods. The result is to create inflationary pressures emanating from both suppliers and consumers.

Thus, if there is a spending key to inflation and higher Federal taxes, the place to concentrate is on defense expenditures—not on education and other urgently needed domestic programs.

CRIME, POVERTY AND THE URBAN CRISIS

War, taxes and inflation do not exist in a vacuum. There are a number of visible social reactions that result—either as directly related problems or as intensification of existing problems.

Increased unemployment breeds poverty, poverty breeds crime, and urban blight is

both the cause and the result of all of these in a vicious circle of decadence.

There are many ways in which to attack these problems, but they cannot be effectively approached from a Federal government level when our national income is being drained by massive expenditures for defense and for the war in Vietnam.

Hence, the nation is caught in the same demoralizing and futile circle that the ghetto dweller finds himself in.

As I pointed out in 1966, speaking against the Defense Appropriation bill which contained $60 billion and which was passed by Congress almost without opposition.

"Our cities are rotting at the core—our traffic and mass transit problems are rapidly growing worse and are strangling urban development; pollution, both of air and water, is making a mockery of human progress by rendering our environment unlivable; our health and education services for our citizens are inadequate. Riots today are sweeping many of our cities for reasons we profess not to understand.

I also stated at the same time:

"One recent estimate has been made that every American in poverty could be raised above that level with the expenditure of $15 billion per year. Just by coincidence, that is approximately what we are spending on Vietnam per year. (The cost rose to $30 billion for Vietnam alone within a year of that date.) To eliminate poverty in the United States this year is well within the capacity of this country. Yet to secure the approval of a public policy to achieve this end is literally impossible in the U.S. Congress."

Obviously, the war in Southeast Asia is the key which could unlock the door to much of what must be done in the way of domestic programs. Until that time, we can only continue to try and get Congress and the President to shift toward priority consideration for programs which provide employment, better schools, decent housing, better and more enlightened training for law enforcement officers, new technology in crime detection and prevention, adequate welfare laws, and a myriad of other proposals which would allow every citizen the fullest possible opportunity to provide for the health and well-being of his family and himself with dignity and equality.

BROOKLYN BUREAU OF COMMUNITY SERVICE HONORS BROOKLYN FOSTER PARENTS

HON. JOHN J. ROONEY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 20, 1970

Mr. ROONEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, on April 30 the Brooklyn Bureau of Community Service, formerly the Brooklyn Bureau of Social Service and Children's Aid Society, will honor 19 men and women who have compiled an extraordinary record in caring about their fellow men. For all 19 have been foster parents for 20 years or longer. It means that they have opened their homes and their hearts so that young children would not go through life without the knowledge of a home or parental love. They sincerely deserve the praise and honor they will be awarded on April 30, as does the Brooklyn Bureau of Community Service which has been caring for homeless children since 1866 when it was formed to look after the many young left homeless by the tragic Civil War.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to call to the attention of my colleagues the record of this fine institution and under permission heretofore unanimously granted me I include with these remarks a brief outline of the function of the Brooklyn Bureau of Community System:

THE FOSTER CARE SERVICE OF THE BROOKLYN BUREAU OF COMMUNITY SERVICE

On April 30, 1970, the Brooklyn Bureau of Community Service, now in its 104th year, will honor at a dinner 19 men and women who have been foster parents for 20 years or longer.

They are: Mr. and Mrs. Oscar Boots of Greenpoint, Brooklyn; Mr. and Mrs. Alonzo Carter of East Elmhurst, Queen; Mr. and Mrs. Clyde Critchlow of Westbury, Nassau County; Mrs. Ozella Dobson of Bedford-Stuyvesant, Brooklyn; Mrs. Evelyn Fillyaw of Bedford-Stuyvesant, Brooklyn; Mr. and Mrs. James Parker of Bedford-Stuyvesant, Brooklyn; Mr. and Mrs. George Petersen of Flatlands, Brooklyn; Mr. and Mrs. Barney Schofield of Jamaica, Queens; Mrs. Estelle Toomer of Freeport, Nassau County; Mr. and Mrs. Eugene Williams of South Ozone Park, Queens; Mr. and Mrs. John Wulff of Baldwin, Nassau County.

This length of service in so good a cause really deserves our recognition and appreciation. All foster parents deserves our thanks for their devotion to children in their care. The confidence, trust and love of the children for them are the best and truest measures of the work they are doing.

The Brooklyn Bureau of Community Service has been caring for homeless children since 1866, when it was organized to provide food, clothing, shelter and educational facilities for children who were roaming the streets in the aftermath of the Civil War.

Today, the agency's Children's Division gives total care to children whose families are unable to care for them. The agency provides continuing supervision of their growth and development. Planning takes into account each child's needs. Service is provided by a social worker who is assigned to every child, every foster home, and to each child's own family. Everything possible is done to contribute to the emotional and physical well-being of the children and their families.

The Brooklyn Bureau believes every child's development is best nourished when he is with his own parents or relatives. Therefore the agency also focuses its service on the child's own family and attempts to help the family reorganize itself so that the child can return to it. When this is not possible, the agency, together with the foster parents, try to find ways to give children love, understanding and opportunity to develop normally.

The Brooklyn Bureau of Community Service provides many special services to help children when they are required—remedial reading, individual and group counseling, psychological and psychiatric consultation, and medical services.

In addition, the agency has a comprehensive program to enrich each child's life. Recreation programs provide opportunities for the children to explore their environment and develop appreciation and knowledge of music, art, literature and nature. Summer recreation programs take the children to parks, beaches, and provide summer and day camp experiences. Children are given opportunity to develop their special skills. Music and art lessons are provided for those who desire them.

The Bureau, or any child care agency, can do very little without the cooperation and dedication of the foster parents in whose care the children are placed. Foster parents are exceptional people who are able to give love and devotion to children who are not their own. They work closely with the agency and receive the agency's help in meeting each child's emotional and physical needs. Being a foster parent is challenging work that requires patience, courage, intelligence and imagination.

Because it is not possible for most foster children to return to their own families, long-term foster home care is provided by the agency. This means that children are put into foster homes at an early age, generally up to 8 years of age, and remain until they reach 21 and are ready to live independently. Where possible, brothers and sisters are placed in the same foster home.

The relationship between foster parents and the children whom they have cared for over so many years does not end when the children reach maturity. For many of the children, their foster parents are the only parents they have ever known and the closeness of the foster parents and their foster children continues throughout their lives.

Today, the Brooklyn Bureau of Community Service needs homes for children whose own families have been broken by illness and other misfortunes. These children are healthy boys and girls who lack homes through no fault of their own. Because they have no place to go they must wait—sometimes for years—in hospitals, institutions and shelters. It is estimated that in the New York metropolitan area more than 2,000 are waiting placement.

Thousands of men and women throughout the country have gained deep satisfaction by serving as parents of homeless children. They have not only made contributions to the children, but they have helped their communities and the nation by helping to build strong, healthy, industrious and productive citizens.

The foster parents being honored by the Brooklyn Bureau of Community Service for their years of devoted service to children are acting in the finest tradition of American life. They are extending their hands and their hearts to the most helpless among us.

The Brooklyn Bureau of Community Service is a voluntary, non-sectarian family and children's social services agency. In addition to its foster care service, it offers individual and family counseling, and operates a comprehensive program for the blind and handicapped including sheltered workshops, job evaluation, vocational counseling, recreation, a work-at-home program for the severely handicapped, and a job-finding service. The Brooklyn Bureau of Community Service is located at 285 Schermerhorn Street, Brooklyn, New York, 11217.

ROBERT D. ENOCH, OF INDIANAPOLIS, WRITES ON SUPREME COURT NOMINATIONS

HON. WILLIAM G. BRAY

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 20, 1970

Mr. BRAY. Mr. Speaker, the following editorial, broadcast over station WXLW, in Indianapolis, and written by Mr. Robert D. Enoch, is an enlightening and perceptive commentary on the recent Supreme Court nominations:

EDITORIAL

(By Robert D. Enoch)

APRIL 11, 1970.

Our nation's founding fathers designed a federal government of three separate distinct responsibilities in order to provide checks and balances that would under all circumstances protect the peoples of the various states from greedy and power hungry government officials.

The checks and balances have worked exceedingly well for about 200 years. But we the people have watched from our side-lines as the great design has been aborted by cunning plan and destructionist leadership.

If you blatantly set about to destroy the greatest nation on earth—that has provided more liberty—more freedom of choice—more self determination—more of the world's privileges, comforts, opportunities, mental and spiritual growth than any other nation has ever provided for its citizens, how would you go about it?—Exactly the way the destructionists have started to get the job done. By destroying the very top institutions from which all of the powers of our limited Republic secures the orderly processes of our constitutional government.

By design—the cunning have bent the interpretations of the Constitution, to the degree that the most honored and respected of all tribunals, the Supreme Court of the United States, has in fact become law-makers not judges. The result—the citizens of this nation seriously question the integrity of the Supreme Court—and quickly follows then—a growing disrespect for law and order. And that's what the nation faces today—a growing disrespect for law and order.

So if you—and the other destructionists want to destroy this nation—keep doing what you have seen done to the Supreme Court and anarchy is certain to follow.

There was a time when the Senate of the United States, fulfilled to a maximum, the honored responsibility of one arm of our limited Republic, of maintaining checks and balances over the Congress of the United States, guarding against emotionalism and the hurried decisions that could adversely effect the stability of the nation, and also serving honorably with guardianship of the actions and decisions of the administration branch of the federal government. Yes—there was a time—that the United States Senate was the most honored body of legislators in any government anywhere.

But—the cunning and destructive influences that have been working on the Supreme Court is now practicing its devisiveness within this principal institution of our Republic.

Many members of the Senate who point with pride to their lengthy careers of service, and come again and again to ask for the vote of each citizen in the states from which they are elected, must stand before the electorate this year and each election—for judgment. Have they served with honor—have they served with constitutional fidelity—have they performed as statesmen—for the good of all men—or have they been party to the cunning and the destructionists—and have they voted and acted—for other less honorable—more destructive reasons.

If you would find some of the answers to those questions, read the Congressional Record, of the debates that took place during considerations of the appointments made by the Presidents of the United States on the last five or six nominees to the Supreme Court.

The record does not show a consistency of position and caution by some of these elected to the Senate. Is the answer only in the thinking of the senator? Or—has there been other factors of great influence that has made possible, for example, a "Yes" vote in the Fortas Senate decision, without the crusade against medocrity, while in the two recent cases of President Nixon's nomination—the destructionist influence; led important representatives of the people in the Senate to literally destroy two fine career jurists. How can we the people respect and honor men in these high positions who make such a record before our very eyes—and the eyes of the world. Most certainly—those who have vowed to destroy us are grateful for these who do this work so well.

And what of us? We stand on the sidelines becoming more disturbed and angry by the minute. Our anger must build—build to election day—when the people can speak—this great unwieldy—and silent majority—speak loud and clear in the privacy of the voting booth. It is there we can show our disapproval of those who bring these destructions and cunning to the honor of the United States Senate.

This problem is not the problem of any one party. The record of the vote on Judge Carswell's nomination to the Supreme Court is a sickening thing—and identifies for all to see—the statesmen, the dupes, and the cunning. This is election year. The next step is up to you—the voter.

"'DELTA QUEEN,' LINK TO TWAIN ERA, DOOMED," SAYS NEW YORK TIMES, BUT IT CAN STILL BE SAVED

HON. LEONOR K. SULLIVAN

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 20, 1970

Mrs. SULLIVAN. Mr. Speaker, the New York Times today carried a charming and delightful feature article by Roy Reed on the pleasures of a leisurely journey down the Mississippi River to New Orleans on the last of the sternwheel paddleboats, the *Delta Queen*, which the Times describes as "aged 44 and doomed." It can be saved, however, if Congress enacts H.R. 16933, which I introduced on April 13.

Companion bills have been introduced by a number of other Members of the House and will also be introduced, I understand, in the Senate, by Members whose districts or States are located along the Mississippi River and some of its tributaries traversed by the *Delta Queen* and whose constituents join my constituents in St. Louis in deep affection for this beautiful old passenger vessel which is so familiar a sight from shore and so peaceful a haven for those fortunate enough to book passage on her cruises.

On several occasions since passage of the Safety at Sea Act of 1966, I was able to get through the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries, and through Congress, bills to grant a temporary reprieve to this nostalgic survivor of the era of the paddlewheelers. But all the efforts which have been made in the meantime to build a replacement for the *Delta Queen* which would conform to the 1966 act's requirements for ocean-going passenger ships have ended in failure because of the tremendous cost of a new vessel, and now the only thing which can assure continuation of the kind of service rendered by the *Delta Queen* is legislation specifically exempting this boat from the 1966 act.

Time runs out for the *Delta Queen*, under present law, this coming November. Unless we can amend the law in the meantime, the proud old steamer which over the years has carried many thousands of happy passengers on idyllic overnight or extended cruises on the great rivers of mid-America will be transformed into a daytime excursion boat or into a floating restaurant.

Mr. Speaker, the New York Times feature today describes so well the pleasures of a *Delta Queen* cruise, and the indignation of passengers and well-wishers that a law intended to protect people in mid-ocean is being invoked to end cruises which are never more than a few minutes from shore, in the shallow waters of our inland rivers. I include this excellent article as part of my remarks, as follows:

DELTA QUEEN, LINK TO TWAIN ERA, DOOMED

(By Roy Reed)

NEW ORLEANS, April 19.—The stars were as bright as lanterns but there was no moon.

Howard Tate read the faint riffles of the Mississippi River with practiced concentration. He nudged the steering lever and slipped the big boat a little closer to the shadows of the western bank.

When he consented to speak, his voice came out in a rusty growl and poked around the darkness of the pilot house.

"Mark Twain never done no piloting to amount to anything," he said. "He never stood a pilot's watch more than six months in his life."

Then he added, after a studied pause, "he was a good writer (italics)."

The old river men who are unawed by the author of "Life on the Mississippi" are becoming scarce. Mr. Tate is 65 years old and has been a river pilot 42 years. He is the son and grandson of pilots. When he is gone, there will not be many left who have lived the river, the way Mark Twain did for a while, and kept the past alive.

ONLY ONE LINK TO THE PAST

The old boats they have known are going even faster than the men. Only one of the steamboats that tie 1970 to the nation's beginnings is left. There are three or four that carry passengers on daytime excursions a short distance from port, and one that sits lifeless and without boilers at the dock at Vicksburg, turned into a little theater.

But the remaining steamboat that actually carries overnight passengers up and down the great rivers is the boat that Howard Tate was taking down the moonless Mississippi that night, with 147 passengers asleep down below and the big red paddlewheel turning and whooshing in the back.

She is the Delta Queen, aged 44 and doomed.

This is her last year unless Congress intervenes. Because of the teak, mahogany, iron-wood and oak of her superstructure, she is considered a fire hazard under the safety at sea law of 1966.

The law was passed because of two disastrous ship fires in the Atlantic. By the Coast Guard's interpretation, the Delta Queen is covered by the law with ocean-going vessels.

EXEMPTION IS SOUGHT

A bill has been introduced to exempt the Queen from the law permanently. She has two temporary exemptions. If the bill is not passed, the old sternwheeler will end her career Nov. 2 at New Orleans, and then become a daytime excursion boat, perhaps, or a floating restaurant.

The passengers on a recent St. Louis-New Orleans roundtrip, most of them middle aged to elderly and from as far away as British Columbia, thought it was ridiculous and a

little shameful that the Queen was being put out of business.

The crew held a lifeboat drill last Sunday afternoon, somewhere above New Orleans, and when it was over both crew and passengers laughed at the absurdity of it all.

"If we ever had an emergency we could be on shore before we could get the lifeboats in the water," said Clarke Hawley, the first mate. "We're never more than four minutes from shore anywhere on the river. If something should happen, all you would have to do is hit the rudder and run her aground."

The passengers shook their heads over the inscrutable ways of government, then went back to gazing at the river banks and the occasional plantation house whose gables peeked over the levee.

People were paying $30 to $70 a day for the privilege of doing almost nothing on this boat for 10 days.

There is no gambling. The liveliest music comes from the calliope when the boat is approaching a town, or sometimes from an organ in the dining room late at night, if the organist is feeling bold.

The cabins are small but comfortable. The food is good. The passengers entertain themselves with books, fortune telling, bingo or lying in the sun.

Mr. and Mrs. Albert W. Giles, steamboat buffs from Olympia, Wash., spent one hour after another the other day studying the engine room, watching the steam-driven pistons pushing their arms out the back of the boat to pedal the paddlewheel like a bicyle.

The wheel produces a hypnotic vibration. The passengers and crew are rocked to sleep each night—and not infrequently in the daytime—by the rhythm and rumble of the turning wheel.

ALL OFFICERS ARE "CAPTAINS"

In a world where meals and the playing of the calliope are rather keenly anticipated events, it is easy to imagine the impact of a change in scenery or weather. The passengers who make friends with the crew soon learn how important these changes are to river folk.

Captain Hawley (almost all the officers are addressed as captain) was talking one late afternoon of Mark Twain's regret at learning that the things he had admired as beautiful while he was a cub pilot—a blood-red sunrise, a floating log, a rifle in the water—were actually signs of danger to the experienced pilot.

"See that white mist on that field?" Captain Hawley asked, pointing to the eastern bank. "That's a beautiful sight, but it means that we have a 50 per cent chance of fog. And if we get in a fog, we have to tie up and wait until it passes."

At 5:45 o'clock the next morning, Capt. Ernest Wagner, the master of the boat, sat in the pilot house watching the sun come up. It was beautiful, all blood-red in sky and water.

He said, half to himself, "You know the old saying: Red in the morning, sailor take warning, red at night, sailor's delight."

Within an hour, the sun had disappeared behind a thick fog. Howard Tate, just up from the officers' quarters and still buttoning his shirt, had to slip her to the bank and stop.

This was an event. The passengers piled out of the cabins and stood on the decks for an hour staring into the fog and listening to the cardinals in the trees and the horns of tow boats creeping by in the channel.

LIFE ON THE RIVER CHANGES

Then the voyage resumed, and the elderly ladies from California and the young couple from Boston settled into the deck chairs and made ready for another day's travel.

The river has changed since Mark Twain's day, in spite of the steadfastness of people like Howard Tate.

Racial integration, for example, has come to the Delta Queen. Its mint juleps (from mint grown in flower boxes that catch the spray from the paddlewheel) are now drunk by occasional black passengers. Two Negro women were among the passengers who stopped recently for a tour of the antebellum homes at Natchez.

The crew was integrated two years ago when Franklin Myles was made chief steward and became the first black officer on the boat. When Mr. Myles sat down at the officers' table the first day, a white pilot threw his napkin on the table and said, "I'm not going to eat with a nigger."

Everyone, black and white, took his meals in his cabin for two tense weeks after that, everyone, that is, except Captain Wagner. He sat alone at the head of the officers' table for two weeks.

* * * * *

Other changes have come to the river, Urban Renewel is working over Beale Street in Memphis. Fancy office buildings have begun to replace the empty music houses and the rundown bars.

They used to say that the Mississippi Delta began in the lobby of the Peabody Hotel in Memphis and ended in Catfish Row in Vicksburg. Catfish Row is a Negro shantytown. Urban Renewal is getting ready to renew it.

Dozens of chemical plants and oil refineries now rear up behind the levees between Baton Rouge and New Orleans. They provide jobs for the people and pollution for the river.

The water of this stretch is now so poisonous that not even Howard Tate will drink it, as strong a believer as he is in the purity of Mississippi River water.

"Look at all these kids along the river," he said one day up around Greenville. "They drink that water all the time and they're just as healthy as they can be."

WHAT HUCK THOUGHT

He drank it himself when he was a boy, just as Mark Twain's people did up at Hannibal, Mo. There is a discussion in "Huckelberry Finn" about how much more nutritious the muddy Mississippi water is than that of the clear Ohio. The Child of Callamity says:

"You look at the graveyards; that tells the tale. Trees won't grow worth shucks in a Cincinnati graveyard, but in a Sent Louis graveyard they grow upwards of eight hundred feet high. It's all on account of the water the people drunk before they laid up. A Cincinnati corpse don't richen a soil any."

For all the changes, the river still robs a man of the sense of time. The passenger on the Delta Queen has joined a different world where there are no newspapers, no radios, no telephones, no automobiles—none of the pacemakers of the 20th century.

The passage from Memphis to Helena, Ark., takes five and a half hours by the clock. But to the passenger on the Queen, it might be an hour or a day. He doesn't care.

Only the movement south into spring—the redbuds open in Vicksburg, the swallows suddenly skim the water above Natchez—keep the river and the boat minimally involved in time, and that largely at the river's chosen speed.

SUPPORT FOR THE ASTRONAUTS

HON. OLIN E. TEAGUE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 20, 1970

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, the Nation and the world hoped and prayed for the safe return of the crew of Apollo 13. Astronauts Lovell, Swigert, and Haise, supported by the magnificent ground crew of the Apollo program, are an outstanding example to the world of dedication and devotion. During those trying final hours of the return of the Apollo 13 astronauts an editorial appeared in the April 15, 1970, edition of the Christian Science Monitor. This editorial does much to place in perspective this significant flight. I commend the reading of this editorial to my colleagues and the general public:

SUPPORT FOR THE ASTRONAUTS

From the moment men began the exploration of outer space, the support and the prayers of those who remained on earth went with them. Now that a serious problem has arisen with the Apollo 13 mooncraft, that support and those prayers are more needful than ever. For such assistance back on earth can help America's three brave men in space, and those who will give them advice from the NASA space center, make the right decisions for their safe return to earth.

Much wisdom and long and careful thought have gone into preparing men to meet any and all emergencies while in space. At a moment like this men can depend upon an intelligence and a guidance infinitely higher than mere human reasoning. Such dependence partakes of the wisdom and might which orders the working of that universe which Astronauts James A. Lovell, John L. Swigert Jr., and Fred W. Haise Jr. are now traversing.

There is no shortage of examples in history where the kind of support and prayers being given Apollo 13 have lifted men from the jaws of grave danger. There were innumerable examples in World War II where nothing but rightly directed prayer could have wrought the "miracle" with which men were saved from the direst circumstances. Thus men in times of trial need never despair.

We all can also take encouragement from the fact that, wherever men on earth are aware of the challenge facing the three astronauts, there will be universal support for their safe return. There may be divisions between men on earth, there may be severe national, ideological, racial, and economic rivalries. But all mankind will be of one mind in its desire to see a successful outcome to the maneuvers through which Apollo 13 is now going. This unity of good purpose will also make itself felt and have its favorable effect.

It is heartening to remember that these astronauts were chosen because of their proven ability to confront crises of all kinds, however unexpected. They were not launched into space either carelessly or unprepared. All the care, heed, and foresight which could be brought to bear went into planning this mission.

Never before have all of us back on earth been called upon to play a bigger role in a space mission. Our role is not to guide the ship, but to accept with confidence the fact that divine wisdom is at hand to do that guiding.

ALL THE NEWS THAT CAN'T BE TINTED

HON. JOHN M. ASHBROOK

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 20, 1970

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, very rarely do I agree with the New York Times, but their appraisal of the impact of the welfare legislation approved by the House last week is, unfortunately, all

too true. In their Week in Review section in yesterday's edition, under the heading "Revolution in Welfare From an Unlikely Source," they express surprise that "Congress has endorsed the startling notion" of a guaranteed income plan.

Who would have ever thought that the party which has historically turned a deaf ear to the socialistic Pied Pipers would suddenly exhibit a lemming instinct and provide the votes necessary to pass this radical plan? The Times correctly terms proposal and passage of the administration's welfare bill "an astonishing development" and then adds:

> The principle of a guaranteed annual income for all Americans, about as pure a piece of socialism as Washington had seen since the 1930's, had been put forward by—of all people—President Nixon and then ratified in that citadel of conservatism, the House, by a resounding 243–155 vote.

As we have said all along, it is the principle that counts the most, and the writer of the article agrees:

> Most significantly, if the Senate concurs, the principle will have been established. Succeeding Congresses, as opponents of the legislation loudly warned, will be able, probably even anxious in election years, to raise the minimum guaranteed income figure . . .

In other words, once we have initiated the program, all the blanks can be filled in later at taxpayers' expense.

In view of the far-reaching consequences of this ill-advised legislation, I strongly commend the following article to the attention of my colleagues, but in particular to those who thought they were supporting a conservative's solution to the welfare problem:

[From the New York Times, Apr. 19, 1970]

REVOLUTION IN WELFARE FROM AN UNLIKELY SOURCE

(By Warren Weaver, Jr.)

WASHINGTON.—On the wall of the Capitol meeting room of the House Rules Committee, a group rarely given to whimsy or charm, there hangs the following legend in old English characters: "Due to the lack of experienced trumpeters, the end of the world is postponed for three weeks." Despite this warning, it was with something of a flourish that the end of an era in American Government, the days of the welfare dole, was proclaimed last week in the cavernous and resonant chamber of the House of Representatives.

For the House, scarcely more venturesome in the past than its own Rules Committee, subscribed decisively to a doctrine that was radical, even revolutionary. Its members adopted the theory that the Federal Government would not allow the income of any American family to sink below a minimum tolerable figure, no matter what its adult members were doing.

Taken altogether, it could only be called an astonishing development. The principle of a guaranteed annual income for all Americans, about as pure a piece of socialism as Washington had seen since the 1930's, had been put forward by—of all people—President Nixon and then ratified in that citadel of conservatism, the House, by a resounding 243–155 vote.

MINIMUM GUARANTEED

True, it was a very modest beginning in terms of impact on an individual poor family. The family assistance plan, the core of the Administration welfare reform bill that moved halfway through Congress, only guarantees a couple with two children an annual income of $1,600, or barely $30 a week. It does not extend this protection to individual adults or childless couples; there must be a family of at least one parent and one child. It does not provide an outright flat grant; the Federal benefits will only be large enough to guarantee that the family income reaches this minimum standard, which is only about half the acknowledged poverty level.

But, for the first time in its history, Congress has endorsed the startling notion that there should be some sort of floor under human misery and that it is up to the Federal Government to lay down that floor and finance its coast-to-coast construction. And, also for the first time, it was recognized that the public obligation to maintain a minimum income for all American families should not be restricted to those with no income at all but should cover the so-called working poor, marginal wage-earners who have been traditionally barred from the welfare rolls.

Most significantly, if the Senate concurs, the principle will have been established. Succeeding Congresses, as opponents of the legislation loudly warned, will be able, probably even anxious in election years, to raise the minimum guaranteed income figure to something more nearly resembling the cost of keeping alive in the United States.

The impact on the Federal budget, even initially, is substantial. In its first year of operation, the Administration bill will approximately double Federal welfare expenditures, to about $8.4-billion. The cost will continue to rise for a time—critics said to $15-billion a year—before accompanying training and employment programs begin reducing the caseload.

How was the timorous House of Representatives ever persuaded to buy such a package? It took broad and powerful combination of forces. Primarily, 103 Republicans became convinced that (A) the present welfare system is so disastrous that any bold revision has got to be an improvement, and (B) on a major political issue, party loyalty demanded support of President Nixon, who could hardly be suspected of radical tendencies.

For the 140 Democrats who voted for the welfare bill, it was much easier. They had to swallow their reluctance to help the Republican Administration win a major Congressional victory, but many of them had long been supporters of the income maintenance principle and could scarcely turn their backs on it because it came to the floor under the aegis of Richard Nixon.

Perhaps most important, waverers of both parties could listen to the homespun Arkansas rhetoric of Representative Wilbur Mills, the Ways and Means Committee Chairman, whose outspoken advocacy of the welfare bill demonstrated the enthusiasm of the recent convert. The House really could not accept that something he backed could be socialism.

The problems the welfare program faces in the Senate are of a different character. No one doubts that the votes are there for the family assistance plan; the question is whether liberal Senators can be dissuaded from increasing the benefit level—and the resulting cost—to such an extent that President Nixon will feel compelled to turn back his own program with a veto.

SALT TALKS RESUME

HON. JOHN B. ANDERSON

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 20, 1970

Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I want to commend the administration on its announced intention to seek a comprehensive strategic arms limitation agreement with the Soviet Union at the talks which resumed in Vienna last Thursday. In his state of the world message President Nixon termed the SALT talks, "The most important arms control negotiations this country has ever entered." And he went on to explain why this was so. In his words:

> Both the Soviet Union and the United States have acquired the ability to inflict unacceptable damage on the other, no matter which strikes first. There can be no gain and certainly no victory for the power that provokes a thermonuclear exchange. Thus, both sides have recognized the vital mutual interest in halting the dangerous momentum of the nuclear arms race.

I have long been concerned about the "mad momentum" of the arms race and where it has been taking us. I agree with the President that it is senseless to continue this dangerous and costly race since we and the Soviet Union already have an assured destruction capability. And I would further agree with the President that both we and the Soviet Union have a "vital mutual interest" in stopping the arms spiral. This is our primary aim at the SALT talks.

Congressional concern about the arms race has been running high for some time. There has been widespread support in both bodies of Congress for a mutual moratorium on the further testing and deployment of multiple-warhead missiles, and I am proud to be one of the principal sponsors of that resolution in the House. Two weeks ago, the other body, by a 72 to 6 vote, passed a resolution in support of the SALT talks and the goal of a comprehensive limitation agreement on both offensive and defensive weapons. It further called for an immediate and mutual moratorium on the further deployment of these systems.

An essentially identical resolution was introduced in this body last week by my good friend and colleague from Delaware (Mr. ROTH), and today I am proud to add my name to the list of cosponsors of that resolution. I do want to emphasize our sincere desire that we not only seek a comprehensive limitation agreement on offensive and defensive strategic weapons, but that we also seek with the Soviets an immediate and mutual moratorium on the further deployment of these systems. The SALT talks may be rather long and drawn out and it will be some time before a formal agreement is arrived at and officially ratified. In the interim, in the absence of a deployment moratorium, the temptation may be great for both sides to arm to the hilt, thereby setting off the arms spiral the agreement would be designed to prevent. It would be somewhat analogous to the two drunks trying to buy as many drinks as possible before the bar closes down. Needless to say, the results could be of staggering proportions, and we could well walk away from those talks more drunk and dizzy with power than ever before. The balance of terror could be seriously jeopardized by the destabilizing effects of new offensive and defensive weapons systems. That is why it is so crucial, it seems to me, for both sides to postpone further deployments while these talks are in progress, "subject to national verification

or such other measures of observation and inspection as may be appropriate," in the words of the resolution.

At this point in the RECORD, Mr. Speaker, I include a copy of the resolution introduced by the gentleman from Delaware (Mr. ROTH) and which I am cosponsoring. I also include an article from the April 17 Washington Post, and two articles from the Sunday New York Times of April 19. The items follow:

RESOLUTION

Expressing the support of the House of Representatives with respect to the Strategic Arms Limitation Talks, and for other purposes

Whereas the preparations for the Strategic Arms Limitation Talks have involved the most intensive study of strategic arms problems ever made by the Government of the United States of America or any other government;

Whereas the Government of the United States of America and the Government of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics open talks on April 16, 1970, which could result in agreement to limit arms and other matters: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the House of Representatives hereby expresses its unreserved support for the talks which begin April 16, 1970, on the limitations of strategic arms between the Government of the United States of America and the Government of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics.

Be it further resolved, That it is the sense of the House of Representatives that—

(1) prompt negotiations between the Governments of the United States of America and of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics to seek agreed limitations of both offensive and defensive strategic weapons should be urgently pursued; and

(2) the President should in such negotiations propose to the Government of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics an immediate suspension by the United States and by the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics of the further deployment of all offensive and defensive nuclear strategic weapons systems, subject to national verification or such other measures of observation and inspection as may be appropriate.

[From the Washington Post, Apr. 17, 1970]

SALT TALKS REOPEN WITH RUSSIAN SOLEMN

(By Chalmers M. Roberts)

VIENNA, April 16.—The strategic arms limitation talks resumed here today on a note more of caution than of optimism.

There were fewer smiles from Vladimir S. Semyonov, the chief Soviet delegate, than there had been when the preliminary phase began last November in Helsinki, and what he had to say sounded harsher than his Helsinki words.

Semyonov once again mentioned Lenin and the Soviet policy of peaceful coexistence. But this time he added a phrase saying that intensification of the arms race, in contrast to its curtailment, "serves the interests of aggressive imperialist circles." No names or nations were mentioned, but such phrases have been applied recently to American Defense Secretary Melvin R. Laird.

At Helsinki the Soviet delegate had spoken both of limitation and the subsequent reduction of nuclear arms. Today he spoke only of "curbing" the arms race and he added that "the items on our program of work in Vienna are not simple."

The chief American delegate, Gerard C. Smith, as at Helsinki, read a message from President Nixon before saying on his own that "we both have nothing to gain from failure. We have and the whole world has much to gain from success. We look forward to its early achievement."

The Nixon message reaffirmed what he had said at Helsinki: hope for an agreement on limitation and eventual reduction of strategic arsenals, "with proper recognition of the legitimate security interests of the United States and the Soviet Union and of third countries."

Then the President added that Smith's instructions "will enable you to move from general explorations," the Helsinki pattern, "to a discussion of more specific proposals toward these ends." Mr. Nixon also told Smith that "you have authority to approach the issues in the most comprehensive manner."

A comprehensive agreement would curb the deployment of rival multiple nuclear warheads on missile systems as well as curb anti-missile defense systems. Mr. Nixon's use of the word "approach in reference to a possible comprehensive" agreement reflected the known administration caution on this critical issue.

The President also expressed the hope that the Soviet delegation had come to Vienna with "the same determination" as the Americans "to bring about a mutually acceptable agreement."

There is considerable discussion within the American delegation as to what is going on in the Kremlin and whether the widely expected changes in the Politburo about which there is no hard information, would have an effect on the SALT talks, as these discussions now are being called by the Soviets as well as by the Americans.

The dominant view appears to be that any Kremlin changes are more likely to stiffen the Soviet position than to liberalize it.

Semyonov gave no clue, but it was noted that he quoted Soviet Communist Party leader Brezhnev's Tuesday speech in Kharkov to the effect that Moscow would welcome "a reasonable accommodation" and would "do its best for these negotiations to be useful." At least in quoting Brezhnev, whose position seems the most secure in the Kremlin, Semyonov was on safe ground.

The first opportunity for an exchange behind closed doors will come when the two delegations have their first business session at 4 p.m. Friday at the Soviet embassy. A second meeting is scheduled for next Monday morning at the American embassy.

At these initial sessions, Smith and Semyonov are expected to read each other formal statements, as was the practice at Helsinki. The question now is at what point in this procedure one side or the other will indicate what kind of proposal it would like.

Today's 30-minute television opening ceremony was held at the Belvedere, an in-city palace, where the Austrian State Treaty was signed almost 15 years ago, the treaty which evacuated the Red Army from Austria and set this small nation on its current neutral course in international relations.

Austrian Foreign Minister Kurt Waldheim sounded very much as his Finnish counterpart had sounded last November when the Helsinki talks opened. Waldheim hoped for "a turning point in the history of disarmament" (a word both big powers avoid here) and "a new phase" in East-West relations.

[From the New York Times, Apr. 19, 1970]

CHAMPAGNE HERALDS SPRING AND SUMMER OF SALT

(By Bernard Weinraub)

VIENNA.—At two minutes to noon last Thursday, a black limousine glided to a halt at the massive Belvedere Palace and Soviet Deputy Foreign Minister Vladimir S. Semyonov climbed out and walked quickly up the marble steps.

By noon, a similar limousine with Gerard C. Smith, the director of the United States Arms Control and Disarmament Agency, had stopped at the palace doors. Within moments the American diplomat—tall, bespectacled craggy-faced—stood beside the Russian minister—short, plump, resembling Otto Preminger—in a glittering red and white marble hall that blended stucco, gilt, mirrors and ceiling frescoes with an allegorical depiction of victory.

"The palace is, you know, a building of war," said an Austrian official early last week. "It was constructed by Prince Eugene of Savoy who plundered and conquered the Turks. It is, perhaps, ironic that the palace could be a building of peace."

It is, perhaps, ironic but also somewhat foreboding and even bizarre that within the baroque splendor of a faded empire—within a palace built between 1714 and 1716 on vine-covered hills facing Vienna—the two superpowers sit down and seek to discuss the nitty gritty of thwarting a nuclear holocaust.

The resumption of the Strategic Arms Limitation Talks (SALT) on Thursday was marked by a curious mood of unease and boredom and a hint—just a hint—of hope. Dutifully, Mr. Semyonov arose and spoke of the arms race "which serves the interests of aggressive imperialist circles." Just as dutifully, Mr. Smith read a message from President Nixon that called for "reduction of strategic arsenals with proper recognition of the legitimate security interests of the United States and the Soviet Union and of third countries."

Dutifully, both men sipped champagne and grinned for photographers and then ordered the paneled doors shut to start the secret talks that may last into the summer.

"It may be *dëjá vu*—we've seen and heard so much of this before that some people may be numb by now to these talks," said a junior American official. "It may be the language that confuses people, all this talk of MIRV and ABM and ICBM that makes it cold and technical.

"What people don't seem to realize is that these talks are a hope—possibly an only hope—for peace."

THE RIVALRY

Another American official, sipping coffee in the Hotel Bristol, slowly discussed the rivalry in nuclear weapons. "We started research in the MIRV (multiple independently targetable re-entry vehicle) when we first learned of their deployment of the ABM (anti-ballistic missile)," he said. "Then they started the MIRV."

The official, who has been working for years on disarmament, paused. "The real question is when do you stop. You've got all this overkill anyway. You've got to stop, sometime. There's an economic factor. There's a moral factor too. You've got to stop."

With the talks enveloped in a mood of somberness and secrecy, the 60 members of both delegations, the security men, the secretaries, the advisers, the families and the hundreds of journalists in Vienna, began the uneasy—and difficult—task of watching the negotiations without knowing too confidently what was going on in the Belvedere Palace where 15-year-old Marie Antoinette married the Dauphin who was later Louis XVI of France.

The Soviet delegation itself has carefully sought virtual total isolation—renting the 93-room Park Hotel in nearby Baden replete with spa, sauna and rejuvenating water cure. By the weekend, the Russians were digging in: Trucks moved into Baden and unloaded crates of sturgeon and bottles of vodka for the spring and summer of SALT.

NIXON CALLS FOR BROAD TALKS ON ARMS

(By John W. Finney)

WASHINGTON—For weeks a debate has been going on within the Administration over whether the United States should seek a comprehensive strategic arms control agreement or propose piecemeal steps to curb the nuclear arms race. Last week, to

the surprise and delight of many in Congress, President Nixon came out in favor of the comprehensive approach.

In his still secret instructions, the President authorized the American delegation to the strategic arms limitation talks in Vienna to propose to the Soviet Union a comprehensive limitation on deployment of both offensive and defensive strategic weapons. The general goal of the Administration is an agreement that would place quantitative limitations on the number of offensive and defensive weapons possessed by each side. Thus, for example, each side might be permitted to have modest antiballistic missile (ABM) systems, while numerical ceilings would be placed on the number of offensive weapons, such as intercontinental missiles or bombers, they could possess.

Basically this proposal corresponds to the negotiating position developed in the Johnson Administration for the SALT talks. But with its cautious attitude toward these talks, there had been no certainty that the Nixon Administration would come out in favor of a comprehensive limitation on strategic weapons.

What the Soviet reaction will be to a comprehensive proposal remains unclear, particularly in light of the apparent power reshuffle within the Kremlin. Admittedly it is more complex than a weapons-by-weapons approach, which was generally advocated by the Pentagon. But a comprehensive limitation has the advantage that it deals with all the interrelated elements of the arms race in a manner that presumably would not give an advantage to one side or the other.

If disarmament critics had one objection to the Administration approach, it was that it does not contemplate a stop in the American deployment of an ABM system and MIRV multiple warheads for missiles. That may prove to be a controversial and perhaps crucial omission, for if the United States proceeds with MIRV warheads and the Safeguard ABM System and the Soviet Union with deployment of its large SS–9 intercontinental missiles, then it may prove doubly difficult to reach agreement on any limitation on strategic weapons.

BETTER SECRETARIES

HON. PAUL FINDLEY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 20, 1970

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, the theme of the 19th consecutive annual Secretaries Week April 19–25 is "Better Secretaries Mean Better Business," sponsored by the National Secretaries Association—International—the world's leading secretarial association, the week will be highlighted on Wednesday, April 22, which is set aside as Secretaries Day.

Many Governors and mayors throughout the United States will officially proclaim "Secretaries Week," while their counterparts in Canada do the same. For the seventh straight year, the Outdoor Advertising Association has undertaken Secretaries Week as a public service project.

Miss Bertha J. Stronach, CPS, NSA's international president, who is secretary and senior staff assistant to L. M. Collins, manager of Educational Marketing Programs, IBM, New York, said that as the leader and authoritative spokesman for the secretarial profession, NSA would be devoting some soul searching to the present and future respect from superiors, colleagues, and subordinates that secretaries can only command through performance.

Miss Stronach said:

Admittedly, secretaries are in a sellers' market. With the ever-adjusting law of supply and demand in the labor market, we have to be on guard against the erosion of the secretarial "image" that will ultimately come from any compromise of the standards we are committed to elevate. When and if the pendulum swings to a buyers' market, we don't want to be remembered from the difficult days of the so-called secretarial shortage.

On every side, management bewails the fact that secretaries are in short supply and that they are having to settle for minimal job fulfillment at maximal salary levels. Yet, some of the same management attempts to recruit from weakness rather than strength and so offer lures that can only be termed frivolous when applied to a business environment. Naturally, we favor appropriate fringe benefits in the form of adequate paid vacations, hospital and retirement insurance plans, and profit-sharing programs. But non-job-related inducements such as a day at the races, a night at the theater or unearned vacations are not what makes a professional secretary job-happy instead of job-hopping.

Our own NSA research consistently reveals that the one major incentive to a secretary is job satisfaction. One recent research conclusion is that it does not necessarily follow, *ipso facto*, that a successful secretary is satisfied with her job, or that a secretary who is satisfied with her job is succesful.

A satisfied secretary is one who is given a challenge and can make a vital contribution to an integral part of the over-all business at hand. When such challenge is offered along with room for advancement, there is a qualified secretary who will be attracted to and remain happy in the position. The key points of what a secretary expects to measure up to are found in NSA's own definition of a secretary, and management's attention is particularly called to the phrases I have underlined:

"A secretary shall be defined as an *executive assistant* who possesses a mastery of office skills, who demonstrates the *ability to assume responsibility without supervision*, who exercises *initiative and judgment*, and who *makes decisions within the scope of assigned authority.*"

One of the primary things management can do toward eliminating the secretarial shortage is to put priority on defining the scope of the secretary's authority on more liberal terms. Then, together, we can work out of the stigmatic, unbalanced atmosphere of the current sellers' market for secretaries.

Miss Stronach also brings to management's attention, as well as that of their employment agents, the continuing need for support and endorsement of the certified professional secretary rating. She states:

Thanks to the support we have already enjoyed, we will have 5,000 CPSs who have passed the examination at the completion of the annual two-day, six-part examination which will be administered May 1 and 2.

As further evidence of the National Secretaries Association's relentless pursuit of seeing that qualified secretaries are trained for the future, Miss Stronach also singles out the goals of the NSA Research and Educational Foundation in defining by in-depth research exactly what secretarial requirements in future years will be.

The Future Secretaries Association, one of NSA's fastest growing endeavors, helps management through FSA's work in assisting business educators to provide realistic training for high school and college students who have chosen to work toward a career in secretaryship.

The observance of Secretaries Week is especially worthy of note on Capitol Hill, where more than 5,000 secretaries provide indispensable skills in handling the steadily rising volume of personal correspondence and official statements which flow from the offices of Representatives and Senators.

NATIONAL LAND REFORM PROGRAM

HON. OGDEN R. REID

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 20, 1970

Mr. REID of New York. Mr. Speaker, I am introducing today with the gentleman from California (Mr. Moss) a bill to authorize an additional $200 million in supporting assistance funds for the Government of Vietnam, which money shall be earmarked to support rapid implementation of the national land reform program enacted March 26, 1970, by the GVN.

Under the so-called "Land to the Tiller" program, land is to be given free to the tenants who have been cultivating it. The present landowners will be permitted to retain only that land which they themselves actually cultivate, and no landlord will be allowed to keep more than 37 acres. If the program is effectively administered, it will be one of the most ambitious and progressive land redistribution programs ever promulgated—the government is to buy up more than 2 million acres of land and distribute it free to the 1 million families who have been working it as tenant farmers for absentee landlords.

The action of the South Vietnamese Government and the legislature on land reform is long and tragically overdue. It may well be too late. Nonetheless, the test now is whether the enacted program will be implemented for all farmers in the next few months. Any real administrative delay could doom government in South Vietnam and make a mockery of promised reform.

There will obviously be many opportunities for corruption and inefficiency in so ambitious a program as the one which has been undertaken by the Government of Vietnam. For that reason, our bill makes the use of these new supporting assistance funds for land reform "contingent upon the attainment of mutually agreed goals of accomplishments stressing economy, efficiency, and advanced implementation of the program by July 1, 1972." Payments for land reform assistance shall be made at quarterly intervals, based upon satisfactory achievement toward the 1972 target goal.

The Vietnamese land reform program, if successful, could help hasten the end

of the war. Certainly it is a vital step toward the economic and social reform which the gentleman from California (Mr. Moss) and I have so long advocated. By making a $200 million contribution toward the cost of land reform—which is expected to cost the Vietnamese Government a total of $400 million—the U.S. Government will simply be acknowledging the fact that we, too, have an interest in bringing about social reform in Vietnam and an early end to the war.

The $200 million authorized by this bill is less than the cost—one-half of 1 week of war. It seems a small enough price to pay for a program which could help bring an end to that war, and enable us once again to focus on the urgent problems here at home.

CONCENTRATION ON INTEGRATION IS DOING LITTLE FOR EDUCATION

HON. ROMAN C. PUCINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 20, 1970

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, recently, the very highly respected columnist, Mr. William Raspberry, wrote his column for the Washington Post which included such foresight and depth of understanding of the whole question of integration that I believe every Member of the House ought to read it.

As chairman of the House Subcommittee on General Education, I am placing Mr. Raspberry's excellent article in the RECORD today:

The article follows:

[From the Washington Post, Feb. 20, 1970]

CONCENTRATION ON INTEGRATION IS DOING LITTLE FOR EDUCATION

(By William Raspberry)

Racial segregation in public schools is both foolish and wrong, which has led a lot of us to suppose that school integration must, therefore, be wise and just.

It ain't necessarily so. It may be that one reason why the schools, particularly in Washington, are doing such a poor job of educating black children is that we have spent too much effort on integrating the schools and too little on improving them.

The preoccupation with racial integration follows in part from a misreading of what the suit that led to the 1954 desegregation decision was all about.

The suit was based (tacitly, at least) on what might be called the hostage theory. It was clear that black students were suffering under the dual school systems that were the rule in the South. It was also clear that only the "separate" part of the separate-but-equal doctrine was being enforced.

Civil rights leaders finally became convinced that the only way to ensure that their children would have equal education with white children was to make sure that they received the same education, in the same classrooms.

Nor would the education be merely equal, the theory went: It would be good. White people who after all run things, are going to see to it that their children get a proper education. If ours are in the same classrooms, they'll get a proper education by osmosis.

That, at bottom, was the reasoning behind the suit, no matter that the legal arguments were largely sociological, among them, that segregated education is inherently unequal.

(Why it should be inherently more unequal for blacks than for whites wasn't made clear.)

In any case, the aim of the suit was not so much integrated education but better education. Integration was simply a means to an end.

Much of the confusion today stems from the fact that the means has now become an end in itself. Suits are being brought for integration, boundaries are being redrawn, busing is being instituted—not to improve education but to integrate classrooms.

The results can sometimes be pathetic.

In Washington, blacks send their children (or have them sent) across Rock Creek Park in pursuit of the dream of good education. But as the blacks come, the whites leave, and increasingly we find ourselves busing children from all-black neighborhoods all the way across town to schools that are rapidly becoming all-black.

The Tri-School setup in Southwest Washington is a case in point. Of the three elementary schools in the area, only one was considered a good school: Amidon, where the children of the black and white well-to-do attended. Bowen and Syphax, populated almost exclusively by poor kids from the projects, were rated lousy schools.

Then the hostage theory was applied. A plan was worked out whereby all first- and second-graders in the area would attend one school, all third- and fourth-graders a second, and all fifth- and sixth-graders the third.

The well-to-do parents would see to it that their children got a good education. All the poor parents had to do was see to it that their children were in the same classrooms.

That was the theory. What happened, of course, is that instead of sprinkling their children around three schools, the luxury high-rise dwellers, black and white, packed their youngsters off to private school. Now instead of one good and two bad schools, Southwest Washington has three bad ones.

After 16 years, we should have learned that the hostage theory doesn't work. This is not to suggest that integration is bad but that it must become a secondary consideration.

Busing makes some sense (as a temporary measure) when its purpose is to transport children from neighborhoods with overcrowded classrooms to schools where there is space to spare.

It works to a limited degree when it involves children whose parents want them bused across town for specific reasons.

But it has accomplished nothing useful when it has meant transporting large numbers of reluctant youngsters to schools they'd rather not attend.

The notion will win me the embarrassing support of segregationist bigots, but isn't it about time we started concentrating on educating children where they are?

AMERICAN COUNCIL ON EDUCATION—COUNCIL ON FOREIGN RELATIONS ON THE COLLEGE FRONT

HON. JOHN R. RARICK

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 20, 1970

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, recently we have heard a loud and anguished scream from the left—over the computerized invasion of privacy. It seems that the U.S. Army, having been given a counterinsurgency mission, was in the process of collecting the necessary intelligence to perform its assigned task. It was busy identifying the potential insurgents, determining their capabilities, and presumably making its estimate of the situation.

I call to the attention of the House the computer games of the left—not the counterinsurgency preparations of the Government which is required by the Constitution to assure to each State in the Union a republican form of government.

I call to the attention of the House an intelligence operation—recognized by intelligence experts to be just that—which has developed information so dangerous that it is "safeguarded" by storage in an unidentified foreign nation.

Many Members are aware of the Council on Foreign Relations—the CFR. This introduces its little brother, the Council on Education—the ACE, also spawned in the aftermath of World War I, and like the CFR a silent partner and often a backstage manipulator of the fashioning of our world during the past half century.

A former intelligence officer in my district was kind enough to furnish me with a bylined story relating to college freshmen and a questionnaire. His comment was to the effect that the possession of such information was an intelligence officer's dream—or a counterintelligence officer's nightmare. I certainly agree with him, and I am sure that other Members of the House will have the same reaction.

The careful research of Publisher Frank Capell, of the Herald of Freedom, fills in the background on the council and its past interests and activities. In view of the council's past use—either of or by—Communists and Soviet agents, its possession of such vital intelligence information, stored "for security reasons" in a foreign country, is worthy of our careful attention.

I include in my remarks the two articles mentioned and excerpts from the questionnaire answered by a quarter of a million college freshmen last fall as published in ACE research reports under the title of "National Norms for Entering College Freshmen—Fall 1969."

[From the Baton Rouge (La.) Morning Advocate, Jan. 19, 1970]

COLLEGE FROSH SPILLING SOME FAMILY SECRETS

(By Patricia McCormack)

NEW YORK.—More than a quarter of a million college freshmen spilled some family secrets when they filled out a super-snooper form last fall. Mom and Dad's education level. Family income.

And they told a lot about their innermost thoughts on controversial topics—abortion, marijuana, the Army.

They also designated their race, religion, attitudes toward political leanings.

Information put on the four-page form from the American Council on Education is for those involved in educational guidance, counseling, administration, research and manpower studies.

Since some of the information is of a personal nature, the question arises: What steps are taken to guarantee confidentiality of responses?

The answer: Very elaborate ones—for if there are no precautions, some of the responses may haunt the student later, even stunting career development.

Four basic magnetic tape files are developed from the student information forms as follows:

—An institutional summary file, the first, contains institutional identification numbers and summary of the responses for males and females in each institution.

—The individual student response file, the second on magnetic tape, consists of responses of each student and an identification number.

CONTAINS NAMES AND ADDRESSES

—A name and address file, the third on magnetic tape, contains a second student identification number. This file contains only name and address.

—The fourth file, also on magnetic tape, is the link file. It contains only the two independent identification numbers. This file is considered so confidential that it is maintained outside of the United States, and under strict security procedures.

The council says this elaborate system has been developed in order to maintain strict confidentiality of individual student response data and to insure maximum protection against misuse of the name and address file.

[From The Herald of Freedom, Mar. 6, 1970]

THE AMERICAN COUNCIL ON EDUCATION

Threats to the privacy of individuals have been growing rapidly in recent years. Various methods of secret observation are widely used in business, politics and law enforcement, while scientific research is done more openly but with possible hidden purposes. Many parents have become concerned over the questionnaires their children have been asked to answer in school, with questions prying into private and confidential aspects of their lives. What has been termed a "super-snooper" form was filled out by over a quarter of a million college freshmen last fall and the use to which this "research project" may possibly be put could be other than scientific.

The questionnaire sought information on the parents' income and education and the students' attitude on race and religion, their political leanings and innermost thoughts on the controversial subjects of the day—abortion, marijuana, the Army, etc. What differentiates this "super-snooper" from other "snoopers" is the care that has been taken to preserve the information and to identify the author of each questionnaire. The UPI release by Patricia McCormack, published Jan. 19, 1970 stated:

"Since some of the information is of a personal nature, the question arises: What steps are taken to guarantee confidentiality of responses?

"The answer: Very elaborate ones—for if there are no precautions, some of the responses may *haunt the student later, even stunting career development.*" (Emphasis ours—Ed.)

The information from the questionnaires has been put on four sets of magnetic tape and filed away. The UPI article describes the tape files as follows:

"An institutional summary file, the first, contains institutional identification numbers and summary of the responses for males and females in each institution.

"The individual student response file, the second on magnetic tape, consists of responses of each student and an identification number.

"A name and address file, the third on magnetic tape, contains a second student identification number. This file contains only name and address.

"The fourth file, also on magnetic tape, is the link file. It contains only the two independent identification numbers. This file is considered so confidential that it is maintained *outside of the United States, and under strict security procedures.*" (Emphasis ours—Ed.)

The organization which provided the questionnaires and which now possesses the taped information is the American Council on Education which claims the information is "for those involved in educational guidance, counseling, administration, research and manpower studies." Its elaborate security system is "to maintain strict confidentiality . . . and to insure maximum protection against misuse of the name and address file." There is another possibility, however, and that is that the organization itself may "misuse" these files.

The organization was first established in Washington, D.C. on January 30, 1918 as the Emergency Council on Education. In July of the same year its name was changed to the present one, American Council on Education. It was incorporated under that name under the laws of the District of Columbia on May 8, 1931. The organization was formed by the Committee on Organization of the Emergency Education Council which outlined the following purpose: "The object of the Council is to place the resources of educational institutions of our country more completely at the disposal of the national Government and its departments to the end that through an understanding cooperation: Their patriotic services may be augmented; a continuous supply of educational men may be maintained; and preparation for the great responsibilities of the reconstruction period following the war may be anticipated." The Council on Education emerged from World War I as did that other organization so powerful in the behind-the-scenes control of the American Government—the Council on Foreign Relations.

Turning from its wartime activities to peaceful pursuits, the Council outlined its objectives in its constitution:

"The general object of the Council, and the purpose of membership therein, shall be to advance American education in any or all of its phases through comprehensive, voluntary, cooperative action on the part of educational associations, organizations, and institutions and in the fulfillment of that purpose to initiate, promote, and carry out such systematic studies, cooperative experiments, conferences, and other similar enterprises as may be required for the public welfare and approved by the Council or the Executive Committee. The Council was organized to meet national needs in time of war and will always seek to render patriotic service. It will also encourage international cooperation in educational matters."

The Council describes itself as follows: an incorporated council of national educational associations; organizations having educational programs or interests; approved universities, colleges and technological schools; state departments of education; city school systems and private schools systems; selected private secondary schools; public libraries; and selected educational departments of business and industrial companies. In describing itself it states:

"The Council is neither a foundation nor a trust. It is an intermediary organization financed by membership dues and by grants from foundations. It also contracts with agencies to carry on special activities related to education. The Council operates through commissions and committees which are set up by the Executive Committee. Many of its activities are the direct result of a request from a private organization or a state or federal agency for a specific service to be performed. Other projects are initiated by the Council's standing committee, the Problems and Policies Committee. . . .

"Membership in the Council is by organization or institution rather than by individual. . . . All members share in the work of the Council, contributing both services and financial support."

The organizations involved in the formation of the original organization were: American Association of University Professors, Association of American Colleges, Association of American Universities, Association of State Universities (later National Assn. of State Universities), Association of Urban Universities, Catholic Education Association (later Nat. Catholic Education Assn.), National Education Association, Society for the Promotion of Engineering Education (later Amer. Soc. for Engineering Education).

The American Council on Education has received large grants from such organizations as the Ford Foundation, The Rockefeller Foundation (General Education Board) Carnegie Endowment for International Peace, National Conference of Christians and Jews, Anti-Defamation League of B'nai B'rith, Committee on University of B'nai B'rith; as well as the U.S. Departments of State, Army and Navy. The Council came under investigation by the Special Committee to Investigate Tax-Exempt Foundations and Comparable Organizations and was involved with the subversive Institute of Pacific Relations as shown in the hearings on that organization.

The report of the Committee investigating tax-exempt foundations released at the end of 1954 stated:

"The Council maintains imposing offices in Washington, D.C., which may not be without significance as, among its many committees, some are concerned with tax, social security and other legislation as it affects institutions of higher learning. Its committee most interesting to us is that on Institutional Research Policy. (Ed. note: The aim of this committee was described in the Council's own literature as follows: "It is the aim of this Council Committee—composed of college presidents, vice-presidents for research, business officers, and faculty members directly engaged in sponsored research projects—to attempt to formulate a policy for the national level based on cooperative relationships."). . . .

"However laudable much or most of its work may have been the Council has certainly been one of the media through which foundation funds have been used to effect considerable control or influence over education in the United States. Some may argue that this control or influence has been wholly good—were this so, we would still believe that the power of great foundations to affect educational policies and practices is one which should concern the public. By the same token, we believe that 'clearinghouse' organizations, while they may serve a purpose in the direction of efficiency, are of questionable desirability when interlocked financially or by personnel with these foundations. The aggregate power involved in such a concentration gives us concern . . . A high concentration of power is always dangerous to society. As we have said, it can be constructed or come into being for wholly benign purposes, but it can readily be used by those whose objectives are against the public interest."

The report contained a reproduction of a chart showing the interrelationships between foundations, education and government, and stating:

"The relationships between and among these organized intellectual groups are far more complex than is indicated on the chart. Some of these organizations have many constituent member groups. The American Council of Learned Societies has twenty-four constituent societies, the Social Science Research Council, seven, the American Council on Education seventy-nine constituent members, 64 associate members, and 945 institutional members . . . Nor does the chart show all the functions of government in which foundations operate or to which they contribute."

After the fall of China to the Communists

was a fait accompli, it was conceded that the work of the Institute of Pacific Relations was instrumental in this, actually dedicated to that end. Cooperating with the IPR in its brainwashing operation of convincing the American public that the Communists were just "agrarian reformers," the "good guys," was the American Council on Education. The leftward bias of the educative process was documented by the hearings on the Institute of Pacific Relations in the specific case of "Resource Packets" prepared for wide distribution by the American Council on Education, whose brochure on the subject (Exhibit No. 408, P. 2584) stated:

THE WHY? WHAT? AND HOW? OF "RESOURCE PACKETS"

Why?—Teachers today have a responsibility to guide students in an honest consideration of the international scene in which the foreign policy of the United States is being forged. . . . To obtain authentic interesting materials on international developments which teachers and students can use is difficult. . . .

What?—To investigate this situation, the American Council on Education 2 years ago appointed a Committee on Materials for Teachers in International Relations. The committee asked the Foreign Policy Association and the American Council of the Institute of Pacific Relations to assist it by selecting materials to provide teachers with helpful background data and immediately useful classroom pamphlets on the United States and Latin America and the United States and the Far East. . . .

How? Each teacher and each school will determine how the packets can be best fitted into the class program. Many teachers have indicated that they will use them as units in civics classes or history classes. . . . Some libraries will make special exhibits of the packets. Their use is almost unlimited in a school which seriously tries to face the problems of the place and stake of the United States in the world scheme.

By disseminating material prepared by such far-left organizations as the Foreign Policy Association and the IPR, the American Council on Education could only mislead rather than "educate" all the students and teachers who trusted in them for guidance. The institute of Pacific Relations is described as follows in the official Guide to Subversive Organizations: The IPR was a vehicle used by the communists to orientate American far eastern policies toward Communist objectives . . . Members of the small core of officials and staff members who controlled IPR were either Communist or pro-Communist . . . The American Communist Party and Soviet officials considered the organization "an instrument of Communist policy, propaganda and military intelligence."

The books and pamphlets in the American Council on Education's "resource packet" on the United States and the Far East were written by Joseph Barnes (identified Communist and secretary of the IPR), Harriet Moore (identified Communist), T. A. Bisson (identified Communist), Michael Greenberg (identified Communist and Soviet agent) and other far-left IPR writers and officers.

Exhibit No. 572–A on P. 3880 of the IPR report is a request from the IPR to the American People's Fund, headed by Communist Frederick Vanderbilt Field, for a grant of $2,500 which they promptly received. As a reason for their request they outlined "Current Program of the IPR:"

"War in the Pacific has created an unprecedented demand for authoritative information on the peoples and problems of the Far East. This has doubled and redoubled the demands on the Institute of Pacific Relations, the sole private agency wholly devoted to objective study of the Pacific area. . . .

"Editors, radio commentators, business firms, teachers and students likewise call on the institute daily for library and information services. . . . The American Council on Education has asked its help in a new effort to improve teaching on the Far East in secondary schools."

On page 3887 of the IPR hearings is Exhibit No. 572–F which is a letter from Wm. W. Lockwood, Secretary of the IPR, to Lauchlin Currie in the U.S. State Department in which he mentions "the ambitious plans of the IPR and American Council on Education for capitalizing on the new interest in the Far East among school authorities."

The American Council on Education professes the same disinterest in the background of individuals associated with it that characterizes most of the intellectual community . . . at least when the background is leftward oriented. In its own prepared material it has stated:

"Without attempting a definition of its own the Council assumes that, as generally understood, subversive activity comprises advocacy of either the overthrow of the Government of the United States by force or violence, or the accomplishment of political change by a means not permitted by the Constitution of the United States. A subversive person or organization would, therefore, be a person or organization that had been proved to have engaged in such activities. . . . Council activities are conducted through committees and project directors appointed by the Council itself. A person known to have engaged in subversive activity would not be considered for membership on such a committee or as a director of a project. Since persons considered for such assignments have high professional competence based on long experience and since their activities have therefore long been matters of public record, we have assumed that investigations similar to those made by the F.B.I. would be unnecessary, even if the Council had the facilities to make them. . . . The Council has no special machinery for investigating prospective committee members and project directors. Such action has not been considered necessary because all such persons have long public records of leadership in American education."

The American Council on Education offices are located at One Dupont Circle, Washington, D.C. 20036. Its present President is Logan Wilson who was previously associated with the Ford Foundation and the Carnegie Foundation. He was president of the University of Texas from 1953 to 60 and chancellor to 1961 at which time he became president of the American Council on Education which post he still holds. The Council's publication, "Higher Education and National Affairs" is issued approximately forty times per year and distributed free to persons in each member institution. Editor is Frank Skinner and Congressional Reporter, Betty Pryor.

Many questions can be raised about the use this powerful organization will make of the confidential information (specifically linked to the persons giving it) obtained from this year's college freshmen. Among previous projects financed by grants and carried out by the American Council on Education have been: a grant from the Institute of Pacific Relations for a survey of the treatment of the Far East in American textbooks; many grants from the National Conference of Christian and Jews for a variety of studies (textbook treatment of "intergroup relations," etc.) and the support of the ACE's Committee on Intergroup Education and other projects; a grant from the identified Communist Front, the National Council on American-Soviet Friendship, Inc. for the support of a project on the study of data on the Soviet Union contained in textbooks and other teaching materials used in American Schools; grants from the U.S. Armed Forces Institute for the continuing examination and evaluation of educational materials used by USAFI; grants from the U.S. Department of the Army for the orientation and educational guidance of foreign national leaders and specialization training facilities in the United States for certain foreign nationals from Germany, Austria and Japan; and from the Dept. of State for the orientation of selected German leaders and trainees representing various professions who were brought to the United States under the German reorientation program. Through grants from the U.S. Dept. of State Coordinator of Inter-American Affairs the ACE was much involved in the selection of personnel and teaching material to be used in the various parts of South America.

Since today's college freshmen will be emerging as leaders and trainees within the next few years, the dossiers compiled on their attitudes and backgrounds would be most useful as guides in eliminating the "undesirables" with the reactionary tendencies, and selecting those with the proper leftist views to be "successful."

The American Council on Education is a powerful organization which has accepted financing from questionable sources and for questionable purposes. It has recommended and distributed the writings of Communist authors and cooperated in the brainwashing program of the subversive Institute of Pacific Relations. The purpose of the IPR was to mislead students and the American public in general while the Communist subversion of China was being carried out under the disguise of "agrarian reform." The fall of China to the Communist conspiracy led in turn to the tragic loss of young American lives in Korea and Viet Nam, as the Communist sought to extend their area of control in the Far East. Now the American Council on Education, which cooperated (knowingly or unknowingly) in the Communist take-over of China, has assembled dossiers on a quarter of a million young Americans. If its purpose were purely scientific, the results could be tabulated and name files would be unnecessary. Clearly it must be planned to follow the course of these students' lives, if not to direct that course. Students who are throwing off more and more controls over their lives, to their detriment, should think about the possibility of control the possession of these dossiers presents. Their parents should demand the destruction of the name files and an explanation of the purpose of the questionnaires, as well as the revelation of what foreign country was selected as the repository for such confidential information.

EXCERPTS FROM QUESTIONNAIRE

(Prepared by Office of Research, American Council on Education, 1785 Massachusetts Avenue, NW., Washington, D.C. Processed by National Computer Systems, 1015 South Sixth Street, Minneapolis, Minn.)

* * * * *

10. Through what source do you intend to finance the first year of your undergraduate education?

Personal savings and/or employment.
Parental or other family aid.
Repayable loan.
Scholarship, grant, or other gift.

11. What is the highest level of formal education obtained by your parents?

Grammar school or less.
Some high school.
High school graduate.
Some college.
College degree.
Postgraduate degree.

12. What is your best estimate of the total income last year of your parental family (not your own family if you are married)? Consider annual income from all sources before taxes.

Less than $4,000.
$4,000–$5,999.
$6,000–$7,999.

$8,000–$9,999.
$10,000–$14,999.
$15,000–$19,999.
$20,000–$24,999.
$25,000–$29,999.
$30,000 or more.

13. What is your racial background?
White/Caucasian.
Black/Negro/Afro-American.
American Indian.
Oriental.
Other.

14. Mark one in each column: Religion in Which you Were Reared. Your Present Religious Preference:
Baptist.
Congregational (United Church of Christ).
Episcopal.
Jewish.
Latter Day Saints (Mormon).
Lutheran.
Methodist.
Muslim.
Presbyterian.
Quaker (Society of Friends).
Roman Catholic.
Seventh Day Adventist.
Unitarian-Universalist.
Other Protestant.
Other Religions.
None.

15. Where did you rank academically in your high school graduating class?
Top 1 percent.
2nd Quarter.
Top 10 percent.
3rd Quarter.
Top Quarter.
4th Quarter.

16. During the next few years, to what extent do you think the Federal Government should be involved in each of the following national issues?
Control of cigarette advertising.
Elimination of violence from T.V.
Control of environmental pollution.
Use of tax incentives to control the birth rate.
Protection of the consumer from faulty goods and services.
Compensatory education for the disadvantaged.
Special benefits for veterans.
Control of firearms.
Elimination of poverty.
Crime prevention.
School desegregation.
Compensatory financial aid for the disadvantaged.
Control of student activists.

* * * * *

18. Mark one in each row: Left, Liberal, Middle-of-the-road, Moderately conservative, Strongly conservative.
How would you characterize yourself politically at the present time?
How do you think you will characterize yourself politically four years from now?

* * * * *

22. What is your best guess as to the chances that you will:
Get married while in college?
Get married within a year after college?
Obtain an A– or better over-all grade point average?
Change major field?
Change career choice?
Fail one or more courses?
Graduate with honors?
Be elected to a student office?
Join a social fraternity, sorority, or club?
Author or co-author a published article?
Be drafted while I am in college?
Be elected to an academic honor society?
Protest against U.S. military policy?
Protest against administrative policy at this college?
Protest against existing racial or ethnic policies?
Drop out of this college temporarily (exclude transferring)?
Enlist in the Armed Services before graduating?
Be more successful after graduation than most students attending this college?
Drop out permanently (exclude transferring)?
Transfer to another college before graduating?

* * * * *

24. Mark *only three* responses, *one* in each column. *Your* probable career occupation; your *father's* occupation; your *mother's* occupation.

NOTE: If your father (or mother) is deceased, please indicate his (her) last occupation.

Accountant or actuary.
Actor or entertainer.
Architect.
Artist.
Business (clerical).
Business executive (management, administrator).
Business owner or proprietor.
Business salesman or buyer.
Clergyman (minister, priest).
Clergy (other religious).
Clinical psychologist.
College teacher.
Computer programmer.
Conservationist or forester.
Dentist (including orthodontist).
Dietitian or home economist.
Engineer.
Farmer or rancher.
Foreign service worker (including diplomat).
Housewife.
Interior decorator (including designer).
Interpreter (translator).
Lab technician or hygienist.
Law enforcement officer.
Lawyer (attorney).
Military service (career).
Musician (performer, composer).
Nurse.
Optometrist.
Pharmacist.
Physician.
School counselor.
School principal or superintendent.
Scientific researcher.
Social worker.
Statistician.
Therapist (physical, occupational, speech).
Teacher (elementary).
Teacher (secondary).
Veterinarian.
Writer or journalist.
Skilled trades.
Other.
Undecided.
Laborer (unskilled).
Semi-skilled worker.
Other occupation.
Unemployed.

25. In general, my parents could be characterized as: Strongly agree, Agree, Disagree, Strongly disagree.
Interested in intellectual pursuits.
Interested in cultural pursuits.
Deeply religious.
Interested in politics.
Deeply concerned about their children.
Financially comfortable.
Having high aspirations for me.

26. Below is a general list of things that students sometimes do. Indicate which of these things you did during the *past year* in school. If you engaged in an activity frequently, mark "F". If you engaged in an activity one or more times, but not frequently, mark "O" (occasionally). Mark "N" (not at all) if you have not performed the activity during the past year.
Voted in a student election.
Came late to class.
Played a musical instrument.
Studied in the library.
Checked out a book or journal from the school library.
Arranged a date for another student.
Overslept and missed a class or appointment.
Typed a homework assignment.
Discussed my future with my parents.
Failed to complete a homework assignment on time.
Argued with a teacher in class.
Attended a religious service.
Demonstrated for a change in some racial or ethnic policy.
Demonstrated for a change in some military policy.
Demonstrated for a change in some administrative policy of my high school.
Did extra (unassigned) reading for a course.
Took sleeping pills.
Tutored another student.
Played chess.
Read poetry not connected with a course.
Took a tranquilizing pill.
Discussed religion.
Took vitamins.
Visited an art gallery or museum.
Worked in a school political campaign.
Worked in a local, state, or national political campaign.
Missed school because of illness.
Smoked cigarettes.
Discussed politics.
Drank beer.
Discussed sports.
Asked a teacher for advice after class.
Had vocational counseling.
Stayed up all night.

* * * * *

28. Indicate the importance to you personally of each of the following: Essential, very important, somewhat important, not important.
Becoming accomplished in one of the performing arts (acting, dancing, etc.).
Becoming an authority on a special subject in my subject field.
Obtaining recognition from my colleagues for contributions in my special field.
Influencing the political structure.
Influencing social values.
Raising a family.
Having an active social life.
Having friends with different backgrounds and interests from mine.
Becoming an expert in finance and commerce.
Having administrative responsibility for the work of others.
Being very well-off financially.
Helping others who are in difficulty.
Becoming a community leader.
Making a theoretical contribution to science.
Writing original works (poems, novels, short stories, etc.).
Never being obligated to people.
Creating artistic work (painting, sculpture, decorating, etc.).
Keeping up to date with political affairs.
Being successful in a business of my own.
Developing a meaningful philosophy of life.

29. Mark one in each row: Agree strongly; Agree somewhat; Disagree somewhat; Disagree strongly.
Students should have a major role in specifying the college curriculum.
Scientists should publish their findings regardless of the possible consequences.
Realistically, an individual person can do little to bring about changes in our society.
College officials have the right to regulate student behavior off campus.
The chief benefit of a college education is that it increases one's earning power.
Faculty promotions should be based in part on student evaluations.

My beliefs and attitudes are similar to those of most other students.

Student publications should be cleared by college officials.

Marijuana should be legalized.

College officials have the right to ban persons with extreme views from speaking on campus.

Only volunteers should serve in the armed forces.

Students from disadvantaged social backgrounds should be given preferential treatment in college admissions.

Most college officials have been too lax in dealing with student protests on campus.

Divorce laws should be liberalized.

Under some conditions, abortions should be legalized.

There is too much concern in the courts for the rights of criminals.

Capital punishment (the death penalty) should be abolished.

SENATOR EVERETT McKINLEY DIRKSEN

HON. JOHN C. KLUCZYNSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 20, 1970

Mr. KLUCZYNSKI. Mr. Speaker, it is with sincere and deep satisfaction that this House of Representatives approves the naming of the new Federal buildings in Chicago, to memorialize the late and beloved Senator Everett McKinley Dirksen of Illinois.

In truth, Senator Dirksen was a monumental figure wherever he was. To many younger persons and newer Members of the House he remains in memory as one of the brilliant ornaments of the Senate, since his election to that body in 1950 and served continuously until his passing in 1969. But he also was a most distinguished Member of this House from 1933 until his voluntary retirement in 1949.

My memories of Ev Dirksen are vivid and cherished. As I recall our long friendship, there is one singular quality about him that I wish to recall today. It is not his fidelity to what he saw as the best interests of our country. It is not his statesmanship, which he proved so many times, by taking public stands which were not popular, or even politically discreet. It was not his great mental equipment which allowed him to see a complex issue to its basic skeleton, with melodious oratory or voice.

Everett McKinley Dirksen had in a greater degree than anyone I have known what was a talent, a gift or perhaps genius for friendship. He had an understanding of people either in their times of calm or storm and out of that great understanding he had a genuine friendship for people. That friendliness was assumed, or donned for the occasion or its political impact.

It is true that Senator Dirksen was hard hitting, a partisan, and his own man in forming opinions of the enormous issues which have confronted the Congresses since 1933, through economic depression, war and its aftermath.

In all candor, I must remark that Everett Dirksen and I did not always see eye to eye on issues affecting either our State of Illinois or the country at large. We could argue and debate with some heat. Yet his friendship never faltered. He praised me for holding to my own convictions and I had to do the same for that kind of a man.

Senator Dirksen was intellectually honest. He let this House and the Senate know what he thought and when he got the opportunity, our people at home in Illinois and very often all Americans, what his position was on some burning issue and why he thought as he did. I believe honestly that he won a national affection, because of the warmth of his personality and charisma that came through his most zealous outbursts for a cause, delivered in that undulating, poetic prose which made him a household word. I think that people sensed his innate friendliness and geniality. After all, that bestowed on him the accolade of being just "Ev."

Great men or women may leave us physically, but we who have known them well keep them alive in our admiration and our memories.

Yet, while we may cherish our memories of association with the great, we also have deep obligation to those who will follow us. This House and Senate over its illustrious 180 years or so, has produced a galaxy of men and women, which I declare without undue boasting, cannot be equaled in any other parliament in the world. It is fitting and proper that we leave some physical memento of these great ones who fostered the greatness of the United States in their own time and made guarantees for its even greater future.

Everett McKinley Dirksen was one of the luminaries of the House and Senate, ranking with the greatest of them. I commend my colleagues for approving the proposal to name this imposing building in Chicago for him.

Let generations in the far future ask: "Who was Everett McKinley Dirksen?" The alert will discover who he was, what he did and what they owe to his presence here on Capitol Hill.

If they do, they will learn about the qualities he possessed and spent without stint for our Nation and its people.

NEW HOPE FOR RURAL AMERICA

HON. ALBERT H. QUIE

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 20, 1970

Mr. QUIE. Mr. Speaker, on March 13, Donald Rumsfeld, Director of the Office of Economic Opportunity, addressed the National Farmers Union in Denver, Colo.

His remarks contained a concise picture of poverty in rural America and some of the proposals submitted by the administration and his own agency for dealing with this problem. Too often, the rural poor have been neglected. I am pleased to see that he recognizes the need to help restore economic viability to the rural areas to help prevent the outmigration from rural areas to inner cities.

I commend his remarks to my colleagues, as follows:

REMARKS OF THE HONORABLE DONALD RUMSFELD, NATIONAL FARMERS UNION, DENVER, COLO., MARCH 13, 1970

President Tony Dechant, Mr. Patton, my good friend, Dr. Blue Carstenson who has been so helpful to the agency throughout its life; distinguished guests on the platform and ladies and gentlemen. I do want to first of all express my pleasure at being able to join you today to personally be able to commend you and congratulate you and wish you well on your 68th Annual Meeting.

You have had 68 years of very distinguished service, service to your members, your neighbors as well as to your Nation. I'm particularly pleased also that the Office of Economic Opportunity is in the process of opening a Regional Office here in Denver so that your national headquarters will have liaison with our Regional Office as well as our many and continuing contacts in Washington, D.C. My special thanks also to each of you and your national leaders, and particularly to Dr. Carstenson who I see in Washington, not simply for the successful operation of your programs sponsored by the Office of Economic Opportunity, not simply for your private collective and private individual efforts to help deal with the very urgent problems of the poor, but also for your support of our legislation.

I want to commend you on your efforts to mount community support for rural community action agencies and your efforts in conducting the largest Operation Mainstream Program operating in the rural areas of fourteen states, and utilizing nearly 2,400 low-income people. The Green Thumb and Green Light Programs have been of direct benefit to thousands of poor. Your work to improve rural housing, create recreational areas and rural fire departments, to supply nurse aides to the Red Cross, to help feed the elderly and infirm deserves recognition. And I am pleased to be able to do so in person.

At the outset of a new decade, it is appropriate to look to the issues of the next generation, when America will expand as never before.

The President has announced that the time is at hand to develop a national growth and land use policy, to give coherence and structure to the growth of population in this extraordinary period ahead.

Such a policy must provide for assistance in the rebuilding of old central cities to be sure, and the expansion of existing metropolitan areas, but also of small cities and towns, and for the creation of a number of new cities. We must carry our concern with the quality of life in America to the farm as well as the suburb, to the village as well as the city.

What rural America most needs is to be dealt with not as a separate entity, but as part of an overall growth policy for all America.

We hear much about the "urban crisis" in America. That crisis is real. However, the reason it is on the tips of our tongues is because it is sharply focused. The problems of rural America are equally real but are not a national topic of conversation. They don't involve traffic jams and protests in the streets and all of the other high decibel activities associated with the cities.

A common understanding of the nature of the problem is developing. We recognize:

1. that rural poverty involves not only the problems of people with little income but the inter-related problems of the poverty of rural institutions;

2. that advances in technology have lessened the opportunities for large numbers of the rural poor to follow traditional occu-

pation in agriculture, mining, forestry and transportation, and that because alternative opportunities have not opened in rural areas affected, an outmigration to urban areas has occurred with harmful effects on both rural and urban areas and to the people involved in this process;

3. that although no one should be coerced, the opportunity to follow ones own path should not be closed to those in rural areas;

4. That in the long run many rural people will have to be prepared for a nonagrarian way of life, but that does not imply a move to the city to achieve opportunities;

5. that the barriers affecting racial and ethnic groups that contribute to poverty in rural areas must be eliminated as a vital part of the solution to the problem.

While the 1970 Census will provide a great deal of valuable new data, we already know the parameters of the problem.

A high proportion of the urban poor, now jammed into city slums, migrated from rural slums. These migrants find themselves better off, economically, in the cities.

Technology has increased farm output dramatically while at the same time, farm employment has been reduced. During the 1970's the need for farm labor will likely continue to decline.

We also know that today few of the rural poor live on farms. They live in open country, in small towns and villages. While a large number of minorities are among the rural poor—including Indians on reservations, Negroes in the South and Spanish speaking in the southwest—whites who are poor outnumber non-whites by a wide margin—more than 3 to 1.

The best estimates show 11.2 million impoverished Americans in rural areas—37 percent of the 25.3 million who were poor in 1968. In other words, 37 percent of the Nation's poor are in rural areas that contain less than a third of the Nation's population. Less than 10 percent of these families receive public assistance.

Of the 11.2 million poor outside our cities, less than 3 million lived on farms. The remainder, some 78 percent, were scattered in rural areas. Forty percent of the rural poor are over 60 years of age, presenting a full range of special problems in rural poverty.

Between 1959 and 1968, the proportion of the total poor living in cities increased from 44 to about 51 percent. This reflects the migration of the poor to the cities. It reflects the failure to develop sufficient opportunities in rural America.

Public programs have improved the lot of the urban poor—but there have not been sufficient similar efforts to improve conditions for the rural poor. This disparity provides fresh incentives for the rural poor to rush to the already overburdened central cities.

A recent Office of Economic Opportunity study reveals that most rural residents show a negative attitude toward migrating to the city. Yet, where job expansion does not occur, and where the economic level of an area is low and static, there is a fairly steady outmigration of rural residents. In general, those who leave are better educated, younger, and have higher incomes than those who do not choose to move. The decision to leave a rural area or a farm nearby always is based on the lure of more attractive economic and occupational opportunities.

This means that those left behind are less educated, and they tend to form a hard core of rural poverty that could grow into a more serious problem.

Almost without exception, those who migrated are better off, but despite improved economic status in the cities, many rural-to-urban migrants wish to return home. But most indicate there would have to be an opportunity for a comparable level of income and economic opportunity. Unless that happens, they will stay in the cities. And we can be certain that others will follow their example.

The President challenged us in his State of the Union Message when he called for the creation of "new rural environment that will not only stem the migration to urban centers, but reverse it." The creation of the Rural Affairs Council as a complement last summer to the Urban Affairs Council demonstrated the President's interest in the condition and future growth of Rural America. He said at that time: "The population of our country is likely to grow by 50 percent in the next 30 years (from 200 to 300 million in a third of a century). Where these next hundred million persons locate is an overwhelmingly important question for our Society. After an era in which people have moved steadily from the countryside to large and crowded cities, we must now do what we can to encourage a more even distribution of our population."

Recognizing that the problems of growth which involve both rural and urban America cannot be fashioned and implemented by viewing them as separate and unrelated, the President yesterday recommended the establishment of the Domestic Affairs Council. This new Cabinet Council will have improved capabilities in recognizing the interrelation of urban and rural problems. Both the Rural Affairs and the Urban Affairs Councils will function as sub-councils of the Domestic Council. I can assure you as a member that this council will aggressively undertake the development of a balanced national growth policy.

This Administration has been in office now for 13 months. The Nation has seen during this last year a shifting of priorities. Defense and military spending have been squeezed; domestic spending has been increased something in the neighborhood of 13 percent. The trend has been quite different from the trend in previous years.

A broad range of reforms has been offered to the Congress; welfare reform, draft reform, tax reform, postal reform, manpower reform, grant-in-aid reform, reform of the District Government, and changes in the Social Security legislation. The Ash Commission is looking at the entire Executive Branch of the Federal Government to see what changes, from an institutional standpoint, might be made so that Government in fact can be more responsive to the problems of human beings across this country than has been in the past.

The single most important problem we have is seeing that Government does in fact work, work not for Government, but for human beings, that it is responsive, that it deals with real problems and affects real changes.

The domestic crisis which the New Administration faced when it took office in January was in many respects a crisis of confidence in Government, born of the apparent sluggishness of problem-solving mechanisms. The public's complaint was not so much that Government was not trying, but that it was not performing. Men did not argue that it was insensitive, but that it was impotent. It was big, they contended, but it was not strong. It was expensive, but it was not effective. It could plan and promise, but in a growing number of cases, it could not deliver.

A central task of the new Administration was to reduce this "performance gap," to make the Government work again. Considerable attention, therefore, has been given to reforming the machinery of Government.

The President pointed out that, "Nowhere has the failure of government been more tragically apparent than in its effort to help the poor, especially in its system of public welfare." And nowhere was the Administration's commitment to far-reaching, fundamental reform more apparent, than in his "new and drastically different" approach to the welfare problem.

In place of a system of welfare payments which vary widely from State to State and city to city, the President called for a new federally-supported floor under the incomes of American families wherever in America they live. In place of a system which provides a disincentive for recipients to go to work, particularly if the work is part-time or low-paying, the President presented a scale of benefits under which it would always pay a welfare recipient to take employment. In place of a system which offers an incentive for the breaking up of families, the President proposed a plan which encourages families to remain together. The Family Assistance Plan is an approach which dealt with the causes—and not just the effects—of past welfare failures.

The Plan is designed to help the poor in rural as well as urban areas and when enacted will have a major impact on those rural poor who are not the recipients of public assistance, those who live on a low income in areas of minimal opportunities for improvement. The Family Assistance Plan will remove a heavy burden from families by opening choices which can be made not under the gun of deprivation. As James L. Sundquist pointed out in his recent article, "Where Shall They Live?" ". . . the movement of people from smaller to larger places is to a large extent—though no one knows the exact proportion—involuntary, forced migration of displaced families, forced out by economic pressures they cannot control." The Family Assistance Plan can help to introduce an element of individual choice into the decision.

The Office of Economic Opportunity is conducting experiments on income maintenance which form the conceptual basis for the proposed Family Assistance system. The New Jersey Graduated Work Incentive experiment, combined with similar rural experiments in North Carolina and Iowa, are testing the premises and assumptions involved in income transfer as a mechanism to alleviate poverty. Preliminary results obtained after 15 months of operations in New Jersey indicate that the system will work as anticipated. We intend to carefully study future data from these projects for use in implementing the system. This experiment is directed at ways to provide a wider individualization of choice, at providing incentives, at providing opportunities so that poor Americans—whether rural or urban—can seize the opportunities to guide themselves into the economic life of our society.

We, very recently, made a computation of the impact of the Proposal on Rural America. As proposed by President Nixon, the Family Assistance Plan would have a beneficial impact on 8,444,000 poor individuals in rural areas. It would raise their income. Some 2,900,000 on farms and 5,544,000 in small towns and the countryside would be eligible for assistance. This total represents 42.4 percent of all of the persons, rural and urban, who would be eligible to participate in the Family Assistance Plan.

The New Jersey experiment was specifically designed to provide evidence about the effects such a program would have for the person it is designed to assist, give realistic cost estimates, and offer suggestions for implementation. Preliminary data suggest that fears that a guaranteed minimum income could result in extreme, unusual, or unanticipated responses are unfounded.

Furthermore, preliminary data from the New Jersey project indicate that a Family Assistance Program is practical. The data suggested that:

1. There is no evidence that work effort declined among those receiving income support payments. On the contrary, there is an indication that the work effort of participants receiving payments increased relative to the work effort of those not receiving payments.

2. Low-income families receiving supple-

mentary benefits tend to reduce borrowing, buy fewer items on credit, and purchase more of such consumer goods as furniture and appliances.

3. The Family Assistance Program, excluding the Day Care Program and Work Training provisions, can be administered at an annual cost per family of between $72 and $96. Similar costs for the current welfare system run between $200 and $300 annually per family.

In-depth interviews with participants indicate that the low-income individual is strongly motivated toward work.

The majority indicated that they aspire for a better job and are willing to move to another city or take training—even if it meant a pay cut—in order to get that better job. The majority also indicated that they are willing to work two jobs to support their families. Of all the factors influencing work choice, job security was ranked twice as high by participants as any other job factor, including wages, working conditions, or job interest.

These responses from the participants indicate that supplementary income assistance will not reduce their work effort.

These data of course are preliminary and the Congress has the responsibility for passing a specific bill to implement the principles of the President's plan. But it is my opinion that there is an excellent chance that some form of this plan will pass the Congress this year.

In recent years, through increased attention, the Office of Economic Opportunity has allocated approximately 28 percent of its funds to meet the complicated host of problems that make up rural poverty. Today rural Community Action Agencies employ nearly 50,000 poor people on their resident staffs.

But let me say quite honestly, I am far from satisfied. Community Action Agencies in rural areas need improvement and greater support, and we are working diligently on it. Rural CAA's got off to a slow start, compared to their urban counterparts. This is partly because of the unique difficulties in mounting effective programs in areas which have a relatively weak administrative and economic base. We are building future CAA efforts around a strategy to promote economic development and foster income improvement. While the Family Assistance Program will be the most dramatic single step in decades for rural America, income transfer alone is not the entire answer. Our aim is to help mobilize resources—including those in other Federal agencies, state and local agencies, and the private sector.

But what is the situation of the Office of Economic Opportunity today? From a quantitative standpoint, it is 1063 Community Action Agencies, private local agencies spread across the country, that receive funds, hire people and proceed to be involved either actively themselves or through delegate agencies in a variety of programs; 600 legal services offices, handling some 610,000 cases last year; 91 migrant and Indian programs in 37 states; 200 programs for older persons; about 49 neighborhood health centers; 230 family planning programs serving some 350,000 women; 475 emergency food programs; and—believe it or not—250 research, development or evaluation activities; some 15 economic development activities; more than 4,000 VISTA volunteers; Head Start, manpower programs and so on.

Beyond that, the Office of Economic Opportunity represents the portion of the Federal budget that is not handled in the traditional way through the existing Executive departments and the state and local governmental apparatus. It offers, the opportunity, properly managed and properly handled, to see if we in this society can help to make these institutions and private institutions as well, function as more perfect problem-solving mechanisms. With its $2 billion budget, however, the Office of Economic Opportunity is not the "War on Poverty," contrary to what you've all heard. There has been a good deal of rhetoric about the Office of Economic Opportunity being the only agency concerned with the poor.

But, the national effort to aid the poor in my judgment involves most domestic departments and agencies of the Federal Government, other levels of government, and the private sector. Indeed, it involves the National Farmers Union. Further, the real task of the Office of Economic Opportunity is not income maintenance, as some feel or seem to assume. The Family Assistance Program, with its great possibilities for changing the economic and social landscape of this country, will be operated by HEW, the Department which is and has been responsible for income maintenance programs. Nor is our task to operate a complete duplicate system for delivery of all services that affect all people. The real task of the Office of Economic Opportunity is to find better ways of opening economic opportunity, of raising the capacity of individuals to participate in the economic life of the country. It is to develop new programs that can be used to help solve social problems, and to make our institutions more responsive.

Achieving a better life requires expanding the range of opportunity for all. We can fulfill the American dream only when each person has a fair chance to fulfill his own dream.

The Decade of the 60's saw great strides in expanding the legal rights of non-white Americans. In the seventies we must build on this record. In particular, it is time for a greater focus on economic opportunity.

Every American must have access to meaningful employment—and access to the education and training to qualify him for the best job within his reach. Federal contract and enforcement powers can help to open doors of opportunity that have remained stubbornly shut.

Beyond this, we must create new opportunities for expanded ownership. In order to be secure in their human rights, people need access to property rights. We should encourage the incentive that comes from a real opportunity to acquire ownership of assets—of business enterprises, homes, shares in a corporation, membership in profit sharing plans. We should do so first because it is right; and second because a Nation in which the great majority of the people participate in progress through ownership of wealth and property is more likely to be stable, orderly and free.

We must develop and implement a broad ranging plan for expanded economic opportunity—especially for minority groups who have suffered unjust discrimination, but also for all Americans, everywhere, who have been denied their full chance to participate in the American free enterprise system. In so doing we can invest in America, as millions of citizens invest their skills and their efforts in building better lives for themselves, their communities and for their Nation.

As these programs move forward, we can deliver on America's basic claim as a place of opportunity not for the few, not even for the many, but for all.

Few have seized so enthusiastically as the young on the quest for a better "quality of life"; few have been so ready to defend a threatened environment. The young know, intuitively, how unique and how precious is the individual. They increasingly and rightly perceived a threat to that spirit as cities grew more crowded, as organizations grew more impersonal, as Government grew more unresponsive.

Their answer has been to declare themselves in favor of life.

America, which has pioneered in the new abundance and the new technology, is called on today to pioneer in meeting the concerns which have followed in their wake—fully, turning the wonders of science to the service of man.

Recently, Mr. John Gardner said, "Too many take a free ride as far as distinctive effort to serve the common good is concerned," "Too many are apathetic, self-absorbed and self-serving." He also said, "One thing the citizen can do—must do—is to reject fiercely all politicians who exploit fear and anger and hatred for their purposes . . ." The emotions cannot be wished away. Nor can politicians, nor will citizens be rid of them merely because they are told to be rid of them.

The great challenge to leadership at this moment is to draw into the system—a great system—those who feel such emotions and follow such politicians; draw them back by appealing to the larger interest in progress and social justice which we all share; by defining problems in a way that unites rather than divides; by proposing solutions in a tone that emphasizes the good of all—not merely of one group. Simple solutions—such as one- or two-group strategies—are deceptive and dangerous. As H. L. Mencken once said, "For every human problem there is a solution which is simple, neat and wrong."

This is not to say that there are not or will not be groupings or citizens with separate interests on many matters. The existence of such interests, and of competition between them, is a healthy part of our system and helps produce much of the light, as well as the heat, by which our Nation resolves great issues.

But the days of national leaders appealing to any one of them must be gone. With communications so rapid and intensive, and our population so mobile, no national leader can go with impunity before a farm or labor group, or a poor or a non-poor group, or black or a white group, and appeal only to their interest at the expense of other groups. We have seen that issues are related—farm policy to labor policy, tax policy to foreign policy. And individual groups, along with issues, are increasingly interdependent. It would be a risky and unwise business to adopt a strategy based on an appeal to interest groups or regional groups—a farm strategy or black strategy or a northern or southern strategy. Those who would contemplate such a strategy, who appeal to a special constellation of groups, risk a further polarization of society that will harm all groups. And most groups know it or are learning it.

The effect of giving undue preference to one group is to exclude others—or to give the feeling of being excluded—and thus to divide the Nation when we need most to be brought together. And at this stage in history with so many powerful forces contending so divisively, such a course would produce disaster. We cannot afford to exclude the South, and we cannot afford to exclude the North or the poor or non-poor, white or black. Those who play by the old rules—the rules of groupings, the rules of polarization—will be duly and properly blamed for the damage done to all groups in our Society, and will be discarded by the people.

The goal of leadership must be to appeal to what is best in the American people—the sense of adventure that brought us to explore and tame this land, the energy and enterprise that caused us to make it the most productive on earth, and the fundamental sense of fairness and decency that allowed us to live in peace with each. A leader must believe in the people he serves, must believe deeply in their most trusting instincts. He must understand their fears and angers and hatreds in order to reach what is best. He cannot dismiss the emotions on which demagogues would play—ordinary, human emotions—but must raise the Nation above them.

John Gardner had a book titled, "No Easy Victories," and I guess that is true. Leader-

ship is not easy—your leadership, State leadership, Federal leadership. John Gardner tells a story about leadership: There was a wife who reached over and read the fortune-teller's card of her husband as he got off the weighing machine after he had put a penny in. She read it out loud, and it said: "You are a leader with a magnetic personality and strong character; intelligent, witty, attractive to the opposite sex." She turned the card over, looked at her husband and said: "It has your weight wrong, too."

I guess what I am saying about leadership is that you have a leadership role, the states and Federal Government have a leadership role. We live in a very complicated society. There is no one leader. If we as a society are going to walk through the coming months and years successfully, it is going to take the best of all of us. And I, for one, am anxious to work with you and to encourage and hope for a maximum amount of participation by you in what I consider to be some very, very important programs that this Nation is trying to manage to deal with the problems of the poor.

Thank you very much.

CITIZENS' CRUSADE FOR CLEAN WATERS LAUNCHES DRIVE FOR $1¼ BILLION

HON. JOHN D. DINGELL

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 20, 1970

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, the Citizens' Crusade for Clean Water has launched its drive for full funding of the fiscal year 1971 operations under the Clean Water Restoration Act of 1966. In connection with its effort, the crusade issued a press statement for release on Sunday, April 19, 1970. So that my colleagues may have an opportunity to be aware of the crusade's views and activities, I include the text of the press statement at this point in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

CITIZENS' CRUSADE FOR CLEAN WATERS LAUNCHES DRIVE FOR $1¼ BILLION APPROPRIATION FOR WATER POLLUTION CONTROL CONSTRUCTION GRANTS

WASHINGTON, D.C.—The Citizens' Crusade for Clean Waters, a coalition of 33 non-governmental organizations concerned about water pollution control, has announced the launching of a new campaign to secure the full-funding appropriation of $1¼ billion in fiscal 1971 for Federal grants to municipalities for the construction of waste treatment facilities.

The "Citizens' Crusade" was organized last year with essentially the same groups involved and it played a significant role in the appropriation by the Congress of $800 million in Federal grants for fiscal 1970 when the authorization ceiling was $1 billion. The Administration had asked for only $214 million.

Louis S. Clapper, Conservation Director for the National Wildlife Federation and Coordinator for the "Crusade" this year, said the group had written the President on March 30 to urge for full funding of the Federal construction grants program. He said that a spokesman for the Bureau of the Budget has responded on April 9, 1970, with a statement that the President's proposed four-year commitment of $4 billion "is the best means for the Federal Government to demonstrate that it is serious about meeting our water pollution control needs."

Leaders of the Crusade, however, point out that the Nixon Administration has not asked for any appropriation for grant funds in fiscal year 1971, relying upon the enactment of the new advanced-commitment program. If the Congress fails to clear a Public Works Appropriations bill by the beginning of the new fiscal year on July 1, 1970, it must approve of a continuing resolution to appropriate at the level of the preceding year or at the proposed figure for 1971, whichever is least. Thus, in this case, the ongoing program could come to a halt.

Further, coalition leaders express considerable doubt that the Congress will enact any new long-range grants authorization bill this year, an election year. The Subcommittee on Air and Water Pollution, Senate Committee on Public Works, soon will begin holding open public hearings on a host of pollution control measures and these are expected to continue well into May.

A bi-partisan group of conservationists in the House of Representatives, led by Congressman John D. Dingell (D-Mich.), is seeking signatures on a commitment to vote for the full $1¼ billion and at least 178 Members have signed.

"Some members of our coalition see merit in proposals for four or five-year advance Federal commitments to States and municipalities for waste treatment plant construction funds," Clapper said. "However, until such a program is approved, we feel we must continue the ongoing program under provisions of the only authorization currently effective."

Under existing law, municipalities have 18 months to obligate cost-sharing funds offered them for the construction of treatment plants. The Federal Water Pollution Control Administration, U.S. Department of the Interior, expects to have only $450 million of the $800 million obligated by June 30, end of the 1970 fiscal year. However, another $200 million will be obligated by Dec. 31, end of the 18-month period, thus leaving $150 million for re-allotment.

"There is no question that the full $1¼ billion can be used by the municipalities to good advantage," Clapper asserted.

The campaign for full-funding is supported by a broad variety of non-governmental organizations in the fields of labor, government, and conservation as well as "independents" such as the League of Women Voters. Joining in the 1970 Crusade are the American Federation of Labor and Congress of Industrial Organizations; American Forestry Association; American Fisheries Society; American Institute of Planners; American Society of Landscape Architects; Association of Interpretive Naturalists; Citizens Committee on Natural Resources; Citizens Council for a Clean Potomac; Consumer Federation of America; and Izaak Walton League of America.

Lake Erie Cleanup Committee, Inc.; League of Women Voters; National Association of Soil and Water Conservation Districts; National Association of Counties; National Audubon Society; National Consumers League; National Fisheries Institute; National League of Cities; National Recreation and Park Association; and National Rifle Association.

National Wildlife Federation; Oyster Institute of North America; Sierra Club; South Jersey Shellfisherman's Association; Sport Fishing Institute; Trout Unlimited; U.S. Conference of Mayors; The Wilderness Society; Wildlife Management Institute; and the Wildlife Society.

Water Pollution Control Federation; United Auto Workers and United Steelworkers of America.

THERE'S LOTS RIGHT WITH AMERICA

HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 20, 1970

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I am especially pleased to insert into the RECORD at this point an essay by a constituent, Miss Becky Crisman, who is a seventh-grade student at Wolcott School in Thornton, Ill. Becky's essay won first place in the Thornton School District American Legion Citizenship contest and I believe that the essay contains a wonderful, positive understanding of the greatness of our country that fortunately is possessed by most young Americans. The essay follows:

THERE'S LOTS RIGHT WITH AMERICA

What's right about my country is a hard question to answer. I never really had to think about it before, but I'll make an attempt now.

The basic freedoms guaranteed us by the Constitution and the Bill of Rights are the foundation. Among these, the right to worship as we believe, freedom of speech, freedom of the press, and the right to vote for the man you feel is most capable and reliable are the freedoms which have made this country what it is.

All Americans are born with the chance to be anything they desire. We all have the opportunity to get an education. Sometimes it seems like a chore, but it's really a privilege. Our schools are the best in the world. There are opportunities for scholarships, available for everyone who applies himself, so that education is not only for the wealthy.

Another really great thing about our country is the way the government helps people help themselves. If a person cannot earn a living, then our government provides welfare. If a person is capable of working, there are government agencies which will help them find a job.

The men we elect may not always do what we want, but they must do what they feel is best for the majority of the people. It aggravates me when I hear a person griping about someone in office. After all, who put him there? It was the majority of the voters. He wasn't appointed by a king, queen or dictator. Yet the fact that nothing happens to us when we criticize an official makes this country great too. If most of the voters feel their representative didn't do his job well, he won't be re-elected.

The laws of this country were made to protect the people. They can only do what they were meant to do if they are recognized by the people. Laws can be changed as the times change.

This nation is a nation that is constantly going forward. Right now our forward movement is toward exploration of space. Americans were the first to set foot on the moon—not just for America, but "for all mankind."

America is the leading nation in the world, which is a big responsibility. We must help other nations if it is at all possible. We know that we cannot be separated from the rest of the world by the oceans which once kept us apart.

The greatest thing about our nation is the people. They came here because of the freedoms that were offered, to live their lives as they wanted and to be proud of being an American. We are now a mixture of all those people. There may be protests and disagreements, but in our hearts we know "There's Lots Right with America", and I'm glad I live here.

CHINA AND U.S. POLICY: A TIME OF TRANSITION

HON. LEE H. HAMILTON

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 20, 1970

Mr. HAMILTON. Mr. Speaker, on March 2, A. Doak Barnett discussd trends in China and in United States-Chinese relations in an excellent speech "China and U.S. Policy: A Time of Transition" delivered to the Women's National Democratic Club.

Given Mr. Barnett's conclusion of United States-China relations now being in a transition period, I commend his full remarks to the attention of my colleagues:

CHINA AND U.S. POLICY: A TIME OF TRANSITION

(A. Doak Barnett's Speech at the Women's National Democratic Club on March 2, 1970)

I'm delighted to be with you and to talk with you briefly today about trends in China, as I see them, and in U.S.-Chinese relations. For the first time in quite a long time, there is something to talk about. For a good many years, this has been a rather gloomy subject to discuss—and I have discussed it for a good many years—not just because relations between the two countries have been so bad, but also because there has been so little seeming prospect of any change or improvement.

During the past few months, this has begun to change, and although there is certainly no basis yet for great optimism or enthusiasm about the prospects, there are at least some rays of hope and small signs of a possible thaw, and this makes the subject of U.S.-China relations much more interesting, and more timely and encouraging, than it has been for some years.

I think it is clear, in fact, that we are now in a transition period; and although no one, certainly not I, can really predict or foresee the future, the future definitely seems more open-ended than it has been for a very long time.

China itself is in the midst of an extremely important transition period. Its situation both at home and abroad is basically different in many respects than what it has been in the past. But the U.S., too, is in the midst of a transition in its policy towards Asia as a whole and in its policy and attitude toward China specifically, so that China's changing situation and our changing attitude and policy have introduced, it seems to me, new elements of flexibility and change into a situation that has been frozen for so many years.

Now let me begin with a few comments on changes that have been taking place or are now underway in China itself, because they are an extremely important ingredient in the situation. I obviously cannot, in a very few minutes, do justice to the extremely complicated and even traumatic events that have taken place in China in the five years since the so-called Cultural Revolution began in '65.

The Cultural Revolution has been a remarkable, and in some respects a unique, historical phenomenon. In essence, it has been a struggle in which an aging and extraordinary utopian revolutionary leader lost faith in, and actually lost control over, for a while, the revolutionary regime which he had created; and then set about organizing what in effect has been a second revolution.

Mao in the early '60s no longer had day-to-day control over the Communist Party which ran China, so he turned to the Army, or at least part of the Army under Lin Piao who was Defense Minister, and to the youth of the country, particularly youth in the schools and colleges and mobilized both to attack the majority of his old revolutionary colleagues and the entire Party and Government bureaucracy which had dominated the country for fifteen years.

In a basic sense Mao had real cause to be disturbed by trends in China in the early 1960s. There was in China, in the aftermath of the great leap forward and the economic depression which followed it a definite decline in ideological fervor and morale; a real growth of deadening, ossifying bureaucratic behavior; an emergence of vested interests and parochial interests; a growing and very serious generation gap; and increasing frustration and disillusionment among the youth.

In response to these trends and to the real economic crisis which China experienced in that period, the leaders in charge of day-to-day affairs in China did appear to become less and less revolutionary; more and more pragmatic, if you will—in Mao's terms revisionist—more and more like leaders in the Soviet Union.

And it was in this context, I think, that Mao decided that he was going to make one final, apocalyptic attempt to try to halt the decline and deterioration of the revolution, as he saw it, in China and try somehow to revitalize the revolutionary process, to try, in short, to ensure that the particular brand of values that he believes in would persist after he died.

In some respects this was a rather grand idea, a heroic revolutionary effort. The fact is, however, in my view at least, that Mao was a romantic, a Utopian, in thinking that he could do this, that he could impose his views on the country, and completely unrealistic in believing that he could achieve his aim, that he could perpetuate his values, by tearing down the bureaucratic structure of the regime that had been built up in the previous fifteen years; by setting loose chaotic forces for change and conflict.

He did set loose these forces. He was able to tear down, in a large degree, the bureaucratic structure that had grown up in the previous fifteen years. He was able to purge most of those who disagreed with him at the top in China. But he was not able—he has not been able to date, and will not be able—suddenly to replace all this and create a new order based on his particular values.

Consequently, after this long and very chaotic period in China, China is now in the process, slowly and painfully, of trying to rebuild its political system, trying to define a whole new set of policies. In this situation, the Chinese leadership is very different from what it was in the decade before 1965, certainly very different from what it was in the 50s. Even though Mao's brooding presence is still there and he is able to inject himself into the situation when he wants to, he does not have real control over the situation in China; and the leadership, I would say, is basically a coalitional type of leadership in which people representing interests of very conflicting sorts are somehow trying to get along, somehow trying to run the country, somehow trying to evolve new policies.

As a consequence, the regime has had a very difficult time defining clear policies. As a matter of fact, it seems to me, if one looks back to the Party Congress last spring, the most notable thing about it was the failure to announce any real strategies and policies, and in my opinion this lack of policy has continued throughout the past year (it is now almost a year since the Party Congress).

In a sense, the atmosphere in China is almost like that of an interregnum already, even though Mao is still there. Clearly the Maoist era is approaching its end, but the post-Mao era has not yet started. And in a basic sense, one gets the sense of a country waiting for its low revolutionary leader to pass from the scene. Mao and his closest followers still do press for revolutionary policies of a variety of sorts, but they are not really able to carry them out throughout the country effectively. Others resist, drag their feet, sometimes push in other directions. And yet, until Mao does pass from the scene, those who might favor quite different policies, less Utopian policies, are inhibited from really pressing for what they believe in, because Mao's prestige is such that they cannot.

As a result of what has happened, the power structure in the country has changed to a very great extent. For one thing, power in a de facto sense has been decentralized very substantially. Peking just does not have the capability now to try to manage and direct everything from the center as it did ten years ago. Instead it is local leaders, military and other leaders in the provinces and at lower levels, who are running China in many, many respects.

Furthermore, it is not the party—and this is unparalleled in any Communist country—it is not the party which is running the country really now; it is the Army. Into the vacuum that was created by the Cultural Revolution, the Army had to step in. It was the only really centralized instrument of power left in the country, and it has stepped in; from the center right down to the local level the Army and military people are performing functions the party used to perform.

The party and government are now in the process of being reconstructed after the events of '67 and '68, but it is very slow, very painful, and there are many kinds of local conflicts, as the people involved try to decide what kind of a party it will be and who will be members of it.

When Mao dies, there will clearly be another period of uncertainty, some confusion and perhaps a power struggle. My own guess, though, is that somehow a coalitional type of leadership will be put together, a collective type of leadership. It will hold the country together. It is likely, in my view, to move in some new directions. As a matter of fact, I think it is highly probable that post-Mao leadership will move almost precisely in the directions that Mao has feared: it will move away from the idea of great, Utopian, apocalyptic, grand strategies; away from the radical revolutionary policies that Mao has tried to promote the last few years. Of necessity, I think it will move toward a somewhat more realistic, pragmatic policy designed simply to cope with the immediate and very pressing problems that the country faces and will face. There will be concern about the need to restore a larger degree of order, a larger degree of unity, a larger degree of purpose, to get the country back on the course of rational development. I believe China will move in these directions over time.

China's international position has also undergone some very great changes in the same period. These Chinese encountered a series of rather dramatic set-backs in their foreign policy in 1965, just on the eve of the Cultural Revolution: the coup in Indonesia—the Chinese had put a great deal of stock in their relations with Indonesia and the possibility of a revolution there—the failure of the attempt to hold a second Bandung Conference at Algiers that year—in which the Chinese invested a great deal of political prestige—and others. Then came the Cultural Revolution.

Although the Chinese adopted, and continued to exhibit a very militant, verbal posture, favoring revolutions all over the world, in practice they became so preoccupied with their internal problems that they virtually abandoned normal foreign policy activities abroad. For a couple of years, I think it is fair to say, China had no real foreign

policy—it turned inward, and cut many of its external ties.

One indicator of this is the fact that at the height of the Cultural Revolution, in forty-odd embassies abroad China only had one ambassador. The rest had all been called home in connection with the Cultural Revolution. This situation started to change as the Cultural Revolution itself began to grind towards a halt in late '68 and early '69. Peking then began to look cautiously outward again; it began to renew its foreign policy activities abroad.

Last spring it sent back the first group of seventeen or so ambassadors. Possibly two or three may have gone subsequently. All of these, incidentally, have been professional diplomats, not Maoist idealogues. Subsequently, it has promoted trade in a very systematic and non-idealogical way, and it has entered into negotiations with a number of countries about the possibility of establishing relations—Canadians and Italians. It has also entered into negotiations with the Russians over border problems, and most recently has agreed to renew negotiations with us.

Looking at what has happened to China's foreign relations through this period, I think the most important and most dramatic change has been in China's relationship with the Soviet Union, as a result of the Sino-Soviet conflict. This conflict, as I am sure you know, has been developing for years, from the late '50s on and has escalated step by step over the years.

The Soviet military build-up around China has been steadily increasing since about 1965, certainly since 1967. And finally, last year as you know, there were some very important and dangerous border clashes between the Russians and the Chinese in Manchuria and in Sinkiang, on the Chinese-Russian border there. I think it is clear that by last year the Chinese genuinely feared the possibility of a major war with the Soviet Union, genuinely feared Soviet attack, and were forced to the conference table by some subtle and not-so-subtle Soviet threats. They have been talking in Peking since last fall, but there is little sign—in fact, no sign—that the negotiations have accomplished anything to date and I suspect that progress will, at best, be very slow.

The sequence of events, I think, clearly has led the Chinese to regard the Soviet Union as a more immediate and more real threat to Chinese security today than the U.S., and this is a very fundamental change. The danger of a Sino-Soviet war is now Peking's single most important preoccupation in foreign policy, in my view, and within China there is a wide range of programs going on right now that are said to be, and to an extent doubtless are, preparations for the possibility of war. This threat hanging over China has been a subtle factor influencing its foreign relations with almost everyone else, including ourselves.

So there are a number of major factors that have been impelling Peking to reexamine its policy: the situation at home, one of uncertainly and considerable fluidity; the need to rebuild a foreign policy, after a period in which they had almost no foreign policy and were very isolated, during the Cultural Revolution; the pressure of professionals concerned with foreign affairs, and certain other leaders in Peking, to have a degree of flexibility in rebuilding China's foreign policy; a new sense of threat from the Soviet Union, which I would say is probably the most important factor; and a feeling, which I think is valid and is shared by most of the powers concerned with Asia, that the situation in Asia is changing, that it is developing toward a much more multi-polar situation than in the past, a situation in which there will be more opportunities for maneuver and flexibility, and more necessity for it.

So this is the context in which China has begun to show some signs of increased flexibility. It is still groping. It certainly has not yet defined any clear new foreign policy or foreign policy strategy, but it is groping for new policies, as we on our side are doing.

These are, in very crude and simple terms, some of the facts that have been influencing the other side. The U.S. has also, I think, been undergoing an extremely significant transition in our attitude towards China. This has happened fairly gradually and in some respects undramatically—so much so that many Americans don't realize how much change has taken place.

Throughout the 1950s, U.S. attitudes and policies towards China were extremely hostile and fearful. We were committed not only to contain China, but also to isolate it, to keep it out of the international community, and to exert as much pressure on China as possible, in the hope that somehow the regime would change. I believe change in our attitudes began in the U.S. government as early as the Kennedy administration, but Kennedy was not able, or did not in any case take steps to change our policies.

During the Johnson administration there were some important steps, more important than many people realize, to redefine our broad posture toward China. At one point, in one very important speech, for example, Johnson actually called for "reconciliation" between the U.S. and China, a very different stance from that we had been committed to in the '50s. But during the Johnson administration there were few concrete steps taken to translate this change of posture into change of actual policy toward China.

The process of making real policy changes began last summer under the Nixon Republican administration.

Several factors help to explain this process of change, I think. One is just a gradual cooling, that time has brought about, in the emotions of the 1950s—which reached a peak in the mid '50s as a result of the Cold War, in general, and the Korean War, in particular.

A second factor has been a revised view of China and its potential threat. This is in part because of the Sino-Soviet split. It is obviously not true that China and the Soviet Union are today a cohesive, monolithic unit working against us. They are competing against each other as well as competing against us.

There are other factors too. Observation of Chinese foreign policy behavior over twenty years has indicated to people in and out of the U.S. government, who have studied Chinese affairs, that the Chinese have not been adventurous and irrational. They have, in fact, been prudent and very cautious in situations where there has been crisis and danger.

As a consequence, I think, in 1970 the "China threat" seems quite different from what it was in the '50s; and validly so, I would say. Today there is simply not the sense of China posing a great, overriding threat to us, or to the rest of Asia, that many Americans tended to feel in an earlier period.

For these and other reasons, Nixon decided fairly early in his administration that he was going to take—or approve—some small concrete policy changes, and he started last summer. You are all aware of them, I think, but to remind you, in the middle of last summer we liberalized travel restrictions as far as China was concerned, and opened the first crack in the twenty-year total embargo that we had imposed on China trade—first by allowing tourists to buy Chinese goods in Hong Kong; then last December we took what was still a small, largely symbolic step but it is nevertheless significant—we decided to allow American subsidiaries abroad to trade with Communist China. Significantly, there has been almost no criticism in Congress, or by the public of any of these steps; that is a sign, I think, of the basic change that has occurred in public attitudes.

I have no doubt, myself, that these are just the first steps in a new direction, and are not the end of it. I would expect, in the relatively near future, some further steps, probably in the trade field—perhaps steps to open up some direct trade between the U.S. and China.

Then early this year, we and the Chinese finally agreed to sit down at Warsaw and reopen the talks that had lapsed for almost two years, and we have now had two sessions in rapid succession. I do not know what took place at either of these meetings. I am quite impressed, in fact, by how well the people in the State Department as well as the Chinese are observing their agreement not to leak what is going on. I find this encouraging; it suggests both sides are looking at these talks as serious negotiations and are not just viewing them as propaganda gambits.

But there are hints. I think, that the U.S. Government is encouraged by the meetings, and personally I think it is very possible that they will produce some results.

Having said that, let me say that in my opinion one should not have unrealistic hopes about large changes in our China relations rapidly developing out of these talks or other trends. The legacy of twenty years of almost no contact, and of intense hostility, certainly is not going to disappear over night. At best, steps towards normalization of relations are going to be slow, and take time.

But I nevertheless think that it is extremely encouraging that the U.S. has adopted the stand that it has, and that the Chinese are showing at least a hint of flexibility. The present administration has said that we will work towards a normalization of relations with China; that we will deal with China on the basis of the same principles that underlie our dealings with the Soviet Union—this is a big change from our approach in the past—and that we will focus first of all on small steps that will improve practical relations. I think this is an entirely sound, desirable posture and a desirable general direction for us to move.

There are, of course, some very large obstacles down the road, if we find it possible to move down this road, before we get to the point of any real normalization of relations. Probably the crucial one, and the most difficult one, is Taiwan. We are committed to the defense of Taiwan against any military attack. It is clear that we will, and should, maintain this commitment. The Chinese Communists are committed to the ultimate liberation, recovery, and incorporation of Taiwan into China. It is clear that they will maintain this as an objective. So it is a major problem. Conceivably, though both sides might show some tactical flexibility about it. It is clear that neither can change its basic position in the years immediately ahead. The question that we will face as we go down the road of some mutual compromise is whether the Taiwan issue can, for a while, be finessed, can in effect be put aside while we and the Chinese Communists deal with other problems and hope that we can make some progress on them.

In the 1950s, Peking was willing to do this, and looking back it is clear that it was rigidity and inflexibility on our side that prevented some mutual accommodation in the latter 1950s. For the past decade, however, Peking has had a very rigid and inflexible view. The question is whether the Chinese will now be slightly flexible; I think we are now encouragingly flexible. I am hopeful that perhaps both sides will be. On the U.S. side, though, I think it is terribly important that we not stop with the two or three important, but essentially symbolic and not

very large, steps we have taken in adjusting our policy, but continue taking a number of other steps.

On some matters, we may well find it possible to reach agreement with the Chinese at Warsaw; on others, though, I think we ought to be prepared to continue taking unilateral steps on our side, on the assumption, and in the hope, that over time this will influence Peking, and will stimulate Peking to take responsive action, even perhaps parallel action.

There are many things that I think we still need to do. We should not stop and be pleased with ourselves, because of the small progress we have made. We should continue exploring every possible avenue for increased contacts. On this, incidentally, the most practical approach would be: instead of putting primary stress on trying to get Americans into China, we should take every opportunity to invite Chinese to come to meetings and conferences in this country. This is going on; the U.S. Government is for it. We ought to keep doing it until the Chinese begin to send a few people; then I think they will reciprocate and let some Americans visit China.

In trade, I think it is clear—and I am convinced most people in the U.S. Government believe this now—we should move to remove all restrictions on nonstrategic trade with China and put China trade on precisely the same basis as trade with the Soviet Union and Eastern European countries. There is every reason to do this; and no real reason not to do it.

Before very long we must also readjust our policy on the China seat in the U.N. This is a terribly complicated subject, and I cannot deal with it adequately now. My own preference, considering the various alternatives, is for us actively to explore some formula for "dual representation"; even though Peking and Taipei both disapprove of this, I am not convinced that it is not possible to work out some formula which ultimately they might be willing to accept.

We must also show greater sensitivity than we have in the past to China's military and strategic fears, and avoid all unnecessary military pressures and provocations. To cite one example, we obviously do not send airplanes on reconnaissance missions over the Soviet Union any more; we rely on satellites. But, out of Taiwan, there are still such flights over mainland China all the time. It seems to me that we should rely on satellites for intelligence about China, as we do about the Soviet Union and avoid this kind of very provocative action.

Even in regard to Taiwan, while maintaining our defense commitment regarding Taiwan—which we can and must—I think we can and should make some adjustments in our policy. We have already made one, incidentally, which has practically escaped notice. We have virtually abandoned active patrolling in the Taiwan Strait. We do not need the patrol in the Taiwan Strait. What we do need is the Seventh Fleet and our Polaris Fleet in Asia; we do not need to have ships touring up and down the China coast. We have virtually stopped doing this, and I think this is both significant and desirable.

However, we should also commit ourselves to remove the limited American military presence on Taiwan, after Vietnam if not before—but preferably before, if we can. We do not have a large presence there. It is mainly connected with one air base which serves as a refueling station for U.S. planes going to Vietnam. But this is something that certainly is of concern to the Chinese Communists, and something we could do without reducing our capacity to fulfill our commitment to Taiwan—and something I think would be desirable.

More broadly—and this is very important—we should take the problem of China policy fully into account in our general strategic and arms control policy; this, I would say, we have not done. The key immediate issue is whether we should build an anti-Chinese ABM—a nationwide light area defense. On this the Nixon administration, in my judgment—despite the rightness of the direction of its general China policy—is quite wrong. The arguments against an anti-Chinese ABM, on political and other grounds, wholly apart from technical grounds, are overwhelming in my view.

For the indefinite future we will have absolute, unquestioned, overwhelming nuclear superiority over China—on the basis of any projection of what the Chinese may be able to do. There is no reason not to proceed on the assumption that our present deterrent against China will be wholly effective in preventing China from even considering any offensive use of nuclear weapons against either us or our allies.

Actually, there is every reason to believe that China's main strategic motive in developing nuclear weapons is to try to acquire a limited defensive second-strike capability. That is all they can hope for. They hope to deter us from considering nuclear first-strikes against China. If we insist on building an anti-Chinese ABM, in effect what we will be saying to the Chinese is that we insist on having a total, continuing, one-sided superiority; that we insist on having a total damage-denial capability against China; that we insist on having a credible first-strike capability against China; and that we insist on having the option of threatening China, without any fear of any kind of a retaliation, for the indefinite future.

This is hardly likely, I think, to be reassuring to the Chinese about our intentions. I would argue that it runs directly counter to the main thrust of our new China policy, and that is, moreover, not necessary from any security point of view. We need, therefore to make our strategic policy and our China policy more consistent than they now are.

I would argue, therefore, that on this issue, at Vienna, when we meet with the Russians in the SALT talks, our aim should not be to get Soviet and U.S. agreement to build ABMs. We should get U.S. and Soviet agreement that neither of us will build anti-China ABMs.

Let me make just one final comment about the overall Asian context of our China policy in the '70s. On many respects there is going to be a new ball-game in the '70s; we are beginning to realize this but have not fully adjusted to it. Instead of a bi-polar confrontation between two ideologically motivated sides—a theoretically monolithic Sino-Soviet block versus a U.S. with a subordinate, compliant Japan—instead of this, there is going to be an increasingly complicated four-power relationship and four-power balance.

All four of the major powers involved in the region—the U.S., Soviet Union, China and Japan—are going to play significant roles, influential roles. All of them, including Japan, I would say, are going to play fairly independent and autonomous roles.

Of the six bi-lateral relationships involved in this four-power balance, it is clear that the one today that is least developed, and yet may have the greatest potentialities for at least some change in the years immediately ahead, is the U.S.-China relationship. If we are wise, we will take the opportunity that we have now to press ahead as much as we can to see what extent we are able, as the Nixon administration has proposed to move toward a normalization of relations with China—without any unrealistic wishful thinking or overoptimistic expectations, but with some basis for the first time in twenty years for believing that some change may be possible.

ROBISON CAUTIONS AGAINST A CHANGE IN SELECTING SUPREME COURT NOMINEES

HON. HOWARD W. ROBISON

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 20, 1970

Mr. ROBISON. Mr. Speaker, with the recent rejection by the Senate of the Supreme Court nomination of Judge Carswell, a wave of concern is swelling both across the Nation and throughout Congress. It has been suggested that the process of selecting Supreme Court justices is unresponsive to the needs of 20th century America, and a bevy of alternative suggestions are being formulated and discussed.

As a general proposition, I find that the current procedure by which the President nominates and the Senate confirms or denies is still viable. I cannot help but be swayed in my analysis by the high caliber of justices our system has produced during the last 181 years. An additional basis for my general reluctance for change now is that much of the outcry is in direct reaction to the fact that three of the last four nominees have been defeated. I am reluctant to support change of a system which has produced men like Marshall, Holmes, Cardozo, Frankfurter, and Warren in a moment of outrage. Some reform may ultimately prove to be meritorious, and I shall carefully consider all suggestions for change, but my concern is that any such reform should come as a product of calm and considered study with a complete analysis of all reasonable alternatives. This kind of rational approach is impossible given the present political climate.

One specific proposal which has been suggested would establish a Judicial Nominating Commission. This Commission would be composed of the chief judge of the highest civil court in each State, and every 4 years this Commission would meet and select 12 candidates for appointment to the Supreme Court—from which 12 the President would be required to make his nominations. The Senate would then—as with the present system—have to confirm his nomination.

I do not support such an approach for a number of reasons.

First, I believe that there is no inherent indication that 50 State jurists would make choices which would result in better candidates than a President. In some ways, in fact, the opposite might be true. Supreme Court nominees, it seems to me, should reflect the temper of the times—whether that temper be one which favors a "strict constructionist" or a man of "liberal" interpretation. The President, by the very nature of election through the popular electoral process, is more responsive to this kind of public demand than would be 50 judges—many of whom are virtually "unremovable" by the public, many of whom are getting along in years, most of whom are not "wired in" to the sensitivities of the public to the same extent as the President. In short, the judgment of the President and his

advisers—while far from infallible—will probably be better, all in all, than the combined judgments of 50 State judges. For that reason, I would prefer that the President not be limited by such a panel in choosing a nominee who he feels is responsive to the needs of the times.

Second, such a convention would not have great investigatory powers or sources currently unavailable to the President. It is entirely likely, for example, that a Clement Haynsworth would have been among the 12 to be included in the list prepared by the Commission. The convention would not be in a position to do so thorough an investigation into the personal finances and private lives of all of the prospective nominees as to avoid the possibility of embarrassing developments after full public scrutiny comes to bear. In this connection, it is important that neither Judge Haynsworth nor Judge Carswell would have been rejected on the basis of information available immediately after the President's nomination. It was only after the intensive investigation which followed the nomination that the alleged damaging facts became known. Hence, the very controversy which has given rise to this proposal—the rejection of three of the last four nominees—would not be avoided by this new plan.

I have other, smaller reservations as well. Such a convention, by requiring that each of the 12 prospective nominees be approved by a majority of the convention, might well guarantee that controversial legal experts—of whatever stripe—would be eliminated from consideration. Perhaps this is fine in some instances, but it might also eliminate the Frankfurters, the Warrens, the Goldbergs, the Cardozos, and so forth. Moreover, since all delegates to the convention would be State jurists, it is logical to assume that the overwhelming number of designees will be jurists as well. This might serve to eliminate the exceptional man, the great legal ability, who has chosen not to make a career out of the bench. It should be noted that some of our greatest Supreme Court Justices have had little or no prior judicial experience.

Finally, there are problems with having our highest State judges come together for an institutionalized activity which is so obviously political in its focus and impact. The potential spectacle of judges trading votes for each other's favorite nominees, banding together to promote regional interests, and campaigning for slots on the final list haunts me.

The fact that three of the last four Supreme Court nominees have not been confirmed by the Senate is of concern to us all. None of us likes the byproduct of battle between the President and the Senate, and the concomitant residuum of bitterness and divisiveness. On the other hand, I recognize that some have viewed this battle as catharsis for the Senate, encouraging them to confirm future nominees, while others have suggested that the rejections will cause the President to be more selective in his future choices. Regardless of whichever view proves the sounder, I am convinced that we should not—in a moment of hot blood—tinker with a system which has given us such a generally high quality of judicial performance over a period of almost two centuries. If reform is desirable, let it come as the result of reflection and not reflex action.

In the meantime, the existing machinery will suffice to fill the present vacancy if it is used properly. I have long felt that the President should give the system a fair chance by giving the Senate a fair choice—and I believe he has finally done so by nominating Judge Harry A. Blackmun of Minnesota.

STATEMENT BY CONGRESSMAN ANDREW JACOBS IN RESPONSE TO ACCUSATIONS AGAINST HIM BY MR. GERALD FORD OF MICHIGAN

HON. ANDREW JACOBS, JR.

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 15, 1970

Mr. JACOBS. Mr. Speaker, since June 1, 1813, the U.S. House of Representatives has used its House Committee on the Judiciary to investigate serious questions of impropriety in the judiciary. Mr. FORD has sought to avoid this clear precedent of the House by bringing a charge of judicial impropriety, not before the House Committee on the Judiciary, but before the House Committee on Rules.

I do not question Mr. FORD's motive in going outside the system and attempting to avoid the clearly established precedents and procedures of the House of Representatives.

Mr. FORD is quoted in a highly unreliable newspaper, the Indianapolis Star, as saying he questions my motives in following the clearly established procedures of the House of Representatives in this matter. Until he looks me in the eye and challenges my sincerity I shall withhold further comment, except for this:

I enter this investigation with a completely open mind, having bias neither for nor against Mr. Justice Douglas, some of whose legal and political opinions I have agreed with and some with which I have disagreed.

As a member of the House Committee on the Judiciary, I shall demand and expect to receive a thorough no-holds-barred investigation of the resolution of impeachment.

If I conclude after hearing the evidence that impeachment should be voted, I shall vote impeachment. If otherwise, I shall vote against it. But in determining this most serious question I intend to follow the proper judicial procedures of the Congress.

In an assempt to deceive the public into believing that the House Rules Committee might be the proper judicial forum of the House, the Indianapolis Star on its front page Friday morning asserted that Chairman WILLIAM COLMER of the House Rules Committee is or was a "judge." That assertion is completely false.

The following is the statement I made on the floor of the House of Representatives when I introduced the resolution of impeachment:

The gentleman from Michigan stated publicly that he favors impeachment of Justice Douglas.

He, therefore, has a duty to this House and this country to file a Resolution of Impeachment.

Since he refuses to do so and since he raises grave questions, the answers to which I do not know, but every American is entitled to know, I introduce at this time the Resolution of Impeachment in order that a proper and dignified inquiry into this matter might be held.

The following is the letter which I have caused to be hand delivered to Representative JERRY FORD a few moments ago:

APRIL 17, 1970.

Hon. GERALD R. FORD,
Minority Leader,
U.S. House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR JERRY: On at least five occasions during the past forty hours I have been asked in news conferences my opinion about your sincerity in departing from the traditional procedures of the House in your avowed move to impeach Justice Douglas.

On each occasion I declined to speculate on your motives. In short, I refused to question your integrity.

I merely stated what I believed to be a duty that you should perform. Obviously you and I disagreed on that point. And obviously I have refused to suggest that the disagreement was not honest on your part.

When I introduced the Resolution of Impeachment I stated my motives. On the front page of my home town monopoly and unprincipled press Friday, April 17, 1970, you were quoted in effect as saying that my Record statement following your speech Wednesday night was untrue.

You were quoted as saying:

"If Mr. Jacobs actually favors impeachment of Justice Douglas he could have demanded an immediate vote on impeachment instead of turning the matter over to the House Judiciary Committee . . . Therefore it appears that Mr. Jacobs has introduced an impeachment resolution which he himself does not support as a diversionary tactic to prevent consideration of the facts by a balanced bipartisan special committee."

A suggestion that sincerity would require me, in clear violation of House precedent, to call for an immediate vote on the Resolution of Impeachment is no different from suggesting a lack of sincerity on the part of a citizen, who, filing an affidavit containing a serious charge on information and belief with the Prosecutor, fails to demand instant indictment without investigation.

Would it be fair to suggest that you do not "favor actual impeachment" because far short of demanding "an immediate vote," you have not even so much as followed the clearly established House precedent by introducing a Resolution of Impeachment?

Did you make a statement questioning the integrity of what I said on the Floor following your April 15th speech?

Sincerely,

ANDREW JACOBS.

TOM ANDERSON—AMERICAN

HON. JOHN R. RARICK

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 20, 1970

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, today I was privileged to attend the national defense

luncheon of the Daughters of the American Revolution, assembled in Washington, D.C., for their annual national congress.

The speaker was that inspiring American journalist, philosopher, and humorist, Tom Anderson, of Nashville, Tenn. Mr. Anderson is editor of Farm and Ranch magazine and is world renowned for his column "Straight Talk." In his inimitable style, Mr. Anderson proved himself once again to be the Will Rogers of our decade and the Patrick Henry of the hour.

Because his timely message is so vital and necessary to Americans who believe in free enterprise, constitutional government under God, and because it will receive little or no coverage in the controlled media—it is too truthful and straightforward—I include the full text of this speech by Tom Anderson—American, following my remarks. I highly commend its reading to my colleagues, as follows:

ADDRESS OF TOM ANDERSON AT THE NATIONAL DEFENSE LUNCHEON OF THE NATIONAL CONGRESS OF THE DAUGHTERS OF THE AMERICAN REVOLUTION

Mrs. Jones, President General, my favorite Congressman—Congressman Rarick—honored guests, ladies and gentleman, my wife has made me well aware of the many vital subjects you ladies are involved in. I can't possibly cover them all today. I feel sorta like a mosquito at a nudist camp: I know what I ought to do, but I hardly know how to begin.

Many years ago a drove of wild hogs lived in a big bend of the Ocmulgee River in Georgia. They had survived floods, fires, freezes, hunters and droughts. Hunters bragged when their dogs fought the hogs and returned alive. Finally a one-gallused stranger came by the country store on the river road and asked how he could find the wild hogs. All he had with him was a one-horse wagon, an ax, a lantern, some quilts, some corn and a single-barrel shotgun.

Several months later the hog-hunting stranger came back to the same store and asked for help to bring out the wild hogs. He said he had them all over in a pen in the swamp. People came from miles around to see the captive hogs which all the natives knew couldn't be captured.

"It's all very simple," droned the one-gallused man. "First I put out some corn. For three weeks they wouldn't eat it. Then some of the young 'uns grabbed an ear here and there and scampered to the underbrush. Soon they were all eating it. (If one didn't, he knew the others would.) So then I began building a pen around the corn, a little higher each day. 'Fore long I noticed they were all waiting for me to bring the corn and had stopped grubbing for acorns and roots. I built the trap door. Naturally, they raised Cain when they seen I had 'em, but I can pen any animal on the face of the earth if I can first get him to depend on me for a free handout."

Fellow hogs, we been fenced. We been had, by one-gallused Socialists. Let's dig out! Federal aid is the greatest fraud foisted on the American people since Fraudlin D. Russiavelt (sic) first ran for President on a conservative platform. Federal aid means Federal control.

We can't have federal aid to schools and have free schools. The Supreme Court has stated—and in that instance I agree that that which the Federal Government subsidizes, it should control.

"This is the law
And the law shall run
'Til the earth in its course stands still;
That he that eateth another's bread,
Shall do the other's will."

A government big enough to give you everything you want is big enough to take everything you've got. A government big enough to tell you who you *must* hire is big enough to tell workers where they must work. A government big enough to tell you who you must sell to is big enough to tell a buyer he can't buy.

This is all part of the grand design of the collectivist conspirators: One race, coffee-colored Mongrel; one church, Apostate and anti-Christ; one nation not under God but under the beast—United Nations.

One-worlders say: discrimination immoral . . . race consciousness shows moral immaturity . . . that's like the man who sued wife for divorce because she was so immature . . . barged into the bathroom while I was in the tub and sank all my boats.

While all men are created equal in the eyes of God and the law, they don't long stay equal even there. God has his own "elect"—penalizes unrepentant sinners, and the law penalizes repeating criminals.

A centralized welfare state brings slavery, not freedom. Poverty rights are the very basis of human rights. The right to self-determination of associates is the very essence of human dignity. Forced equality is not democracy but dictatorship. Free men are not equal and equal men are not free. The issue is freedom—freedom of choice. Freedom to choose the doctor who's going to have to wait to get paid.

A government which allows a "have-not" majority to confiscate the "excess" earnings and assets of the "have" minority is a governmental tyranny regardless of whether it has a constitution and free elections or not. For no dictatorship is more corrupt or tyrannical than the dictatorship of the mob. Even if there were no such thing as a Negro, "civil rights" bills are bills for the concentration of power, which the bill of rights specifically denies. "Open housing" and the busing edicts are additional planks in the dictator's boardwalk, another nail in the coffin of States rights, another unconstitutional infringement of property rights, which is the most basic and sacred of all human rights.

Nixon calls his trillion dollar city renewal plan a "human investment program" and Humphrey called his a "Marshall plan for the cities." Whether there's a dime's worth of difference between them or not, both are clearly unconstitutional.

Incidentally, 69% of the "poor Americans" (incomes below $3,000) are white.

Take from-the-haves-and-give-it-to-the-have-nots is Marxism.

"Guaranteed annual income" is Marxism. The so-called "civil rights" movement is Marxist-oriented.

Jesus didn't take the people out of the slums; he took the slums out of the people. Jesus did not minister to groups; he ministered to individuals.

Since fiscal 1953, the beginning of the post-Korean war period, so-called "defense" expenditures are up 41%, but domestic spending is up 242%. Since 1948, tax collections have increased $109 billion a year, or 241%. Why? Population increases? No. During the past 20 years, population of the United States rose 37% and the cost of the Federal Government alone grew ten times faster than the rate of population.

"Defense" spending has increased 68% since 1960, but non-defense spending has increased 97%. Spending our way into prosperity is like. . . . I'm reminded of the story of the beer drinker who drove 12 miles out of town where he could buy beer five cents cheaper. When I asked him how he could justify the expense of going 12 miles to save a nickle, he said the answer was easy—he just kept drinking until he got even.

With the continued "Vietnamization" of our no win war, the Federal Government will spend in this fiscal year more than 200 billion, and that's more, in one year, than 32 presidents (from Washington through half of the third term of Franklin D. Roosevelt) spent in 153 years.

In socialist America today, one-fourth of the people are already living off of the other three-fourths, completely or partially. In federalized America 48 million people now get regular Government checks. That's roughly—and it is rough on those of us who pay the bills and don't get any—one out of every two households in America, assuming no duplications. That's even rough on the Post Office, having to deliver them. I dreamed awhile back that our collectivists had an answer for that too: That they plan to integrate carrier pigeons with woodpeckers, forming a pigeonpecker corps. The pigeonpeckers would not only be able to deliver the 48 million government checks, but they would knock on the door when they got there.

Our total commitment, including veterans' benefits, social security and everything bought and unpaid for, is one trillion, four hundred billion dollars. Mere contemplation of that makes one turn as pale as an undertaker's apprentice.

What is this spending for, primarily? It is to promote, here and abroad, socialism, fascism, and communism. Or, let's say, a good part of it is to promote treason and subversion against our constitution and country. Socialism, neither modern nor unique . . . unlike a bride . . .

Karl Marx said, "Spend them to death." They are. But the collectivists don't care—their program is one debt, one nation, one citizenship, one church and one firing squad—the way to get our govt. out of the Red . . .

There is only one great giver—and that is God, not government. Governments don't give freedom; they take freedom. People have to wrest freedom from government. Then, after the people secure freedom, they have to work constantly to keep it.

The materialist do-gooders profess to believe that once we make Communist "haves" out of Communist "have-nots," they will be sweet and mellow—and even renounce communism. There is as much chance of that as there is of the Pope renouncing catholicism and becoming a Baptist. He couldn't do it, and the Baptists wouldn't have him.

If you are a person of good will and honesty, you don't want to be helped unless you are willing to help yourself.

The 16% of our people who make $10,000 to $15,000 a year already pay more than half of the Federal income taxes.

Jesus was not a socialist. Jesus believed in the profit motive. He recognized that three men had different talents and abilities in varying degrees. Some gained more talents with what they had, and these were rewarded with more talents. However, Jesus took away the talent of the man who did nothing and gave it to the man who had 10 talents and congratulated those who profited.

Charity is not charity unless it is voluntary. In Luke 12:13–14 Jesus was talking to a large crowd when a man approached him saying: "Master, speak to my brother that he divide the inheritance with me." And Jesus replied: "Man who is it that would make me a divider among men?" Jesus didn't tax the "haves" to give to the "have-nots."

Jesus said: "Take heed, and beware of covetousness . . ."

Government does not and cannot create great societies. Individuals create great societies, not vice versa. The only great societies in history have been free societies in which the individual had maximum rights and privileges and was the master, not the servant of government.

Total government planning has no room for true Christian charity. The best way to reduce the exploitation of man is to embrace Christianity. Christianity, not handouts, is the hope of the world.

Of course, we can't expect our leaders to be perfect.

Reminds me of the preacher who was preaching on the imperfections of man: "I, myself, am guilty of many sins of omission and commission. I dare say there's not one among you who even thinks he's perfect."

He was appalled when a little fellow timidly arose in the rear of the church and held up his hand.

"Sir, do you mean to say you think you're perfect?"

"Oh, no, Reverend! I'm just standing up in lieu of my wife's first husband!"

Our forefathers fought the revolutionary war in order to escape taxation without representation. Taxation without representation was not nearly as bad as taxation with representation as we have had in recent years. The collectives who say "debt doesn't mean anything, we owe it to ourselves," and "the way to stop inflation is with a surtax," reminds me of the treasurer of the woman's club who got up and reported: "I am happy to state that through prudent management we ended the year with a deficit of $114.23."

A little old lady in tennis shoes jumped up and said: "I move we donate it to the Salvation Army."

The collectivists brazenly proclaim that they will "take it from the haves and give it to the have-nots who need it so much." Hitler said the same thing, in German, and Lenin said it in Russian. That's not only unconstitutional, that's stealing.

The liberals love to give away money—your money. They would say, "Elect rich humanitarian politicians—elect rich folks who don't have to steal." Reminds me of the cockroach—it's not what they steal, it's what they carry off.

Daniel Webster declared: "God grants liberty to those who love it and are always ready to guard and defend it." There is no freedom for the weak. The meek will inherit the earth, but not the weak.

If you want your government to be your slave, and not your master, you must understand it, participate in it, distrust it, and control it, for the bigger it is the littler you are.

Parents should do nothing for children which they can do for themselves. Government should do nothing which private interests can do as well or better. And the Federal Government should do nothing which can be done as well or better by local and State governments—and that includes practically everything. The bigger the government is the further removed from the people it is, the more crooked, wasteful, inefficient.

Remember, as Lincoln said: "You cannot strengthen the weak by weakening the strong." America represents the last hope of mankind, during our time, to be free. The enslaved of the world look to America. We may yet have the morality and the courage to free them from Communist tyranny. But if we lose our freedom, who will free us? If the lamp of freedom is blown out in America the world will be thrown into darkness. To save the world we must save America.

This has been the greatest nation in history because of three things: The American system of free enterprise (profit motive): the land and climate and the kind of religious, creative, hard working people who settled and made this country. 7% of land and 6% of people—71% cars—56% telephones—83% TV sets—90% bathtubs.

American business did this, not the Government. Business did it in spite of its Government, which has been anti business for 30 years. Foreigners did not do it and youth didn't do it. The "squares" over 30 and their parents did it. And then gave much of it to the world and to our youth, neither of which appreciated it (which, to any student of human nature and history, is not surprising). Only one of the seven people Jesus cured of leprosy had the decency even to thank him.

Why *destroy* the system that produced the highest standard of living and the greatest degree of freedom ever known—the Constitution of the U.S. is the greatest freedom document ever devised by man.

The so-called war on poverty is a blueprint for socialism and dictatorship, there is no unemployment in Russia. They shoot enough people to make the people and the jobs come out even. The U.N. Charter says that all member nations should maintain full employment regardless of the consequences. It is impossible to have perpetual full employment and freedom. As important as the right to get rich, is the right to be a bum.

Of course, the only sensible way to really reduce poverty is to increase and improve private enterprise.

Some young people complain because there is no more opportunity. Somebody has estimated that 80% of the world's knowledge has been developed in the past 10 years and is doubling every 10 years. Ninety percent of all drugs being prescribed by physicians today were not even known 10 years ago. Ten years from now ¾ of all people who will work in industry will be producing products that have not yet been invented or discovered.

Where there is erosion of the national morality, property rights are always destroyed. Property rights are the foundation of morality. That's the reason one of the 10 commandments decrees: "Thou shalt not steal." The politician who will steal for you will also steal from you. Some of our politicians would steal a dead fly from a blind spider.

Well, we got rid of Johnson and got Nixon. Like getting a divorce and getting custody of your wife's parents. Some uninformed conservatives still think Nixon is a conservative—weather vane.

Most of us don't yet know what to expect from President Nixon—which reminds me . . .

Once upon a time there were three bears: papa bear, mama bear and baby bear. "Someone has eaten my porridge," boomed papa bear in his deep sonorous voice. "Someone has eaten my porridge!" cried baby bear in her high little voice. "Bitch, bitch, bitch" said mama bear, "I haven't even put it in the bowl yet!" Nixon-bear hasn't put our porridge into the bowl yet. But everything indicates it will be a better tasting, slower poison.

Of course, we conservatives want perfection. Like the old maid who had waited so long for the right man to come along. Her little nephew said: "Auntie waited so long for her ship to come in that her pier collapsed." Some people even condemn Ted Kennedy for wearing that neck brace to the Kopechne funeral. He needed it to hold his head up!

Some conservatives I know spend more time and effort fighting each other. Some conservatives are like the two preachers who were earnestly discussing their religious differences. Finally one turned to the other, resignedly, and said: "After all, we're both trying to do the Lord's work. You in your way and I in his!"

Under Republicans *and* Democrats, our government, through abandonment of the gold standard, through confiscatory taxation, through continuous deficit spending, through government-sponsored union racketeering, through fantastic giveaways at home and abroad, through actual sponsorship of anarchy and insurrection across our land, through deliberate subsidization of the enemy—our leaders are destroying the home of the brave and the land of the free, deliberately. I was quoted the other day as saying "unwittingly." I didn't say "unwittingly." I said "deliberately." Our menace is not the Big Red Army from without but the Big Pink Enemy within.

It didn't just happen . . .

Our greatest menace is not fallout, but sellout.

The so-called liberals now talk about Armageddon, the last war when all shall be destroyed. If we are on the brink of Armageddon, who brought us there?

The "liberals" remind me of the boy who murdered his mother and father and then threw himself on the mercy of the court because he was an orphan.

With Marxism taking the world, our leaders don't even mention the Communist menace but talk of "building bridges of friendship." No candidate for the presidency or vice presidency—except George Wallace and Ronald Reagan—even mention the Communist scourge. They play like it doesn't exist.

We conservatives have our slight differences of opinion—like the bride-elect who was describing her differences with her fiance, "I want a big church wedding," she said, "and he wants to break the engagement." Lots of us are going to break our engagement with the Republican party unless it turns conservative. I'm for making the Republican Party conservative or making it die.

Having to choose between Democrat and Republican puts us in the position of Adam: God showed Eve to Adam and said, "Now, choose a wife!"

Christ had this to say about "moderates" (middle-of-the-roaders) a religious type. He denounced in no uncertain terms: "I know thy works, that thou art neither cold nor hot: I would thou were cold or hot. So then because thou art lukewarm, and neither cold nor hot, I will spue thee out of my mouth." (Rev. 3:15–16)

More people are interested in losing 5 pounds than in losing Cuba.

Several years ago a national survey showed more people knew who said "Hi Ho, Silver!" than who said "give me liberty or give me death!"

Typical Americans eat breakfast over their white tablecloths and pink newspapers, and end the day propped up before their boob tube which slyly undermines every form of religion, patriotism, decency, and self-reliance.

The world watches America, and America watches TV, America, former land of the free and home of the brave; now the land of the criminal and home of the sacred; America, a land in which workers get paid for not working, preachers get paid for not believing, teachers get paid for anarchy, mothers get paid for not marrying, farmers get paid for not farming, and promoters get paid for fertilizer tanks which ain't; America, where the only God recognized in the classroom is Santa Claus. A people who won't take a stand deserve to take a fall.

Even more appalling than the noise of the bad people is the silence of the "good people." Many "good people" are mainly concerned with how to stay awake on a full stomach.

As General Van Horn Moseley said: "Those who have the most to lose will be the last to resist." (The country club set) and they're neither blind nor innocent; they are gutless and guilty.

As Hiram Mann said: "No man escapes when freedom fails. The best men rot in filthy jails and those who cried, 'appease, appease!' are hanged by those they tried to please." Appeasers are people who feed a crocodile hoping it'll eat them last.

It is fashionable to be a moderate, a middle-of-the-roader, these days. Many middle-of-the-roaders are merely people who have no principles they'll stand up for. The middle of the road has been moving to the left for 25 years. Pontius Pilate was a middle-of-the-roader. He didn't dare make the decision to crucify Christ. He let the mob decide, the "democratic" thing to do. The middle of the road between good and evil is evil.

We conservatives are always accused of being against change—who have to be dragged into the 20th Century—aginners opposed to all change. But not changing just to be changing. Like the fellow who decided just for a change he'd start parting his hair crossways, ear to ear.

His one remaining friend asked, "Well, how do you like your hair parted that way?" He said, "Fine, except for one thing. People are always whispering into my nose." You can raise a pig in your parlor. It won't change the pig, only your parlor.

Many of the hypocrites who never miss church on Sunday are "going along" with the criminal take-over of our country by Socialists, Communists, atheists, degenerates and slobs. These are businessmen who say we've already lost and who lack the integrity and the courage to identify with what appears to be the losing side.

Cicero said, "It is impossible to know the truth and not be held responsible."

An informed Christian can't quit! Beatniks quit—beaten because they refuse to try. They're long on hair and short on character.

The human race—to which many politicians belong—has made no measurable improvement morally and intellectually in all human history. How sad! And it won't, unless Christianity prevails.

We "haters" are accused of intolerance. One of the greatest national weaknesses and sins is an excess of tolerance. Let us not mistake ignorance or cowardice for tolerance. One is not capable of tolerance unless one has a conviction. A person unable to arrive at convictions is a person morally immature.

Some people are mainly interested in whether the Jones' are doing it before they do it. Remember, today's mighty oak is just yesterday's little nut which stood its ground. Confucius said: "To know what is right and not to do it is the worst of cowardice." If it is morally wrong, it can't be politically right.

Many who ask what can I do are afraid you'll tell 'em.

There are many people in America who know the score and yet refuse to get involved. We have the strength of their convictions. There is no excuse for people who say: "I'm with you all the way—but don't use my name."

What can "little I" do? A little 17-year-old girl who couldn't even read or write changed the course of history. Her name was Joan of Arc.

When and if St. Peter meets us at the golden gate, he won't ask what we agreed with. He won't ask what we belonged to. Heaven is not open to Methodists, Catholics, Rotarians or D.A.R. Heaven is open only to individuals. It's not what we belong to—it's what we are. It's not what we say—but what we do—and what we don't do. "But it's too late," some say. For Christians it's never too late.

We can't depend on our political leaders. We can't depend on the professionals. I'm constantly amazed by the people who think all we've got to do is to elect a so-called conservative president and then go back to the bridge table and golf course. If our republic can be saved from dictatorship, bankruptcy, and surrender it will be saved the same way it was founded, from the bottom up, by we-the-people.

In the Russian Revolution the business and professional leaders stayed neutral. They figured they were smart enough and sophisticated enough to stay on top regardless of which regime won out. They ended up shot in the back of the neck. And that's what they deserved. They stayed neutral until it was too late. How soon will it be too late in America? Many business and professional people are staying neutral or else riding the tide of what they think is the wave of the future; opportunist icebergs who'll go along with any tide that'll promote their own selfish interests.

Dante said, "The hottest places in hell are reserved for those who in a period of moral crisis maintain neutrality." If this is not a period of moral crisis, when have we ever had one in the history of the world?

Coexistence is an immoral, impossible, gutless fraud. General Eisenhower's buddy, Russian General Zhukov said, "Coexistence is as nonsensical as fried snowballs." Every Russian leader is on record as saying that coexistence is impossible, that we cannot live side by side, that one or the other must be destroyed. Yet our leaders have been serving us fried snowballs, sugar-coated, for 25 years.

Let's demand that our leaders quit fighting evil by compromising with evil. Let's demand cessation of all recognition and trade with all Communist countries until their slaves are freed. This would give the enslaved of the world new hope: that America, their only hope, has not yet surrendered, that America may yet have the morality and the courage to help them free themselves from Communist chains. If the lamp of freedom is blown out in America, the world will be thrown into darkness.

What can one person do about it? One man, Nathan Hale, sent chills up the spines of generations of American patriots when he said just before he was being put to death, "I only regret I have but one life to lose for my country." Sometimes I've wondered if U–2 spy Powers might be the modern Nathan Hale. He was paid $30,000 a year to do a job and when he was caught, he said, "I didn't know what I was doing and if I had known, I wouldn't have done it."

What can you do? One man, Adolph Hitler, cast the deciding vote in a beer putsch that set the world on fire. One man's vote kept us from killing compulsory military training—4 months before Pearl Harbor. One man's influence led to giving China to the "Agrarian reformers." That man was not a foreigner, but an American.

What can one person do? One person, unknown today, fired the shot heard 'round the world. He didn't worry about it hurting his business. He didn't check to see if the leaders approved. He was neither paid cash nor guaranteed any benefits by his government. He just did what his conscience told him to do for his country. You are but one. So were Carrie Nation, and Joan of Arc, and Patrick Henry. Maybe one person can't save the country, but he can try.

What can one person do? One man, Karl Marx, Karl, was a ne'er-do-well. But his criminal conspiracy, sometimes miscalled a religion, has enslaved half the world. What can one person do? Hitler was a psychopathic paperhanger. Are we inferior to them—or even to Christ's Disciples—before they became dedicated men?

Appealing to our one worlders to save our free republic is like appealing to the Jesuits to save unitarianism. But most of our Congressmen and Senators are not collectivists. They're neither dedicated leftists nor dedicated rightists. They're merely dedicated to staying here. And that depends on you. We have no permanent patent on freedom. Freedom is not George's job. It's yours.

Some people try to excuse their own do nothingness by alibiing: The majority *want* what they're getting! The majority don't know what it wants. The mob is a slob.

History is made not by silent majorities but by dedicated minorities. Let each of us do the best we can, where we are with what we have. Enough dedicated ants can whip an elephant.

We must have the courage to stand up for what is right against the mob, win or lose. Many dictators get a majority vote. The majority is not always right. One—with God—is a majority. The majority permitted the reign of terror in the French Revolution. The majority shouted to Pontius Pilate, "Crucify Him." The majority burned the Christians at the stake. The majority drove the Jews into exile and to the ghetto. The majority established slavery. The majority of the House of Burgesses jeered when Patrick Henry asked: "Is life so dear or peace so sweet as to be purchased at the price of chains and slavery?" The majority ridiculed Columbus for saying the world was round. The majority said that Gallileo must recant or go to prison. Only a few responded when Paul Revere cried: "The British are coming!" Only a few defended the bridge at Concord.

Only a few signed the Declaration. "Why be upset?" the ostriches ask.

I'm upset because in 1945 at the end of the so-called hostilities, the Communists controlled about 7% of the world's peoples. They now have 40% of the peoples and 25% of the land mass in chains. And the big Red Army didn't fire a shot. They are now taking us and other free nations from within, and yet *Senator Fulbright* said the other day that there *is* no Communist conspiracy! And many of our leaders tell us "The cold war is over." If the cold war is over, we lost it!

What am I upset about? I used to be upset because my child might have to live in a slave state. Now I'm upset because I might have to.

Just a few years ago when Karl Marx died only eight people attended his funeral. Most of our State Department were too young to go. All the Communists have to do is to keep on doing the same things we've been doing, and their timetable calls for taking us over, from within, in this decade. And we are told not to get upset.

The situation we are in today in America reminds me of the two skeletons, locked in a closet. One skeleton turned to the other and rattled, "How did we get in here?" The other answered, "I don't know, but if we had any guts we'd get out."

When freedom is at stake, silence is not golden; it's yellow.

A recent Harris poll showed 25% thought it was O.K. to ignore a victim's cry for help. Remember the story of the woman returning from work in New York? She had been attacked and stabbed repeatedly on the sidewalk in public, while some 30 people who could have helped her, did nothing. They said they didn't want to get involved. In fact, her assailant returned while she was trying to crawl to safety, to finish her off. May God have mercy on their uninvolved souls! We will get involved or get enslaved. A people who lack the morality to stand on their feet will crawl on their knees.

The great issue of our time is neither education nor economics; it's moral. We have many problems and one overshadows all

others. And that is morality. That's the main reason we're in the shape we're in: Lack of morality, domestically and internationally. Our critical problem is not our housing slums but our moral slums.

On the home front we have been seduced by bread and circuses, running to Washington hat in hand selling our freedom for a mess of pottage. On the international front we have cynically tried to bribe and buy the world as a substitute for a foreign policy. This is materialism. The war for the world is not based on hunger versus plenty, ignorance versus education, totalitarianism versus Democracy . . . Germany . . . Cuba . . . the war for the world is between good and evil. Some of the "Best" educated people are the most wicked. You have to be educated to even know how to commit some crimes. One-fourth of Hitler's concentration camp guards held doctorate degrees!

"This is the best-educated generation this nation has yet produced," say the educators and the statisticians. But they don't say what they are educated for. They mean that a higher percentage of our students now graduate from high school and college than ever before, which really means very little. One of the first things many graduates should do as soon as possible is to unlearn the untruths they were taught by mistaken educators. Our progressive educators have been stressing life adjustment instead of the preservation of a free Nation. They have taught security, peace and brotherhood but left duty, honor and country aside.

The first thing an educated person learns to do is to walk alone. The first requirement of a school, in my opinion, is to build character. We need not more nationalized educational supermarkets but more small, local schools, and more Christian schools. We need more good teachers who can spend more time with the students than the bus drivers do. We need more learning and less riding, better teachers instead of better buildings. More truth and less TV. More understanding and less innovation.

Recently, I spoke at what was described to me as one of the most exclusive girls' schools in Pittsburgh. My reception was underwhelming. No applause—no laughs—until I said that Jesus was the hope of our nation. During the following question and answer session, the students arose to say time and time again, "I disagree with everything you've said." To this there was great applause.

And so it went. Every question antagonistic. Every antagonistic question applauded. After forty minutes of threat, the headmistress insisted that the little dears' mommies and chauffeurs were waiting without. A few little darlings insisted on surrounding me after the formal meeting was over: "We are Marxists!" They proclaimed.

I turned to comrade headmistress and said: "You have done a wonderful job of brainwashing these children!"

"Mr. Anderson, we feel that our teachers are more or less evenly divided on these things," she replied archly.

"Yes", I replied, "Fifty percent for Russia and fifty percent for Red China."

And with that the rest of the little angels rushed out to their waiting Cadillacs and departed. The median age of these children was not more than 15. It'll be at least three or four years before they're old enough to destroy the country.

Fortune magazine reports that 700,000 young Americans in colleges and universities now accept the communist condemnation of American capitalism and want to destroy the system.

The "new left" has reportedly captured the student-body presidencies in more than half of our institutions of higher learning.

Who is responsible? The parents, the teachers, the preachers, and the liberals. The reds could not have accomplished this unless the pink brainbenders were running their errands for them.

The parents defaulted. The pinks have taken over the educational system. The students have been lied to. They have not been told the truth about capitalism and the American system. Nor about Christianity.

How can the free enterprise system survive the next generation if the next generation doesn't believe in the free enterprise system?

Neither Jesus Christ, Abraham Lincoln, Winston Churchill nor Shakespeare (Grammar School Dropouts) could have been admitted to today's colleges. And all but Christ might have been ruined if they had been. A college degree is the most overrated thing since Jackie Kennedy.

We spend billions for buildings and peanuts for teachers. We're obsessed with science so we can keep up with the Russians, who can put missiles on the moon but can't make toilets work.

Meanwhile, the voice from the campus cries "hyprocrisy!" At the community elders and the "establishment." Students decry the "rat race," the "crushing materialism," our "money-mad society"—and then wire home, collect for $200 to finance a spring hash of booze and sex at Fort Lauderdale, or a trip to New York for a parade to honor the Vietcong. They're as spoiled as a butcher's dog. They're always itching for money but never scratching for it.

I heard about a widow who raised five wonderful boys all by herself. "How in the world did you do it?" somebody asked. "The main thing," she said, "was a pat on the back. You must do it early enough, often enough and low enough."

If the campus "idealists" are opposed to materialism, if their hearts bleed for the disadvantaged, the guilt-ridden phonies should know that, just to help defeat hyprocrisy, they may turn over to the nearest pastor their new car, TV, stereo, tape recorder, electric blanket, hair drier, camera, or fancy "mod" wardrobe, and he will personally see that they are distributed among the poor. Why don't the self-described "idealists" practice what they preach? That goes for the Rockefellers, Kennedys . . .

Why don't they rebel against a rigged communications system which is brainwashing the American people? How long since we've seen an anti-Communist TV program or movie? Ever? Communism is the scourge of the world. Yet most Americans either ignore it or embrace it.

Our country today needs nationalism, patriotism, morality, courage, dedication and religion as never before. And these eternal verities—these necessities if we are to survive as a free people—should be taught from kindergarten through college.

Even though we are the richest society in human history and therefore necessarily one of the softest, wickedest and unhappiest, we have no monopoly on permissiveness. Both ancient Greece and ancient Rome became permissive societies—and went under. Permissiveness is now pervading the west, where there is freedom. There is no permissiveness in Russia—there is still the firing squad and Siberia.

Loss of faith in God is our Nation's most serious problem. When men lose God they turn to the state.

The new morality is not new—it's old as Sodom and Gomorrah. "God is dead" is not new. The new religion is Atheism—anti-God. The new economics is feudalism and fascism. The new art is anti-art. The new politics is a return to the jungle.

We now have new math, new religion, new morals—the so-called liberals are deliberately trying to destroy all the eternal verities. "Liberalism" is Atheism concealed; Communism is atheism revealed.

If your minister preaches a new moral code what you need is not new values—but a new preacher. If you can believe God is dead you can believe anything. If you can believe there is no such thing as sin, as right, as evil . . . then conversely you can believe there is no such thing as morality, wrong, good.

More and more we were told, "everything depends on the situation, and how you look at it." Like the wife said to her husband: "You say I'm overdrawn. I say you're underdeposited."

I heard about a modernist church which put on its bulletin board in the yard: "There ain't no hell." And a fundamental church across the corner put on its board: "The hell there ain't!"

I also heard about a new modern and sophisticated preacher who got a call to a little rural church in Alabama. He announced the second Sunday that the congregation would have to cease and desist from shouting "Praise the Lord! Amen! And shouting and other such square expressions.

The very next Sunday a little old woman got carried away—"Praise the Lord. Halleluja!" The ushers hastened down the aisle, lifted her up gingerly and carried her out. Waving her handkerchief she cried: "Jesus rode one into Jerusalem and it takes two to carry me out!"

When you analyze all of our major problems, you find they all go back to morality. Law and order, Vietnam, inflation . . . pornography . . . books . . . magazines . . Liz tells all! . . . Liz can't—she couldn't remember all.

If you were a commie and wanted to take over this country, how would you go about it? They wouldn't dare bomb Washington and New York. They'd kill too many of their own folks. They are winning without it. Their own slaves would turn on them. They know and we know that there can be no winner in a nuclear war. The way to take over this country is to infiltrate the clergy, press and networks, the educational system, key spots in government. And it's not how many Communists there are: It's who they are and where they are . . . 3% . . . took over Russia and have ruled it ever since.

The F.C.C. talks of a "fairness doctrine" . . . socialism is not controversial but antisocialism is. There is no real freedom of choice on TV.

Being able to switch channels and get Frank McGee or Frontley and Pinkley instead of Walter Cronkite or Eric Sevareid is like getting shipwrecked on a desert island with your own wife.

Comparing CBS to NBC reminds me of the time the Earl of Sandwich (who invented the sandwich) was challenged by backbencher John Wilkes in the English Parliament. Sandwich was kind of a ladies man, but he was tough in debate and told Wilkes that he was a no good so-and-so and that he'd surely die on the gallows or of a dread disease.

Wilkes replied: "That depends, my lord, on whether I embrace your principles or your mistress."

Switching from NBC to CBS is like switching wives and getting custody of your ex-wife's parents.

Missile strength, manpower strength, H-bomb strength get the headlines. Few ever mention the greatest weapon: spiritual strength. Who—we or the Communists—have the fanatical zeal necessary to survive? Which will make the most sacrifices and the least compromises? We must maintain our moral superiority! We must fear slavery more than we fear war. We must prefer to die in our feet than to live on our knees. War is not unthinkable—but slavery is.

We are in a war for survival as a free people—and we are losing. We are losing because our leaders are not trying to win.

In a sickening spectacle, on Nov. 7, 1968, while American men were dying in Viet-

nam, the Johnson administration joined the Russians in observing the Communist Revolution's 50th Anniversary celebration at the Russian Embassy in Washington.

Secretary of State Rusk clinked vodka glasses with the Red killers. Our chief international bugler, Sen. Fulbright was there. The only tune he can play is "Retreat." He makes me wish birth control could be made retroactive.

Our "Pueblo" strategy was the same as our Vietnam, Korea, Cuba, East Germany, China—to compromise and surrender.

The strategy is: to lose. We have never won any war against any Communist nation—and we won't—until we get the pro-Communists out of leadership positions in our government, press, education and churches.

Switching from Rusk to Rogers is like leaving a soiled diaper on a baby and just changing safety pin.

The chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations committee, J. W. Fulbright had this to say in his maiden speech to the Senate on March 28, 1945: "Where one recalls the birth of our own nation—that in 1776 our forefathers were regarded as being quite as radical, by the rest of the world, as Lenin was in 1920—is it not strange that we should be so harsh toward Russia?"

Senator Fulbright has been anti-American and pro-Communist in the intervening quarter century. Just a few weeks ago he said he didn't care if all of southeast Asia went Communist. Chairman Fulbright's conception of the Communist menace reminds me of the drunk who stumbled up on a man barbecuing a chicken over the rotary spit in his patio.

"Shay buddy, whatsa' matter?" he asked. "Your organ ain't playin' and your monkey's on fire."

It's great that the three Apollo 13 astronauts got back safely. But, why are they so much more important than the thousands of American POW's rotting in communist jails while our government helps their captors? Why are the lives of our astronauts any more precious than the 42,000 American lives we have sacrificed in Vietnam, in a war we never had any intention of winning? Why should any American submit to being drafted to fight an undeclared no-win war, to be killed by American foreign aid, or be captured and tortured by communist criminals, while our government makes no effort to recover them?

Occasionally, we "super patriots" are accused of dividing our country, and thus helping the communists. Remember, today's mighty oak is just yesterday's little nut which stood its ground.

"Am I, therefore, become your enemy, because I tell you the truth?" (St. Paul, Galatians IV, 16).

The great President Roosevelt, *Theodore* Roosevelt, said, "Patriotism means to stand by the country. It does not mean to stand by the President or any other public official save exactly to the degree in which he himself stands by the country." Continuing, Theodore Roosevelt said, "It is patriotic to support him insofar as he efficiently serves the country. It is unpatriotic not to oppose him to the exact extent that by inefficiency or otherwise he fails in his duty to stand by the country. In either event it is unpatriotic not to tell the truth save in the rare cases where this would make known to the enemy information of military value which would otherwise be unknown to him."

Some apologists say the State Department knows what it is doing and the people do not. Yes! The State Department has always known what it was doing. We didn't get where we are by accident. It was planned that way. Some of those anonymous creatures on the fourth floor of State have never made a mistake in our favor. Those hidden persuaders remind me of that new deodorant called "*stereo.*" It doesn't stop the odor but you can't tell where it's coming from.

Our State Department is like a poisoned candy bar: A yummy mixture of nuts, fruits, chocolate and jelly with artificial coloring and a tasteless poison added.

We lower mentalities must realize that the Senator from Oxford, *J. William Fulbright,* has said: "Fundamentally . . . the American people have little, if any, need to be alerted to the menace of the cold war."

Few men of our time have dipped more deeply into the sacred fount of learning and come up drier.

The U.S. Supreme Court ruled about two years ago in an opinion appropriately written by Justice Abe Fortas, that Americans with a valid passport cannot be prevented by our State Department from visiting and consorting with the enemy. This same so-called Court ruled that it is illegal to have the Lord's Prayer in school; but not illegal to plot to overthrow our Government by force, unless you try to do it. And now it is being tried. And our officials do nothing.

So-called Christians who say, "We will do nothing but pray, let God do everything," are failing God, faith and duty. Our faith and our works must match His will. As Beaumont said, "faith and work are like the light and heat of a candle—they cannot be separated."

Those who say "it's all ordained and so why fight it?" remind me of the Presbyterian preacher back in pioneer days who was asked by a parishioner: "If you believe things are fore ordained and predestined, and you believe that when your time has come it's come and there is nothing you can do about it, why do you carry a gun with you when you go to church on Sunday?" "Well," he said, "it's like this. I carry a gun because I might meet an Indian whose time has come."

As an old Negro preacher said: "Status quo is just Latin for the mess we is in."

The Bible says "it came to pass," it didn't come to stay! Whether it stays depends on us.

Once a farmer took his small son with him to steal some corn. The man prepared to put the corn into the bag, and he anxiously looked around to see if anyone was watching—"quick son, open the bag!" "Daddy, you didn't look in one direction." . . . Frightened . . . "where, where?"

The son answered simply: "Daddy, you didn't look up."

To find the way out of our troubles, we need to look up. And we need to get to work. God alone can save the world—but God won't save the world alone. Nor will prayer alone.

No matter how difficult the task or how long the odds, let us never quit trying. Like the fellow on the golf tee who said to his companion: "I've got to do well here! That's my mother-in-law on the club house porch."

"Don't be silly!" Replied his friend. "That's over 200 yards—you'll never hit her from here!"

Of course, there are many discouraging things. What hope is there for a nation which votes Jackie Kennedy as "most admired woman?" except for the knowledge that for 10 or 15 years it was Eleanor Roosevelt.

Then, there's my friend named Paul, who was asked by a street urchin, "Is this your car, Mister?" Paul nodded, "My brother gave it to me for Christmas."

The boy looked astonished. "You mean your brother gave it to you and it didn't cost you nothing? Gosh I wish . . ."

He hesitated, and Paul knew what he was going to wish. He was going to wish he had a brother like that. But what the lad said jarred Paul all the way down to his heels. "I wish," the boy went on, "that I could be a brother like that."

Paul looked at the boy in astonishment, then impulsively he added, "Would you like to ride in my automobile?"

"Oh yes, I'd love that!"

After a short ride, the boy turned and with his eyes aglow said, "Mister, would you mind driving in front of my house?"

Paul smiled a little. He thought he knew what the lad wanted. He wanted to show his neighbors that he could ride home in a big automobile. But Paul was wrong again.

"Will you stop right here where those two steps are?" the boy asked.

He ran up the steps. Then in a little while Paul heard him coming back, but he was not coming fast. He was carrying his little polio-crippled brother. He sat him down on the bottom step, then sort of squeezed up against him and pointed to the car.

"There she is, buddy, just like I told you upstairs. His brother gave it to him for Christmas, and it didn't cost him a cent, and someday I'm gonna give you one just like it: Then you can see for yourself all the pretty things in the Christmas windows that I've been trying to tell you about."

Paul got out and lifted the little lad to the front seat of his car. The shining-eyed older brother climbed in beside him and the three of them began a memorable holiday ride.

That Christmas Eve Paul learned what Jesus meant when he said: "It is more blessed to give . . ."

CHICAGO PLAN FOR THE BUILDING TRADES

HON. ROMAN C. PUCINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 20, 1970

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, much has been said about the turmoil presently expressed by the building trades in trying to open up job opportunities for minority groups.

The Nixon administration has proposed the Philadelphia plan as the answer. I agree with the General Accounting Office that the Philadelphia plan is illegal because it sets quotas for minority groups, which is a violation of the Civil Rights Act. I am not at all persuaded by statements by the Secretary of Labor that these are not quotas but goals.

The Philadelphia plan is one of the most controversial proposals made in recent years and deserves to be seriously amended before it can become operative.

I would like to call to the attention of the House the Chicago plan recently agreed to by the Chicago and Cook County Building Trades Council, whose president is Thomas J. Murray, and whose executive secretary is Thomas Nader; the Building Construction Employers Association of Chicago, whose chief officer is Arthur F. O'Neil; and the Coalition for United Community Action, which has a number of outstanding black leaders in Chicago headed by Rev. C. T. Vivian and Rev. Jesse Jackson.

I believe time will prove that the Chicago plan is much preferable to the Philadelphia plan and will provide wider opportunities for minority groups.

Both Mr. Murray and Mr. O'Neil, as

well as the Coalition for United Community Action, deserve high praise for working this problem out among themselves.

I am placing in the RECORD today a copy of the Chicago plan for use by other communities throughout the country.

The plan follows:

THE CHICAGO PLAN—AN AGREEMENT TO IMPLEMENT THE EMPLOYMENT OF MINORITIES IN CHICAGO'S CONSTRUCTION INDUSTRY

AGREEMENT

This agreement is entered into on this 9th day of January, 1970, by and between the undersigned, the Chicago and Cook County Building Trades Council (herein called "the Council"), the Building Construction Employers Association of Chicago, Inc. (herein called "Employers Association"), and the Coalition for United Community Action (herein called "the Coalition") for recommendation to their respective members and affiliates.

Whereas, the Council, Employers Association and the Coalition recognize the desirability and necessity of securing a greater minority group representation into the skilled trades of the building industry of Chicago; and

Whereas, if general business conditions permit, the said parties hope to achieve, year by year, over a period of not more than five years a level of minority group employees proportionate to their percent in the community at large; and

Whereas, the parties are agreed that no party will benefit by or has an interest in the destruction or dilution of existing standards and programs; and

Whereas, the parties agree that knowledgeable persons acting in good faith are the most effective and efficient means to achieve these goals;

Now, therefore, it is agreed that the Council, Employers Association and Coalition shall affirmatively recommend to their respective members and affiliates the following plan:

I.—ADMINISTRATIVE COMMITTEE

A. There shall be established an Administrative Committee composed of seven (7) representatives as follows:

1. Mayor Richard J. Daley or his designated representative;

2. Two (2) representatives to be selected by the Council;

3. Two (2) representatives to be selected by the Employers Association;

4. Two (2) representatives to be selected by the Coalition.

B. Duties—the Administrative Committee shall have the following duties:

1. To implement the program agreed upon by each Operations Committee;

3. Where applicable, to seek funds for the purposes of carrying out the directions of the Operations Committees in the following areas:

(a) Recruitment;
(b) Counseling;
(c) Physical facilities;
(d) Teacher recruitment;
(e) Staffing;
(f) Motivation and retention;
(g) Certification of journeymen status.

3. Action by the Administrative Committee shall require the vote of at least five (5) members.

4. In the event a complaint arises relating to programs already agreed upon by each Operations Committee, such complaints may be referred to the Administrative Committee for purposes of mediating said complaints.

C. Funding—both public and private funds may be used to accomplish the goals and purposes according to the needs and availability of funds.

II.—OPERATIONS COMMITTEES

A. There shall be established an Operations Committee for each participating individual affiliate or member composed as follows:

1. Two (2) representatives selected by the affiliate or craft union;

2. Two (2) representatives selected by the member industry;

3. Four (4) representatives selected by the Coalition.

B. Qualifications—it is expected that representatives selected for the Operations Committees shall be knowledgeable in the particular industry and/or craft.

C. Duties—it shall be the duty and responsibility of each individual Operations Committee to formulate and determine particular programs appropriate to each craft and industry. In formulating and determining such programs, representatives on the Operations Committees shall be guided by the following principles:

1. Those crafts and industries that can accept accelerated and/or auxiliary programs should do so;

2. No program shall in any way affect the integrity of any collective bargaining agreements and/or commitments.

3. Any and all agreements on programs shall be by mutual agreement of all representatives.

D. Filing—programs developed and formulated by each of said Operations Committees shall be reduced to writing and filed with the Administrative Committee for the purpose of implementation as set forth in paragraph 1(B) above.

III.—GUIDELINES FOR OPERATIONS COMMITTEES

1. We will endeavor to obtain employment at once for 1,000 qualified journeymen who possess the necessary skills of their respective trades, and look to the Coalition to supply us with qualified journeymen. Each respective craft union will accept such journeymen into membership within the time period called for in the pertinent collective bargaining agreement, and each craft union will accept its initiation fee or required fees on a partial payment plan to run at least three months.

2. Those persons who possess some of the skills of a particular trade and can furnish proof of employment for two or more years in the particular craft in which they possess some skills will work for a 30-day probationary period, after which they will receive the equivalent of the apprentice's rate for the applicable year of the particular craft, as determined by its Joint Apprenticeship Committee, and will be enrolled as an apprentice. Or a special training program will be set up in those industries where practicable, and each worker will receive special training in the particular craft involved. We will look to the Coalition to supply us with persons possessing such skills.

3. With respect to those individuals who have had no prior training and do not possess some of the skills of a particular craft involved, but who are within the age limits of 17 to 23, or the age limits for the particular craft, we propose an information and recruiting program designed to acquaint all applicants with the trades and the requirements of each trade. We will enlarge upon the present facilities of and combine the efforts of the Urban League and the Apprentice Information Center to implement this program. We believe such a training program would run about one month and could be funded through the government to provide a modest wage during this month period. There would be no prior tests for coming into this program. The program would prepare each applicant for entering the existing apprenticeship programs for all crafts, would explain what each craft does and would determine the aptitude of the applicant with respect to the particular trade and increase the probability of success of the applicant as well as his adjustment into the Construction Industry. From this program the applicant who meets the qualifications would go into the existing apprenticeship program for the particular craft. The Coalition would be responsible for the recruitment of applicants into this program. We anticipate that at least 1,000 applicants could be accepted into this program.

4. We propose an on-the-job training program for persons who do not wish to take the tests provided for in point 3 above for admission into the respective apprenticeship programs or who fail in such tests. Provided that the necessary funding can be obtained for such a program for on-the-job training, the wage would be geared to the equivalent apprenticeship rate, and provisions would be made for schooling of one day a week or for evening classes as facilities permit. This on-the-job training program would apply in such industries where such trainees could be employed. We believe that at least 1,000 such on-the-job trainees could be placed in these industries which lend themselves to such a training program.

5. These recommendations shall be applicable only with respect to persons who have been residents of Chicago for over one year.

6. We recognize the desirability and the necessity of securing a greater minority group representation into the skilled trades of the Building Industry in Chicago and will therefore seek to establish further programs in keeping with the demands of the industry, and if general business conditions permit, which will hopefully achieve over a period of not more than five years, a level of minority group employees at least proportionate to their percentage in the community at large.

IV.—DURATION

The obligations imposed by this Agreement on the Council, the Employers Association and the Coalition shall become effective when signed. There shall be a review of all programs instituted as a result of this Agreement and the effectiveness of the various committees established as a result of this Agreement six (6) months from the execution thereof.

Dated at Chicago, Illinois, this 9th day of January, 1970.

Coalition for United Community Action

Robert L. Lucas, Black Liberation Alliance.
Barry Patterson, Conservative Vice Lords.
Michael Shane, Black Disciples.
Curtis E. Burrell, Kenwood-Oakland Community Conference.
Robert E. Williams, Lawndale Peoples Planning and Action Conference.
Bob Taylor, National Welfare Rights Organization.
Alphonse Small, Black P Stone Nation.
David Reed, Valley Community Organization.
Paul King Jr., West Side Builders.
C. T. Vivian, Coordinator.
Sally Jackson, Allies for a Better Community.

(Signed by Coalition on January 9, 1970.)

Chicago and Cook County Building Trades Council

Thomas J. Murray.

Building Construction Employers Association of Chicago, Inc.

Arthur F. O'Neil.

(Signed by Industry Committee on November 12, 1969 and in Mayor Daley's office on January 12, 1970.)