

A Good Man—Indiana State Senator Leonard Opperman—Steps Down

HON. JOHN BRADEMAS

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 26, 1968

MR. BRADEMAS. Mr. Speaker, it was with profound regret that many of my constituents and I heard recently of the decision of Indiana State Senator Leonard Opperman, of South Bend, Ind., not to run for reelection this year. We were justly proud of the capable and effective manner in which Senator Opperman represented the best interests of all Hoosiers in the Indiana General Assembly.

Senator Opperman is a young man but of considerable wisdom; he is a businessman devoted to helping labor and management; he has an academic background in political science combined with the skills of a practicing politician and legislator.

Senator Opperman indicated that his departure from elective office might only be temporary while he seeks a degree at the University of Notre Dame Law School. Many of us share his hope that he will again be making an active contribution to politics and government.

At this point in the RECORD I wish to include an editorial commanding Senator Opperman from the February 18, 1968, edition of the South Bend, Ind., Tribune as well as a perceptive article written by Senator Opperman and entitled "Aid for the States: Is Revenue Sharing the Answer?" which appeared in the January 1968 issue of the Review of Politics which is published at the University of Notre Dame:

[From the South Bend Tribune,
Feb. 18, 1968]

GOOD MAN STEPS DOWN

In a perceptive article on state government which he wrote for the current issue of "The Review of Politics," Indiana State Sen. Leonard Opperman had this to say about Indiana's General Assembly: "The legislature is inexperienced... Because of low status and low pay approximately half of the state legislature turns over after each 61-day biennial legislative session. Only the lobbyists are around long enough to know where are the levers of power. Everyone else is involved in on-the-job training."

Sen. Opperman was not writing about himself. He had passed through apprenticeship and was a journeyman state legislator—one of the best informed and most effective men in either house of the General Assembly.

Sen. Opperman has decided not to stand for re-election, and St. Joseph County—and the next Assembly—will be the poorer for that decision.

Sen. Opperman served in the state legislature for six years, one term in the House and one in the Senate. He knows where the levers of power are. He has the integrity to use them for the benefit of his constituents and for the greater good of the state of Indiana.

His decision to retire from the legislative forum was based on the fact that he is currently attending Notre Dame Law School. But that is undoubtedly less than the whole reason.

Only he knows to what extent the very problems he cited in the passage above—low status, low pay for legislators—contributed to his decision.

If they were not of prime importance in his choice, he is correct in assigning them as major causes for the heavy turnover in the Indiana General Assembly.

The answer is something more complicated than just raising pay and hiring a public relations firm to work on the "image" of the legislature. The real answer must go to the heart of the problem, which is Indiana's outmoded constitution.

Legislators should be better paid. They also should hold regular sessions annually, rather than biennially. The Assembly should have more power and more independence from the executive branch of state government than the present constitution permits.

As for Sen. Opperman, we thank him for having invested his time and talents in state government over the last half-dozen years. He expressed a hope that "one day I will again be in a position to make a further contribution" to politics and government.

We hope so, too.

[From Review of Politics, January 1968]
AD FOR THE STATES: IS REVENUE SHARING THE ANSWER?

(By Leonard Opperman)

The latest plan making its appearance on the American public scene as a solution to the problems of "big government" and the decline of state government in our federal system is that of revenue sharing between the federal government and the states. This proposal has met with a wide and uncritical acceptance by state legislators, members of Congress, and the public. A Gallup Poll taken on January 1, 1967, indicated that seventy percent of the American public favored the idea of revenue sharing.¹ The sponsors of revenue sharing regard it as a means of revitalizing state governments; yet, an examination of this new plan of distributing state aid suggests that its results may be quite different from what its proponents expect. Most likely, revenue sharing will weaken the self-governing capacities of our states rather than strengthen them. This undesirable consequence may follow because revenue sharing would encourage those interests presently controlling most state governments to increase their activities. The point simply stated is that revenue sharing will not make reform of state governments any easier.

Walter W. Heller, formerly the chairman of the Council of Economic Advisors, is generally credited with originating the idea of revenue sharing.² While several variations of revenue-sharing plans exist, the most frequently discussed plan involves taking a portion of the total revenues produced by federal income taxes and returning it to the states without imposing specific spending guidelines. It is assumed that the money received by the states would be used to promote state and local programs of general welfare for their citizens.

In the short period since revenue-sharing plans have been seriously discussed it is interesting to note how the original Heller plan has been modified and appropriated by the Republican Party and how it has become that party's answer to the political and ad-

ministrative problems of "big government." When Heller first outlined his plan of revenue sharing, he did so against a background of anticipated budget surpluses coming from rising national income. So far these surpluses have not materialized because of the increasing national commitment in Vietnam. In 1964, Heller argued that revenue sharing would not replace existing federal categorical grant programs but would supplement them—be regarded as an additional form of federal aid for use by the states as they saw fit. Fearing that the anticipated surpluses might be dissipated through tax reductions or used for schemes not in the public interest, Heller felt that his revenue-sharing plan would strengthen state governments and assure that the surpluses would be used for socially desirable public purposes. He was concerned also about the need for maintaining economic growth through fiscal policy and believed that revenue sharing was a promising device for achieving that end.

In 1967, however, present advocates of revenue sharing have significantly departed from Heller's original conception. Today, revenue sharing has come to mean an end to federal categorical grant programs and their replacement by block grants to states without specific spending guidelines. None of the major proponents of revenue sharing give so much as lip service to Heller's original assumption of budget surpluses or to his conviction that revenue sharing should supplement categorical grant programs.

Perhaps the best way to understand current thinking about revenue sharing is to examine the statements of Congressman Melvin R. Laird (R. Wisconsin), a leading proponent of revenue sharing.³ Laird argues that many social and economic problems of state and local governments currently requiring federal assistance might be solved at the state and local levels if adequate funds were available. High federal taxes have made it virtually impossible for state and local governments to increase their own tax revenues to a point where they can deal effectively with all of their own problems. Thus, Laird argues, only a lack of funds prevents the states and localities from meeting their own needs and this lack of funds has resulted in a clamor for forms of federal assistance from Washington. Yet, Washington is distant and offers of help are usually accompanied by controls and guidelines administered by remote bureaucrats not mindful of local situations who appear determined to impose national solutions to problems which really require local ones. Furthermore, the multiplicity of federal programs has led to inadequate federal funding of most of them so that state and local requests for funds far outstrip the capacity of the federal government to provide. Underfinanced federal programs do little more than recognize the existence of problems which they purport to resolve. The very existence of these underfinanced federal programs has led states to misapply their own limited resources by encouraging otherwise low priority programs simply because of the availability of some matching federal help. Laird believes that all of this assumed misdirection will end when revenue sharing is adopted. He insists that the state governments have the will to attempt solutions of their own problems. He insists that state governments can better determine the proper allocation of available funds, that the device of revenue sharing will eliminate the need for much existing federal intervention in state affairs.

¹ Norman C. Miller, "Building An Issue," *Wall Street Journal*, January 19, 1967.

² E. R. Dale, Jr., "Subsidizing the States: The Heller Plan," *New Republic*, 151 (November 28, 1964). See also Walter W. Heller, *New Dimensions of Political Economy* (Cambridge, 1966).

³ Melvin R. Laird, *Congressional Record*, vol. 113, pt. 3, pp. 3443-3451.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

February 27, 1968

and that the viability of the states in our federal system will be assured through the adoption of revenue sharing.

To be sure, the mechanics of revenue sharing have not yet been fully developed, and Laird is open-minded about requiring states as initial recipients of block grants to pass on a certain amount to their political subdivisions. He believes desirable the establishment of a national distribution formula which would take into account each state's willingness to tax itself. Under such a formula any state reducing its own taxes would receive less from the federal government than a state that maintained or increased its own taxes. The major innovation of the Laird scheme and the one most attractive to Republicans in Congress is abandonment of existing federal grant programs. Each state would determine for itself whether to continue, abolish, or change the emphasis of existing federal grant programs.

In a recent issue of the *New Republic* Leon H. Keyserling criticized the concept of revenue sharing from an economist's point of view.⁴ Keyserling contended that Heller's original idea of revenue sharing was bad Keynesian economics; it would destroy the flexibility required for proper management of the economy. More important, Keyserling argued that the real issue ought to be not the mechanics of distributing federal funds but rather how they were to be allocated. Allocation involves the determination of priorities in terms of the national interest and decisions of this kind should be left to the federal government and not undertaken at state or local levels. In Keyserling's view the national government is better able to resist pressures to spend for the wrong purposes than the state or local governments.

Revenue sharing appears attractive because it seems to provide a simple answer to the pressing fiscal problems of state and local governments. Yet, as one who has participated in state government for a number of years, the present author has several strong reservations about revenue-sharing plans. These reservations are not speculative or philosophical; they arise from his experiences with state government in Indiana, and what holds for Indiana in large part may be true for the other states. As a matter of fact, the basic assumptions of the revenue sharers simply do not make sense in the light of Indiana's recent experience. For example, take the argument that the states could solve their own social and economic problems if only they had the financial resources to do so. In January, 1967, the Indiana General Assembly convened with an anticipated budget surplus estimated between \$80,000,000 and \$100,000,000 for the next biennium. Various public and special interests pressed for a share of the surplus. Especially vocal were the public universities, proponents of mental health, and the public schools. Equally insistent were the advocates of "property tax relief" who pressed for a share of the state surplus to relieve overburdened homeowners. Now, the extent to which Indiana homeowners are actually overburdened is disputable. According to one well-regarded study of property taxation in Indiana, the Indiana property taxes have maintained approximately the same ratio to personal income for the past twenty years.⁵ The total individual tax burden in Indiana (income, sales and property) combined to place the state at about midpoint in any ranked comparison with other states. In view of this fact the Indiana's legislature's disposition of its surplus is suggestive of what other states

might do with an anticipated bonanza of unrestrictive funds from the federal government. Over \$80,000,000 of the surplus was sent back to local units of government as a "property tax relief fund." This money was intended to replace taxpayer money with state money and thereby reduce individual Hoosier homeowners' tax bills.

In 1967, with the possible exception of a modest effort at pollution control, no significant new programs were begun by the state. Long-neglected problems in correction, care for the mentally retarded, highway construction, regional university campus development, and public welfare continued to be ignored even though the largest surplus in the state's history was available for public use. Money was not lacking, but the will to spend it for socially desirable purposes was.

If the experience of the 1967 Indiana General Assembly has any meaning it is that neglect of state and local responsibilities is not always a lack of money as is so frequently assumed by the proponents of revenue sharing. More important than lack of money is the absence of a commitment to government. Returning money for property tax relief poses genuine problems of equity for nonproperty owners who pay state taxes but receive no benefit from this type of relief. Furthermore, distributing a surplus back to the local units so that property taxes can be reduced directly contradicts the idea that government should solve public problems with public funds and should refund tax money only after the needs of the people have been met. Indiana has not progressed to a point where it can, in effect, reduce taxes by \$80,000,000 and continue to meet its responsibilities. Medicaid, a program which would have helped welfare recipients and also would have lowered county taxes by shifting part of the cost of caring for the medically indigent to the state and federal governments was vetoed by Governor Roger D. Branigin because the program would cost an estimated \$6,000,000. Other examples of neglect of important public needs like the establishment of a second state medical school could be cited. The absence of a will to use public funds to perform vital services that cannot be performed by individuals or private groups is virtually endemic in the legislative and executive branches of the government of the State of Indiana.

Why do we find such a lack of commitment to positive government? The answer to this question is complex but a few factors can be noted. First, in Indiana the state constitution requires a relatively high turnover of elected public officials. Consequently, Indiana's elected public officials never develop sufficient experience or expertise to perform their job well. For example, the governor is limited to a four-year term and can only succeed himself after a four-year interval; only one governor in Indiana's history has been elected to a second term! The legislature is inexperienced. While it is not hampered by a constitutional limitation on succession in office, because of low status and low pay approximately half of the state legislature turns over each sixty-one-day biennial legislative session. Only the lobbyists are around long enough to know where are the levers of power. Everyone else is involved in on-the-job training.

Second, the press in Indiana does not perform the watchdog function which, at times, acts as an important check on actions of the federal government. No writers of statewide repute cover the legislative sessions. Few papers even send reporters to cover the legislature or state government; most papers rely on wire services. As a consequence the lobbying activities of private interest groups are rarely subjected to public scrutiny. The always inexperienced legislators are unrestrained by public awareness of their actions and come to think that submission to

private interests is legitimate. To be sure, some legislators and participants in state government are totally dedicated to the public interest, but their numbers and influence are small.

Third, reapportionment which many had regarded as a way of revitalizing state governments has not yet demonstrated its value in Indiana. An increase in urban representation has not led to greater concern for urban problems because the new urban representatives themselves have conflicting views about the nature of those problems and about approaches to their solution. In Indiana, what seems to be emerging is a coalition of rural and suburban legislators sharing a common antipathy toward the city and the city's poor. Whether this new coalition will develop more concern for urban problems than did the formerly rural-dominated legislatures is a moot question.

The realities of state government in Indiana suggest that revenue sharing with the federal government would not even approximate the goals expected by its proponents. Unless stringent guidelines accompany block grants, the funds received would probably be used to reduce taxes or to further special-interest programs of doubtful public benefit. The main weakness of such plans is an overestimation of the states' capacity for self-government. Revenue sharing assumes that states will act to meet public responsibilities if given the funds. It also assumes that the states' taxable resources have been preempted by existing high federal taxes. Neither of these assumptions are true in Indiana. Unfortunately, state government in Indiana and elsewhere has not shown by performance any real capacity for resolving the explosive social problems of our time.

In Indiana while reform is not impossible, it is difficult. The limited attention of state government is largely taken up by lobbyists representing important interests. Underpaid public servants are no match for their highly paid counterparts in regulated industries. Because of the constitutional limitations upon gubernatorial succession in Indiana, continuity and expertise do not exist together in state government, and the vested interests are generally satisfied with maintaining things as they are. But no less an important impediment to reform is public apathy. Hoosiers do not appear especially dissatisfied with the status quo. The inevitable grumblies that one reads in "letters to the editor" columns in newspapers are about the outer limits of public dissatisfaction. This is the reality that one sees from the perspective of a state capitol, this is the reality that revenue sharing proposes to alter. Against a background of this kind of reality what then are the chances that revenue sharing can "revitalize" our federal system? They are not very promising.

However, even more important than the effect of revenue-sharing schemes upon the prospects for reforming individual state governments is the effect that implementation of such schemes might have upon our federal system as a whole. Implementation of revenue sharing could lead to a situation in the United States where, insofar as development and implementation of domestic programs are concerned, this nation will become fifty separate states, not one country. Instead of developing domestic programs consistent with national interests, priority for establishing domestic programs would be left to governmental units which to the present have demonstrated neither will nor capacity to act.

The future development of state government as well as our federal system will turn upon the appearance of a will and capacity in the states to meet their responsibilities. But at the present time revenue sharing may do no more than make needed reforms more difficult. Revenue sharing will reward those

⁴ Leon H. Keyserling, "Revenue Sharing With the States," *New Republic*, 156 (March 25, 1967).

⁵ Charles F. Mott and James R. Ukokis, *Financing Local Government in Indiana* (Commission on State Tax and Financing Policy, Indianapolis, Indiana, 1966) p. 6.

persons and interests already laboring so diligently to keep state governments weak. The addition of federal funds will make "influence" a prize well worth seeking. Revitalization of the states must come before revenue sharing. The consequences of abandoning existing federal grant programs, especially those designed for the urban poor nonwhites, are unthinkable. Until reform of state government is a fact Americans should be extremely cautious about providing federal funds to states without adequate safeguards for their proper expenditure.

"Untouchables" Unbearable

HON. JOHN R. RARICK

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 26, 1968

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, the question being asked by every patriotic American is, "What are we going to do in Vietnam?"

The answers are varied and most interesting.

But how do we—who just over 20 years ago brought peace to a world by freeing it from tyranny—find our young men being killed by Communists while some businessmen trade with the enemy?

It is not hard to uncover the answer—and more and more—frustrated mothers and dads are searching for answers.

The same untouchables that prepared the stage for Korea, South Vietnam, and a hundred other no-win wars that we are being led to believe cannot be won, remain in positions of decisionmaking.

Untouchables unbearable, but as of yet still untouchable. Mothers and dads need but a few more answers and when fully awakened, the untouchables will become touchable. We can win the wars if we overcome the "untouchables."

I insert Mr. Capell's "Untouchables—Part VIII," from the *Herald of Freedom*, in the RECORD for all to review:

THE UNTOUCHABLES—PART VIII

At the very time when thousands of American servicemen are being killed and wounded by the Communists in Vietnam, the State Department is conducting a program of expanding trade with Communist countries. These same countries are supplying the weapons of destruction with which our servicemen are being killed. Already half a million U.S. military men are committed to the struggle against Communist aggression in the Vietnam area, and each day new names are added to the casualty lists. Mothers, wives and families face the tragic sorrow of the death in action of a loved one, killed by American financial aid to the Communists.

In the State Department there is a large clique of pro-Soviets who see nothing wrong in trading with the enemy and, indeed, actually promote the increase of this treasonous activity. Anthony M. Solomon, Assistant Secretary of State for Economic Affairs, gave an address on March 2, 1967 at the Chicago Automobile Trade Show Luncheon on the subject: "Why the United States Should Expand Peaceful Trade with Eastern Europe." He stated:

"We believe there is a compelling case on the broadest political grounds and the narrower grounds of economic self-interest to expand peaceful trade (Is there any other kind?—Ed.) with Communist Europe. Some American firms, however, are holding back from trade with Eastern Europe because of public criticism damaging to their domestic

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

markets and corporate reputation when they contemplate such trade. In order to make this Government's position perfectly clear to American businessmen, the Secretaries of State, Defense and Commerce joined in a statement that has been given wide circulation. They stated:

"Your Government regards commerce in peaceful goods with the countries of Eastern Europe, including the Soviet Union, as completely compatible with our national interest. No American business enterprise should be penalized for purchasing or selling such goods. In fact, any individuals or groups that seek to intimidate, boycott, blacklist, use or threaten economic reprisals against such American enterprises for carrying on lawful trade with Eastern European countries act harmfully and irresponsibly. To yield to such groups is to encourage capricious interference with the vital processes of our Constitutional Government—interference that could at the end of the road make it impossible for our country to conduct a coherent foreign policy."

Naturally the "Untouchables" are involved in the formulation and promotion of the "Government's" policy of "building bridges" and "commerce in peaceful goods" (peaceful trade), which help to strengthen the enemy and result in more American lives lost. The man who quoted the "Statement" of "Your Government" on this subject must be numbered among these "Untouchables." It is interesting to note that no such "Policy Statements" were issued when some were boycotting firms which traded with Nazi Germany, even when no Americans were being killed by Nazi guns and supplies at the time.

Anthony Morton Solomon was born at Kearny, N.J., December 27, 1919, the son of Jacob Solomon and the former Edna Yudin. He graduated from the University of Chicago in 1941 with a B.A. degree and the following year was appointed as Director General of Finance of the American Financial Mission to Southwest Iran where he remained until 1946. This vital position precluded his being inducted into the Armed Forces. During this period there was much Communist maneuvering going on in this area.

British and Communist Russian forces entered Iran on August 25, 1941 and later withdrew. The British and USSR governments signed an agreement to respect Iran Integrity and to give economic aid to Iran. U.S. "Lend Lease" funds and supplies were channeled into Iran and Anthony M. Solomon, the 22-year-old financial wizard just recently out of the University of Chicago, was given the job of spending the "Lend Lease" funds, mostly for the benefit of the Soviet Union. By 1945 the Soviets, who had occupied northern Iran, sponsored a revolt and the formation of two "peoples' republics." Shades of North and South Korea, North and South Vietnam, etc., etc., etc. !!!

In 1946 Solomon continued his education by returning to college (Harvard) and by 1948 had obtained two more degrees. He spent a number of years in private employment in Latin America and came back on the government scene in 1963 as a Consultant to the Chairman of the Agency for International Development (AID) Mission to Bolivia. He obtained a security clearance (a la W. W. Rostow) by being appointed a "Consultant" to President Kennedy. In November 1963 he was appointed to the State Department as a Deputy Assistant Secretary of State for Inter-American Affairs where he worked under Assistant Secretary Edwin M. Martin. He had no problem with State Department Security since, like Rostow, he already had a "presidential clearance."

Solomon's first State Department boss, Martin, has since been made an Ambassador. Concerning Martin, we read in "Treason Is the Reason": "Martin was a dues-paying member, active in the Washington, D.C., Branch of the IPR. He wrote a book published under the auspices of the IPR. He was

admittedly close to and took counsel and advice from John Carter Vincent, a trustee of the Institute of Pacific Relations who was identified as a member of the Communist Party. Martin was a frequent speaker on behalf of the IPR and was known to be critical of Gen. Douglas MacArthur and other 'right-wing reactionaries.'

In April 1965 Solomon went over to the Economic Affairs Section and in June 1965 was promoted to Assistant Secretary of State for Economic Affairs, a presidential appointment. In this position Solomon has as his Special Assistant Mrs. Ruth Schechter Gold, who on June 19, 1966 moved up from Civil Service rating GS-15 to Foreign Service Officer Reserve R-s, which pays from \$19,333 to \$23,360.

Mrs. Ruth Schechter Gold was born in New York City on November 12, 1912. She graduated from Hunter College in 1931 with a B.A. Degree and from 1932 to 1938 was a public school teacher in New York. For many years she was a dues-paying member of Local 5 of the Communist-controlled New York Teachers' Union. In the report of the Senate Internal Security Sub-committee on "Subversive Influence in the Educational Process," Page 9, we read:

"Dr. (Bella V.) Dodd testified that the New York Teachers' Union, of which she was a leader, achieved a membership of 11,000 teachers, of which 1,000 were members of the Communist Party. She further testified that the union had considerably more Communists than was necessary to control that organization, so extensive was the influence of the controlling Communists. Some of these were used in building other Communist organizations...."

The New York Teachers' Union, in which Mrs. Gold was an active member, was expelled by the AFL-CIO due to its being completely Communist-controlled. The Senate report of "Subversive Influence in the Educational Process" stated on Page 1:

"The subcommittee received impressive evidence from former Communist organizers that the Soviet organization was continuously engaged in a plan to penetrate our educational institutions at every possible point, thus posing a serious threat to our national security. The Communist agents who spun the very real web of conspiracy and intrigue within the framework of the United States Government Departments, in almost all cases, were cradled in our distinguished universities and colleges. The subcommittee observed that the universities and colleges are, understandably, more and more participating in government, creating policy and shaping our national destiny and that the expressions and sentiments of educators are more and more flowing into the mainstream of our national culture."

From 1938 to 1939 Ruth Schechter (Gold) attended the Fabian Socialist London School of Economics, founded by Sidney Webb, head of the Fabian Society. From 1940 to 1942 she attended the New School for Social Research. "Keynes at Harvard," the excellent Veritas Foundation study, has this to say regarding the "New School:"

"The New School for Social Research, which operates as an accredited educational institution, has been sold to the general public as an independent and politically neutral institution. Actually the New School was established by men who belong to the ranks of the near-Bolshevik Intelligentsia, some of them being too radical in their views to remain on the faculty of Columbia University. When the above characterization was made by the New York Legislative Committee (1920), the New School Fabian socialist nature was not too well defined but its extremism was recognizable even then. The list of its faculty, lecturers and directors from its origin in 1919 to the present day (1960), reads like a Who's Who of the socialist and communist movement." We

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

might add that Alger Hiss has recently lectured there.

In 1942 Mrs. Gold came into U.S. Government employment via the War Production Board. In 1944 she went over to the Foreign Economic Administration where she worked under Frank Virginius Coe with whom she became closely associated. Coe has been identified as a Communist and member of a Soviet espionage ring. Also working with them was another associate of Coe, Irving Kaplan, later identified as a Communist and member of an espionage underground. Coe later became an assistant to Harry Dexter White (another Communist and Soviet agent) in the Treasury Department and Mrs. Gold is reported to have sat in on conferences in the office of Secretary of the Treasury Morgenthau.

Ruth Schechter married a British subject named Joseph Gold, an employee of the International Monetary Fund, an organization which Harry Dexter White helped to set up. White became U.S. Executive Director of the International Monetary Fund and Frank V. Coe resigned from the Treasury Department to accept employment with this same organization. Security officers reported that Mrs. Gold gave her husband (labeled "a leftist") confidential information obtained from the State Department regarding Lend Lease programs.

Mrs. Gold was reported as having been a member of the American Labor Party, having registered as a member in 1937, 1940 and 1941. The Senate Internal Security Subcommittee in its "Handbook for Americans" stated: "Communist dissimulation extends into the field of political parties forming political front organizations such as the . . . American Labor Party. The Communists are thus enabled to present their candidates for elective office under other than a straight Communist label."

Mrs. Gold has also been reported as a dues-paying member of the League for Industrial Democracy, a Fabian Socialist pro-Communist organization whose membership has included Corliss Lamont, Frederick Vanderbilt Field, Scott Nearing, Owen Lattimore, etc. The Students for a Democratic Society (SDS) was created by the League for Industrial Democracy and has been active and in the forefront of the revolutionary activities of the "New Left."

After coming into the State Department Mrs. Gold became an international economist and worked in the Office of Financial and Development Policy on the Investment and Economic Development staff which maintained State Department liaison with the Export-Import Bank and the International Monetary Fund, both United Nations affiliated. After a number of promotions Mrs. Gold had become by 1963 Advisor to the Director of the State Department's Office of International Resources in their Bureau of Economic Affairs. She was the advisor to Henry Brodie, another strand in the "Web of Subversion."

Henry Brodie was born in Canada, May 13, 1913, the son of Samuel Brodie and Etta Guinsburg. He came to the United States in 1933 and in 1937 graduated from New York University with a B.S. degree. He obtained his M.A. degree in 1940 and Ph.D. in 1942. On September 23, 1939 he married Elizabeth Kaufman. For two years, from 1937 to 1939 he had worked for the State of New York as a tax expert, although not a citizen. In 1942 he was appointed as an economic analyst attached to the staff of the U.S. Embassy in London and later went into the OSS (Office of Strategic Services).

When Brodie applied for a State Department position he gave as a reference Carl Aldo Marzani, also of the OSS, who was to be identified as a Communist under the Party name of Tony Whales (Wales). Marzani was convicted of perjury and served a jail sentence for this. He is now an official of the "leftist" publishing firm of Marzani and

Munsell of New York City. Brodie has been reported as having close associations with a number of Communists and pro-Soviet individuals. Another of his employment references was Otto Nathan, also an economist, who has been named as a member of the German Communist Party. Nathan has been active in the cited Communist-front, the National Committee to Abolish the H.C.U.A.

Brodie moved up rapidly in the State Department through the Officer of Intelligence Research and by 1960, was a member of the State Department Policy Planning Staff. In 1961 he was made Director of the Office of International Resources, and is at present shown as being in charge of the International Economic Affairs Section of the United States Mission to the European Office of the United Nations in Geneva. Brodie and Ruth Schechter Gold have been reported as serious security risks on a number of occasions and were both on the famous "Scott McLeod List."

The Web of Subversion, which operates through strategically placed individuals, has another strand in Leonard Felsenthal, assisting Brodie in Geneva. Felsenthal was born in Germany in 1913, the son of Herman Felsenthal and Caroline Becker. He studied at the Universities of Berlin and Munich 1932-3. Coming to the United States as a refugee from Hitler, he attended the University of Chicago, graduating in 1940. "Peaceful trade with Communists" Solomon also attended the U. of Chicago during this period.

Felsenthal became a U.S. citizen in 1939 and by the following year was snugly settled as an economic analyst in the U.S. Treasury Department through the efforts of Harry Dexter White and Frank Virginius Coe (Communists and Soviet agents) whom Felsenthal gave as personal references on his application for federal employment. While at the University of Chicago Felsenthal was an active "leftist" and member of the American Student Union, cited as Communist and subversive. Intelligence sources report that Felsenthal actually held Communist Party meetings in his own home. He became a member of the United Federal Workers of America, a Communist-controlled organization, and was known to have maintained contact with important Communists for many years.

Felsenthal went into the OPA (Office of Price Administration) in 1943 and in 1945 was appointed as the Information Control Officer of the U.S. Military Government in Germany, holding this post until 1947 in spite of his known subversive record. Returning to Washington, in 1948 he became an international economic analyst in the State Department and was involved in the same area of interest as Ruth Schechter Gold and Henry Brodie. From 1956 to 1960 Felsenthal was in Tokyo, and from 1961 to 1963 in Singapore. He then came back to Washington again as an international economist in the Office of the International Trade Agreement Division (1963-65). By 1965 he moved up to become the Counsellor for Economic Affairs to the U.S. Mission to the United Nations at Geneva where he now works with Henry Brodie.

Felsenthal and Ruth Schechter Gold were both closely associated with Soviet agent Frank V. Coe who is now living in Communist China and promoting anti-American propaganda. Mrs. Gold's husband, described by intelligence sources as a "strong leftist," has been employed for many years by the International Monetary Fund where Frank Coe worked after leaving the Treasury Department of the United States. The International Monetary Fund was the brainchild of Harry Dexter White, the important Soviet agent about whom the F.B.I. sent thirty-five warnings while he was an official of the Treasury Department, all of which were ignored. The only discernible result of the warnings was that White obtained further promotions.

At present Joseph Gold, Ruth's husband,

February 27, 1968

is General Counsel and Director of the Legal Department of the International Monetary Fund, 19th St. and H St., Washington, D.C. He and his wife reside at 7020 Braeburn Place, Bethesda, Maryland. With Ruth advising him, it is no wonder "The Honorable Anthony M. Solomon" spoke as follows to his Chicago audience on March 2, 1967:

"I want to talk to you today on an important and controversial subject . . . The subject is expanding peaceful trade between the United States and the Communist countries of Europe.

"The restrictions we impose had their origin in the late 1940's when Stalin ruled the USSR, the USSR ruled the Communist world, and the Communist world was a unified, hostile, overtly aggressive empire. . . . But over the past decade as the Communist world has changed, our allies have modified their practices. . . .

"We believe strongly that changes have indeed occurred and are now in process in the Communist world that are favorable to our interests. . . .

"Today there is no longer a single united Communist world. You know, as well as I, how the once arrogant Moscow-Peking axis has fallen to pieces. The Communist world is split down the middle. On one side is Communist China, paranoid in its hostility to the United States. . . . On the other side is the USSR. . . . moving slowly and cautiously to increased peaceful intercourse with the West. . . . The small countries of Eastern Europe that in Stalin's day were mere satellite appendages of the USSR are today increasingly able to adopt internal and external policies appropriate to their interests. . . .

"What is the significance of these changes for United States policy? . . . Can increased contact and increased peaceful trade contribute to the further favorable evolution of Communist society in Europe? We believe strongly that it can. . . . The President has said eloquently that we should try to build bridges to Eastern Europe—bridges of ideas, education, culture, and trade.

"To some of our people the very idea of increasing peaceful trade and contact with Communist Europe is anathema. They see it as a snare and a delusion, indeed as fundamentally immoral. Our answer to them is that in this nuclear age it would be both immoral and irresponsible not to try to find areas of agreement. . . ."

After stating "Your Government's" position, previously quoted, Solomon concluded:

"We have lived with the Cold War for some two decades and it is difficult to modify attitudes even in the face of change. It is even more difficult at this moment in time when we are fighting in Vietnam and the countries of Communist Europe are giving support to our opponents. But we believe it is just in this situation that we should do everything we can to demonstrate to the Soviet Union and the other countries of Eastern Europe that their true interests lie not in attempts at aggressive expansion, but in seeking the well-being of their people through peaceful means. . . ."

So the Rockefellers and the Eatons and other greedy businessmen (whom the Soviets know would sell the rope used to hang themselves if they thought they could make money) are most anxious to trade with Communist countries, and the pro-Communist politicians and "untouchable" government employees warn that we must "stop bombing, negotiate and build bridges." And how is this affecting the "mellowing" and peace-loving Soviets? U.S. News and World Report of February 5, 1968 states:

"No doubt about it this time, Russia, not Red China, is the real power behind the latest move to draw the United States into wider war in Asia. . . ."

"Russia arms and trains North Korea's forces . . . Actually, that U.S. request (for Russia to intercede) laid the responsibility

for what happened next in the Pueblo seizure right where it belonged—on Moscow's doorstep."

With Moscow supplying arms and planes to the North Vietnamese Communists and now scheming to involve us in a widening war by stirring up trouble in Korea, it seems strange to be told by such men as the Honorable Dean Rusk and the Honorable Anthony M. Solomon that it is in the interest of mankind to try to make friends with the Communists. As our young men die in Vietnam Solomon and the other Untouchables work hard to finance the economy of the true enemy, the U.S.S.R. and the world Communist Conspiracy.

Help Your Police Fight Crime

HON. ALBERT W. WATSON

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 26, 1968

Mr. WATSON. Mr. Speaker, the spiraling crime rate is like the weather. Everyone complains, but no one seems able to do anything about it. However, a group here in the Nation's Capital is doing something, and from all indications they are meeting with success. I am referring to the campaign entitled "Help Your Police Fight Crime." A survey of any parking lot in the District of Columbia is dramatic proof of the results, since thousands of cars now proudly display a bumper sticker encouraging others to join the campaign.

A good friend, Mr. Bill Stover, is devoting his many talents to this worthy project, and I would like to commend to the attention of the Congress a thought-provoking letter written by Mr. Stover which has reached literally thousands of homes in the Metropolitan Washington area.

The letter follows:

DEAR VICTIM: This is a very personal, very vital *two-page* message which comes to you by form letter—*because* this non-profit, self-supporting cooperative has no paid staff, officers or directors.

Read it well. Then re-read it, again and again, until you really get the message that *action by you and by us all*—is *imperative*—if this Nation is to endure—and if your family, your employees and mine are ever again to enjoy *real safety* on our city streets and in our homes.

You may not have been robbed, roughed-up or rubbed-out, yet, but don't get over-confident. The day isn't over. You could be the next victim. Or it may be your wife, daughter or secretary.

Do you realize that before this time tomorrow, 100 persons will fall prey to criminals, in the District of Columbia alone? One person will either be raped or murdered, 9 criminally assaulted, 15 robbed, 18 film-flammed, 23 automobiles stolen and 38 places burglarized, according to statistics. For, despite repeated pronouncements about making city streets safe, not even the policeman is safe on the streets of Washington today.

And you may be surprised to learn that there are many individuals wearing pants and parading as men—who cower, crawl or straddle on the crime issue because of fear, apathy or misguided politics. God help America if we have reached the sorry state where grown men lack the courage, integrity and gumption to stand up and be counted on the side of law and order before it is too late.

Knowing that crime has its inception in wrong attitudes of mind and heart; and that

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

attitudes are learned and therefore can be unlearned or changed; we have united in a concerted effort to help develop a better psychological climate of respect, restraint and civic responsibility in the community.

Since laws are but the rules by which society lives, and since people make the laws which police must enforce, it would logically follow that people should support and respect their police as the first step in any realistic fight on crime. But respect must be mutual between police and public, for they are inter-dependent. The police and the people must stand up together, or else be knocked off, separately.

To those merchants who ask "How can we help?"—we suggest, You may become a 3-way sponsor, first, by breaking with precedent—as some of the better stores, restaurants, banks, savings & loan associations, etc., are doing—and offer our bumper sticker for sale to employees and customers, strictly as a public service; second, then wear a pair on your personal car or company truck; and third, put your postage meter to work in the fight on crime.

If you share our concern and wish to do your bit, please use the reverse side of this letter in whatever way you deem appropriate. And please remember—time is of the essence.

Sincerely,

"BILL" W. H. M. STOVER.

Congress Must Act Quickly on President Johnson's Proposal To Modernize Visa Requirements for Tourism

HON. HERBERT TENZER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 26, 1968

Mr. TENZER. Mr. Speaker, it is no secret that excessive prescreening of potential foreign visitors to the United States has seriously interferred with our Nation's tourist program.

The fact is that the United States needs a greater influx of tourism to help ease our balance-of-payments situation.

President Johnson is keenly aware of this problem. And last week he submitted to Congress a proposal to modernize and streamline visa requirements for visitor entry into the United States.

I urge my colleagues to act promptly and positively on this important matter. As the President noted:

Under the present system of imposing stringent requirements, we appear to a foreign visitor to be greeting him grudgingly rather than graciously.

There is simply no good reason why we cannot cut down on the redtape and complex procedures that discourage the very visitors we seek to encourage.

Under the new proposal, recommended by the President's special Industry-Government Commission on Travel, regulations would exempt visitors to the United States for 90 days or less from visa requirements. This would be done on the basis of reciprocity; and foreign nationals who have been convicted of a serious crime will continue to be barred; and entering aliens will continue to be examined by the Immigration Service.

Thus, the national security will be protected. And persons entering will be required to have a valid passport, a non-refundable roundtrip ticket, and will not

be allowed to alter their status as visitors.

This new act will allow us to treat travelers from abroad with the kind of hospitality and efficiency that will encourage their visit. And it will also provide protection and safeguards to insure that our foreign tourism program is not abused. The proposed privileges are to be extended to those nationals whose Nation extends the same privileges to Americans traveling to their countries.

This is urgently needed legislation. And it is legislation that is in the vital interests of the United States.

I urge full support for the President's proposal.

Estonian Independence Day

HON. LESTER L. WOLFF

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 26, 1968

Mr. WOLFF. Mr. Speaker, since the end of the Second World War, the cries of anticolonialism have risen to a high pitch throughout most of the world. Yet, paradoxically, few of these voices speak out against Soviet suppression of the Baltic peoples. One constantly hears warnings at the United Nations and elsewhere of the danger of Western "neocolonialism" and "neoimperialism," but the same people who are so worried about this become deathly silent with respect to the most blatant form of colonialism in the 20th century: The snuffing out of the national existence of three independent and free nations that sought only to live in peace with their neighbors. Historians will surely regard this as paradoxical and hypocritical.

Estonian Independence Day, February 16, graphically illustrates the global double standard that so many apply to Western colonialism as compared with Soviet Communist imperialism. Imagine the outcry that would arise if France invaded Algeria and reimposed its rule over that nation. Yet, Algeria has been independent for less than 10 years. Estonia lived in freedom for 22 years, from 1918 to 1940, and served to justify Woodrow Wilson's great doctrine of self-determination. Its death sentence came in the form of the infamous German-Soviet Nonaggression Pact of August 22, 1939, which gave Stalin a free hand in the Baltic area. The Soviet dictator soon demonstrated the ability to use his newly won privileges. Within a year, the Red army had marched into Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania, smashing freedom in its wake.

Since those dark days, many new nations have emerged from the shackles of foreign rule. Estonia remains submerged. Many peoples have experienced a cultural flowering with independence. Estonia's centuries-old culture and strong religious heritage remains suppressed, as Moscow attempts to destroy all vestiges of nationalism and turn the Estonian into its patented vision of the new "Soviet man." Other peoples still living under foreign or alien rule receive strong moral and sometimes material support from the outside world. Few peoples and even

fewer governments uphold the cause of the Baltic peoples.

Estonia today stands as a mark of shame on the world, which will be erased only when that gallant nation receives the freedom for which it has struggled so long and hard.

Three Marylanders Die in Vietnam

HON. CLARENCE D. LONG

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 26, 1968

Mr. LONG of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, Sp4c. Earl Mack, Sgt. Wayne J. Spare, and Stephen H. Miller, three young men from Maryland, were killed recently in Vietnam. I wish to commend the courage of these young men and to honor their memories by including the following article in the RECORD:

THREE MARYLANDERS DIE IN VIETNAM—INCLUDE A SOLDIER, MARINE, FOREIGN SERVICE AIDE

A soldier from the Eastern Shore and a marine from Baltimore were killed in Vietnam last week, the Defense Department announced yesterday. The body of a foreign service officer from Silver Spring, Md., killed in a Viet Cong offensive on Hue, has been found, the State Department said.

Reported dead were:

Spec. 4 Earl Mack, 21, of Cambridge, who died in Vietnam last Thursday.

Marine Sgt. Wayne J. Spare, 20 of the 400 block Hornet street, who had been in Vietnam since February 10, 1967.

Stephen H. Miller, 28, of Silver Spring, who was serving an eighteen-month tour of duty with the United States Information Agency.

Specialist Mack was drafted in March 1967, and received his basic training at Fort Bragg, N.C. He then went to Fort Polk, La., where he received training in guerrilla warfare. After a fourteen-day leave in July, 1967, he was sent to Vietnam.

He served in the infantry, according to his aunt, Mrs. Elsie Hughes, of Cambridge.

Born in Cambridge, he graduated from Mace's Lane High School in 1964 and went to work as a laborer at the Coastal Food Company. He was planning to go to college after his discharge from the Army.

SURVIVORS LISTED

Besides his aunt, his survivors include four sisters, Miss Katharine Mack, Mrs. Shirley Hill and Mrs. Murray Jolley, all of Cambridge, and Mrs. Ella Mae Pruitt, of Boston; and two brothers, Samuel Mack, of Cambridge, and Sylvester Mack, of Philadelphia.

Sergeant Spare was killed by rifle fire February 13 in the vicinity of Quang Nam while on patrol about two weeks before he was scheduled to return home.

He enlisted in 1966 after graduation from Patterson High School. After basic training at Parris Island, S.C., and Camp Lejeune, N.C., he was sent to Vietnam February 10, 1967.

Wounded twice, he rejected an opportunity to return to the United States after his release from Guam Naval Hospital last August and volunteered to return to Vietnam "because he thought he was needed over there," his father, William G. Spare, said yesterday.

Besides his father, Sergeant Spare is survived by his mother, Mrs. Helen L. Hisker, and two brothers, William D. and Kenneth L. Spare, all of Baltimore. He was engaged to Miss Edith Fisher, also of Baltimore.

Mr. Miller had been reported missing by

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

the State Department February 7. The discovery of his body in a shallow grave in a Hue cemetery was reported to his wife Sunday.

Born in State College, Pa., Mr. Miller graduated from Haverford College in 1962. He entered the State Department's foreign service that same year.

FOREIGN SERVICE

He served two years in Frankfurt, West Germany, and one year in Windsor, Ont., before transferring to the Foreign Service language school in Washington to learn Vietnamese.

Sent to Vietnam in July, 1967, he taught reading and hygiene in the villages around Hue. Mr. Miller had been "very encouraged about the work he was doing, although he knew there was a great deal of danger," his father, Paul I. Miller, said yesterday.

Besides his parents, survivors include his wife, the former Gay Wilson; a son, John H. Miller, 5, and two daughters, Ann W. Miller, 4, and Patricia I. Miller, 2, all of Silver Spring; a sister, Sarah I. Miller, of Berea, Ky., and a brother, Phillip Miller, of New Bedford, Mass.

Anniversary of Estonian Independence

HON. WILLIAM L. ST. ONGE

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 8, 1968

Mr. ST. ONGE. Mr. Speaker, the United States is currently being vilified by the Communist press for protecting the right of self-determination of the South Vietnamese people. Yet at the same time Russian imperialism continues unchecked in its flagrant disregard for even the elementary national integrity of the Baltic Nations.

The horror of what this can mean may be seen by the fact that 10,000 Estonian citizens were taken from their homes and sent to Siberia on the single night of June 13, 1941. In the first year of the Soviet invasion of Estonia more than 60,000 people of all classes and ages were killed or deported. When German armies entered Russia, Estonia was occupied and became part of what the Nazis called their "Ostland Province." In 1944 when the Red armed forces pushed the Germans out of their country, they again occupied all of the sovereign territory of Estonia. Before this was completed, 30,000 Estonian refugees were able to escape to Sweden by sea, and a like number fled into Germany. Unfortunately, many thousands died in the Baltic Sea in their haste to avoid the oncoming Russian hordes.

Once the domination of Estonia was completed additional thousands of her citizens were uprooted and transported deep into the Russian heartland. This was a deliberate program on the part of the Soviet imperialists to destroy any expression of opposition to their colonization, and in particular the objections to the collectivization of agriculture.

Mr. Speaker, this year marks the golden anniversary of the declaration of independence of Estonia. We can only feel outrage when contemplating the extent to which this legitimate expression of Estonian liberty has been violated by its totalitarian neighbors. For an all too brief period of time after the declaration

February 27, 1968

of independence the culture and economy of Estonia flourished, only to be stifled by the ruthless might of the Nazi and Soviet armies, and finally crushed under the heel of Russian imperialism.

We must not let the flame of Estonian independence be extinguished, for if one man is denied his freedom the liberty of all men is placed in jeopardy. Let us therefore resolve on this 50th anniversary to strive for the eventual independence of the proud Estonian nation as a worthy tribute to its brave citizens who have endured so much suffering at the hands of tyranny.

Rent Supplements

HON. SAMUEL N. FRIEDEL

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 26, 1968

Mr. FRIEDEL. Mr. Speaker, last week the President submitted to the Congress a very strong message about the crisis in our cities and made numerous recommendations as to how we can help solve these problems, including a vastly expanded rent supplement program.

The need for this particular program cannot be overstated. Uncounted thousands of our citizens living in dilapidated dwellings in our central cities, including my own city of Baltimore, are evidence of the great need to expand our rent supplement program.

Decent housing is a key element in upgrading not only the physical condition of our disadvantaged neighborhoods, but also in renewing the hopes of the poor who reside in them. One very important method of achieving these twin goals is through adequate funding of the rent supplement program which, until now has been minimal. After 2 years of operation, we know this is a successful program—one which holds exciting promise for the future.

Rent supplements is a sound, well thought out program which enlists the cooperation of private enterprise in the planning, construction, or rehabilitation of the housing, and employs private management for the completed dwellings. And, the property remains on the local tax rolls.

Rent supplements is a flexible program whereby a tenant pays one-fourth of his income for rent and the Government pays the difference needed to equal the amount he must pay for decent housing. The Government assistance decreases as the tenant's income increases. Ultimately, the supplement ceases and the tenant pays the full rent.

The President has asked that we authorize 72,500 units under the rent supplement program to provide shelter for almost 250,000 poor Americans. We have started a tremendously valuable program of providing sound housing for the needy and we must not let this program lapse for lack of funds. Rent supplements is a program strongly endorsed by the home building, real estate and insurance industries and we must vote for adequate funds to continue this program.

Before We Tax Travel

HON. JAMES H. (JIMMY) QUILLEN
OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 26, 1968

Mr. QUILLEN. Mr. Speaker, the following editorial, which recently appeared in the Johnson City, Tenn., Press-Chronicle, expresses some of my thoughts about the proposed tax on foreign travel, and I wish to call it to the attention of my colleagues and the readers of the RECORD:

BEFORE WE TAX TRAVEL

The "American abroad" celebrated by Mark Twain, Henry James and Ernest Hemingway may soon be a vanishing species.

The Johnson administration is currently studying a tax on the spending of Americans overseas as one method of slowing the nation's loss of dollars through tourism.

This one ostensibly will be only a temporary emergency measure. In some distant future the ordinary citizen of the United States could regain his cherished right to travel and traditional freedom of movement.

But, as the French say, "nothing is as permanent as the temporary." In government bureaucracy restrictive measures usually become permanent. Indeed, was a tax ever rescinded? Americans are still paying taxes imposed as temporary measures during World War II.

There is hardly any doubt that a tax on travel to Europe, if it is ever imposed, will hurt the less-affluent, especially teachers and students ever eager to acquire a bit more culture.

It will mean little to the well-heeled heavy spenders of the international jet set who will continue to shuttle to the plush cafes and discotheques of Europe and New York.

A tax that only the affluent can pay is a particularly undemocratic way of curbing American urge to travel abroad. A wiser method to stop the drain on the dollar, more in the spirit of American democracy, was suggested by Senate majority leader Mike Mansfield, D-Mont.

Why not, he asked, bring home the 220,000 American soldiers who are still in Europe? Under the protection of the American "nuclear umbrella," the West European nations are now strong enough to defend themselves in a limited war with Russia.

The fact is, of course, that the Russians are too busy with their Red Chinese enemy and their own economic troubles to embark on military adventures in Europe. Moscow's military strategists never relished the idea of a possible conflict on two fronts—in the Far East and West.

NATO still serves as a guarantee against a revival of Russian aggression, but it no longer needs the presence of American divisions in Europe.

Another practical suggestion was made by Prof. Robert Strausz-Hupe, director of the Foreign Policy Institute of the University of Pennsylvania. In his view, a drastic reduction in the swollen staffs of U.S. agencies operating abroad would be an effective measure to cure the ills of the American balance of payments.

The American ambassador to Brazil said recently that his diplomatic mission would not be worse off for a 25 to 40 per cent reduction in manpower.

As Strausz-Hupe pointed out, U.S. missions abroad "team with all kinds of experts who are supposed to render all kinds of services to the respective host countries." Yet such services to the local populace could and should be provided by the indigenous governments at their own expense.

To save some \$500 million, the govern-

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

ment bureaucracy is again encroaching on the American's fast-vanishing rights.

As yet, it seems, the Johnson administration has done little to trim the top-heavy "diplomatic" staffs abroad or bring the American soldiers home from Europe.

Perhaps, Strausz-Hupe suggested, before the physician attempts to cure his patients, he should make every effort to cure himself.

The imposition of a tourist tax is also a two-edged sword since governments threatened with the loss of American tourists are bound to retaliate.

It will certainly stop the flow of young Europeans who have been coming in ever greater numbers to the United States to see with their own eyes what America is really like.—Leon Dennen, Newspaper Enterprise Association.

The Threat of Russia's Rising Strategic Power

HON. JOHN M. ASHBROOK

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 26, 1968

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, many Members of Congress, including myself, have referred to the fine study done last year for the House Armed Services Committee by the American Security Council entitled, "The Changing Strategic Military Balance, United States Versus U.S.S.R."

Although issued last July, this report was so hard hitting and unique that it is still frequently covered in press accounts and maintains a high place among the unclassified documents cited in discussing the questions of U.S. strategic superiority over the Soviet Union.

This report has recently been augmented by other studies and together they form the basis for an article in the February issue of Reader's Digest by John G. Hubbell.

I commend Reader's Digest for bringing this vital problem to the attention of millions of Americans who have the greatest stake in our policies, but who are, for the most part, unaware of the problem.

As Mr. Hubbell states, we have given away our superiority because—

Early in this decade the idea took root at high levels of our government that the Soviet Union had abandoned its goal of World dominion, that continued American military supremacy could only provoke the Soviets and block the building of "bridges of understanding."

The result is that we are dangerously close to being surpassed by the Communists who are concentrating on gaining the lead in the categories of space weapons, ICBM's, an ABM system, and strategic bombers.

The threat of nuclear blackmail by the Soviet Union seems absurd until one reads of the gains which the United States has allowed them to make.

I include at this point the article entitled "The Threat of Russia's Rising Strategic Power," from the Reader's Digest of February 1968:

THE THREAT OF RUSSIA'S RISING STRATEGIC POWER

(NOTE.—According to highly informed sources, the cold war has taken a chilling

new turn: as a result of miscalculations and misconceptions, our shield of nuclear supremacy is slipping from us, and military ascendancy may soon pass to the Soviet Union. Because the hour is late, an informed citizenry must act—now.)

(By John G. Hubbell)

In 1962 the United States had the capability of delivering two and a half to ten times as much nuclear firepower as the Soviet Union. By 1967, the estimate is that the Soviets had drawn roughly equal to us, possibly even ahead in terms of deliverable megatonnage, that is, the explosive power of the warheads. (One megaton equals one million tons of TNT.) Present indications are that the Soviets, with their larger rockets and more powerful warheads, will have a clear lead by 1969, and will open a massive gap by 1971—with the capability to deliver from twice as much to perhaps ten times as much nuclear megatonnage. In other words, the situation by 1971 will be almost exactly the reverse of what it was in 1962, when our strategic supremacy was such that the Soviets had no choice but to accede to our demands during the Cuban missile crisis.

Such was the startling picture presented last summer to Rep. L. Mendel Rivers (D., S.C.), chairman of the House Armed Services Committee by a distinguished panel of 17 military and weapons experts of the American Security Council. Chaired by Gen. Bernard A. Schriever, USAF (Ret.), the officer most responsible for development of our intercontinental-ballistic-missile (ICBM) force, the panel, at Rivers' request, confined itself to a study of unclassified sources, obviously drawing on those it knew to be sound. In 94 grim pages, the panel detailed the decline of American strategic power as against the Soviet Union's visible, across-the-board drive for overwhelming strategic supremacy. They advised that we virtually had forfeited the initiative to the U.S.S.R. in the rapidly accelerating field of military technology.

The experts concluded that there still is time—short, to be sure—to reestablish an American strategic posture that can provide us with freedom to take appropriate action during crises and ensure that this country will prevail should a nuclear attack ever occur. But the panel, noting the long lead times needed for new weapons development and production, warned, "Time is on the side of those who use it."

Last fall, two more authoritative studies appeared. One was *The Soviet Military Technological Challenge*, by an equally distinguished panel¹ at the highly respected Center for Strategic Studies of Georgetown University. The other was *Peace and the Strategy Conflict*,² an impressive book by William R. Kintner, a former member of the Planning Staff of the National Security Council, now deputy director of the University of Pennsylvania's Foreign Policy Research Institute. These two new studies confirmed that unless present trends are quickly reversed the United States seems certain in the 1970's to find itself in a markedly inferior strategic position to the Soviet Union, with possibly disastrous military-political results.

¹ Chaired by Adm. Arleigh Burke, USN (Ret.), former Chief of Naval Operations. Some of the other members: General Schriever; Dr. Harold Agnew, director of the Weapons Division at the Atomic Energy Commission's Los Alamos Scientific Laboratory; Dr. Robert D. Crane, senior staff member, Hudson Institute; Lt. Gen. Arthur Trudeau, former Chief of Research and Development for the Army; and Dr. Thomas Wolfe, professor at George Washington University's Sino-Soviet Institute.

² Published by Frederick A. Praeger.

CALCULATED RISK

What comes through in these studies and from many additional interviews is that early in this decade the idea took root at high levels of our government that the Soviet Union had abandoned its goal of world dominion, that continued American military supremacy could only provoke the Soviets and block the building of "bridges of understanding." Since the Soviets had "mellowed," the United States had a chance to seize the initiative in "stabilizing" the international political climate. The best way to do this would be to exchange U.S. military superiority for U.S.-Soviet military equality. When the Soviets were shown in so dramatic a way that we are not bent on war, and conquest, they would halt their side of the arms race.

This idea was supported strongly by members of the academic community and a few scientists influential at powerful positions in the Defense Department and in the White House. They argued that military technology had reached a "plateau," with no new technological mountains to climb and an inevitable nuclear stalemate.

Against this position was ranged the argument that, however much the United States had hoped that the Soviets had "mellowed," they had not done so in fact. Until concrete evidence was forthcoming that they had abandoned their goal of world dominion—until, for example, they stopped fomenting "wars of national liberation," permitted free elections in captive states and agreed to on-site inspections of their nuclear and space activities—the United States had no choice but to guard jealously its military supremacy. Because no technological "plateau" was in sight, that continued supremacy depended on maintaining a technological lead over the Soviet Union.

In any case, Congress and the public were given no real chance to debate the issue. Says a recently retired senior officer, "For seven years the Defense Department has been deliberately implementing policies whose aim appears to be to achieve only strategic equality with the Soviet Union. The rationale is that this would help bring about a political détente with the Soviets and deescalate the arms race. This policy has not been carried out in the open, but under the guise of a super-efficient cost-effectiveness. The result is that the American people have been cost-analyzed into a dangerous strategic position."

In entering into the 1963 Nuclear Test Ban Treaty barring all aboveground nuclear testing, still hailed by Administration officials as the greatest step yet toward ending the cold war, the United States took what many knowledgeable men regard as a dangerous calculated risk. The Soviets decided to sign the treaty, which permits no on-site inspection, only after completing their 1961-1962 test series, the most extensive and sophisticated ever. In this series they surged far ahead of us in very-high-yield nuclear weapons technology,³ thus the treaty served to safeguard their lead.

The Senate Armed Services Committee's Preparedness Investigating Subcommittee held 29 closed hearings on this treat, taking exhaustive testimony from 19 key witnesses. Significantly, four of the seven members of the subcommittee voted against ratification. Senior officers and nuclear scientists involved believe that had they and the dissenters been able to say publicly what they knew—they could not and still cannot because their information is secret—the Senate might not have ratified the treaty. Moreover, some now insist that, because certain safeguards proposed by the Joint Chiefs of Staff have not been fully kept, it would take a long time—

perhaps too long—for the United States to resume a comprehensive atmospheric nuclear-testing-and-development program, if necessary.

TECHNOLOGY WON'T STAND STILL

The Defense Department's cost-conscious civilian managers long ago decreed that no new weapons-development project may proceed unless a clear-cut military need for it can be demonstrated—i.e., any new American strategic-weapons-development programs must be reactions to innovations by potential enemies. Many promising new projects have been canceled or cut back, and our high-risk, high-payoff military research and development has been stifled. Our major operational strategic weapons systems were already on the drawing boards before this decade began.

"One of the greatest faults of U.S. policymakers," says Dr. Harold Agnew, "is that they seem not to understand that technology never will be stagnant. It will not stand still." Citing a Soviet Defense Ministry document explaining that the U.S.S.R. "is not limiting itself to those military means which the adversary already has," Dr. Agnew says, "We are completely vulnerable to new systems which we have not heard about, but which all of a sudden appear." According to the Georgetown Center study, our gravest danger is that we will be taken by technological surprise. Military technology has reached a point where strategic-weapons breakthroughs which could nullify the strongest existing defense posture are possible. Many authorities argue that our intelligence on the Soviet Union is not good enough, and that we simply do not know enough of Soviet intentions and future technological efforts.

The Soviets are striving to surpass us in these ways:

By establishing the beginning of a space-weapons arsenal. While we have engaged in predominantly nonmilitary space programs, the Soviet effort has been militarily oriented. We have invested some \$30 billion in our national space programs, but, according to the American Security Council panel, less than one-third of it in military programs.

The Defense Department last November had to report that the Soviets, who have violated treaties and agreements whenever it has suited their purposes, could this year put into operation orbital nuclear weapons that could hit us with only three minutes' notice. The Defense Department was "not concerned."

The background to this situation is incredible: In October 1963, a United Nations resolution banned weapons of mass destruction from space. Both the United States and the Soviet Union agreed to comply with this resolution, but subsequently the Soviets noted that the agreement did not ban the development or manufacture of such weapons.

On July 4, 1965, Communist Party boss Leonid Brezhnev said that the Soviets possess orbital rockets. Since September 1966 the Soviets have been carrying out a series of spaceflight tests, and U.S. officials soon deduced that the Soviets were working out techniques for the re-entry of warheads from space vehicles. Inexplicably, we then entered into a formal treaty with the Soviet Union and more than 100 other nations (most of whom would not be competent to do so) not to orbit weapons of mass destruction. The space treaty, like the 1963 test-ban treaty, contains no provision for inspection.

By recently undertaking a rapid expansion of their intercontinental-ballistic-missile force. At the end of 1966 the Soviets had an estimated 340 ICBMs—and, since they have been rapidly expanding this force and have the capability of adding 200 to 404 per year, they may surpass us by late 1969.

The United States in 1971 will continue to have the 1000 land-based ICBMs we have now—Minuteman missiles. The new Minuteman III missiles are to carry several warheads each, which can be guided after launch to separate targets. In addition, they will be stuffed with decoys and other devices to ensure penetration of Soviet defenses. Called MIRV (Multiple Independent Re-entry Vehicles), this concept also is being applied in our undersea ballistic-missile-firing fleet, where Polaris missiles are to be supplemented with a MIRV missile called Poseidon, which may carry up to ten warheads.⁴ It all sounds like a lot of retaliatory striking power. The trouble is that it may not all be there if we ever are forced to retaliate.

According to a British Defense Ministry source, it is widely believed that the Soviets have developed their own MIRV missiles, each of which could release a "shower of H-bombs" (perhaps up to ten). Further, Soviet missiles have the size and their boosters the thrust to carry warheads containing far more nuclear firepower than ours—warheads so powerful that they might be effective against our underground ICBMs. As Kintner points out, missile accuracies constantly are improving, for the Soviets as well as for us, and it is likely that by 1970 the Soviets will be able to drop ICBM warheads within 1500 feet of bull's-eye.

By maintaining and modernizing what is today the world's largest strategic bombardment force. The Soviets have ostensibly agreed with all who insist that the manned bomber is obsolete. Yet, they have a force of 1100 bombers—the largest in the world—which they have been modernizing. Soviet strategists say their bomb force is meant to attack in mop-up fashion, behind an ICBM strike, and they would first launch nuclear missiles from beyond the range of our anti-aircraft defenses.

By last August our nuclear-bomber fleet had shrunk to 635 aircraft (from upwards of 1600 in 1962): 80 supersonic B-58s and 555 aging B-52s. The Joint Chiefs of Staff have been advising the Defense Department and Congress of an increasingly urgent need for an advanced aircraft which would carry at least as heavy a bombload as the B-52, but which would be much superior to it in performance and filled with devices to enable it to thwart present enemy air defenses.

Engineering development for such an advanced bomber has long been ready. Congress has appropriated the funds and urged the Department of Defense (DOD) to proceed. But DOD has persistently refused to act; it sees no need for a new manned bomber. At the same time, it has spent huge sums beefing up later-model B-52s so that they can perform against Soviet air defenses through the mid-1970's. By 1975, General Schriever explains, "The B-52 will represent a nearly 30-year-old technology, and it is difficult to understand how it could by that time be considered an effective strategic weapons system."

Also baffling the Pentagon order for 210 FB-111As for the strategic bombardment force. The FB-111A (a modified version of the TFX, a fighter bomber) will be small, able to carry only a light bombload and an inadequate number of sensing devices and penetration aids, and will require midair refueling for intercontinental range.

Hence, despite its protestations, DOD seems to agree that we will need a manned bomber force. If so, we ought to be building a modern bomber force designed specifically for the strategic mission.

According to the American Security Council Panel, one of the main reasons the Pentagon has refused to order a new manned bomber is that the whole idea of a manned bomber force is considered "provocative"—to keep such a force from being wiped out by an enemy missile strike, it would have to be launched before enemy missiles arrived in the United States. The Pentagon worries that this smacks of a first-strike strategy.

³ For instance, the Soviets must know—and we, since we have not tested in the very-high-yield field, can only guess—what effect tremendous bursts of hot X rays from super-megaton shots in space would have on incoming ICBMs.

⁴ See "Poseidon—New Chapter in Missleery," Reader's Digest, January '68.

and we must do all we can to convince the Soviets that we never would strike first.

By developing an anti-ballistic-missile (ABM) system. In late 1966, the Administration revealed that the Soviets have been widely deploying ABM defenses. Many strategists find it difficult to believe the Soviets would be investing in so hugely expensive an undertaking without high confidence that their system is effective or can be made effective by an aggressively advancing Soviet ABM technology. Indeed, the Georgetown Center suggests that it could be well within Soviet technological capabilities to produce a system whereby a network of artificial space satellites could track our ICBMs during their boost phase, so that ABM missiles could be launched to kill our missiles before the decoys and warheads got a chance to separate from the boosters.

Moreover, the Soviets' offensive force—their first-strike ICBMs and orbital bombs—could be part and parcel of their ABM capability. The electromagnetic radiations from their very-high-yield blasts might disrupt our command-control communications by burning out circuits and fusing wires together, thus immobilizing our strike-back missiles.

For nearly a year, the U.S. response to the Soviet ABM deployment was to try to talk them out of it, an effort which is continuing but which thus far has proved unsuccessful. Last September, it was announced that we will build a limited ABM defense. Its primary purpose, we are told, will be to defend against the kind of modest ICBM attack Red China will be able to launch by 1972 or 1973.

The Administration emphasized that it has no intention of building a full-scale ABM defense, the explanation being that this would only force the Soviets to devise new ways to penetrate with their offensive forces. At the same time, the Secretary of Defense said, "They have been building up their strategic missile forces. We had no choice but to take some additional steps to maintain the adequacy of our own deterrent."

Thus, since we have been unable to argue the Soviets out of deploying an ABM defense, we are to deploy one designed to blunt an attack from Red China, one reason being that the Soviets are expanding their strategic missile force. Such woolly rationalizing is difficult to follow. The fact is that the ABM field is one wherein major breakthroughs are possible and where we, with our still substantial leads on the Soviets in advanced electronics and computer technologies, still could achieve superiority. Since the evidence warrants our entry into this field, we would be well advised to work as rapidly as possible toward breakthroughs which will give us the best possible ballistic-missile defense against all potential enemies.

Apart from provoking the Soviets, reluctance to proceed with a full-scale ABM system was based on the military axiom that the best defense is a good offense. Our military leaders agree—provided the United States plans a good offense for the future. "But we haven't done this for the past six or seven years," says Schriever. "The Defense Department has refused to give the nation the best offensive deterrent to Soviet aggression. We are placing ourselves in a position where the Soviets might be able to make cold, hard calculations about the possibility of knocking out our offensive capability with a surprise attack. This position should be unacceptable to all of us."

THE DECISION IS OURS

The American Security Council and Georgetown Center studies and the Kintner book, and indeed, the Soviets themselves make it clear that the U.S.S.R. has no intention of settling for "mutual deterrence," but is aiming instead for military supremacy; in fact, the evidence has become so ominously convincing that we must worry about the years just ahead.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

Leading Soviet strategists time and again publicly have insisted that victory in nuclear war will go to the side that is best prepared to wage nuclear war, and that the Soviet Union is so preparing itself; and Kintner finds that the Soviets lay great stress on the value of a preemptive surprise attack—with no formal declaration of war. Moreover, says Kintner, America will be their main adversary.

It was inevitable that the Soviets, having mastered their own nuclear and missile technologies, would gain on us. It is not inevitable that they achieve supremacy. But, should they score breakthroughs in the offensive or defensive technologies we know that they are developing, or come up with highly reliable new strategic systems we have not yet heard of, it could overnight shift the balance of strategic power to the Soviet Union. Even if this did not mean that the Soviets would launch a nuclear war against us—a possibility that no longer should be considered remote—the Georgetown Center spells out what we surely could expect: a far more aggressive Soviet foreign policy; U.S. concessions on many issues long in contention; a greatly inhibited U.S. response to communist-inspired wars of liberation; greater support for the Soviet Union from nonaligned nations. In short, it would mean an end to the cold war, with victory to the Soviet Union.

Congress is charged by the Constitution with the maintenance of the armed forces, and for years the armed-services committees of Congress have been pleading with the Defense Department to proceed with the development of the strategic-weapons technologies that our military professionals and all logic insist must be developed. But the Defense Department has consistently refused to act. Congress' armed-services committees need the support of an informed American public. The decision to retain military supremacy still rests with the people—but the hour is very late.

New Communities in the Nation's Future

HON. JAMES KEE

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 26, 1968

Mr. KEE. Mr. Speaker, while older cities "just grew," like Topsy, a new community does not. It is a planned, carefully programmed development which provides more homes, stores, and jobs. It can be built on the edge of a metropolitan area, on a bypassed tract within an existing city or on the site of an existing small town.

The President's proposal will aid the development of hope for crowded urban dwellers and for those who are forced to move because of urban development or renewal projects. New communities can provide additional housing in a Nation that sorely needs more housing. They can offer opportunities for effective land use and for the preservation of natural resources. They can provide the showcases for the products and skills of modern science and technology in such fields as housing construction, recreation, landscaping, and public facilities development. They can present us with the golden opportunity to take a new direction in urban development.

The President has called the attention of all to the plight of our Nation's cities. On the one hand, there is creeping blight and deterioration. On the other hand, there are the fruits of ill-planned or unplanned development.

The New Communities Act is a program that provides Federal guarantees for loans to make new community development a realistic investment for the private developer. There is relatively little additional Federal financial involvement. Also it will provide incentives for cooperation to local, public agencies through existing loan and grant programs.

The Nation cannot afford to miss this chance. And, we in Congress, cannot overlook this opportunity to do something about the plight of our cities. Let us support the President's proposal.

Letter to a Captured Pilot

HON. WILLIAMSON S. STUCKEY

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 26, 1968

Mr. STUCKEY. Mr. Speaker, Freedoms Foundation of Valley Forge has awarded Capt. John Duncan Williams, Jr., one of its top Freedom Awards.

Captain Williams received the George Washington Honor Medal for a letter he wrote to a captured pilot.

Captain Williams is assigned as an action officer with the Public Information Division, Secretary of the Air Force Office of Information. In this capacity he is responsible for assisting news media representatives with matters relating to coverage of air operations in Southeast Asia.

The people of the Eighth District of Georgia which it is my privilege to represent are extremely proud of Captain Williams' accomplishments and of his service to our country.

Captain Williams was born in Fitzgerald, Ga. I had the honor of attending the University of Georgia with him. He is both a graduate of the university and of Boston University. Commissioned through the AFROTC in 1955, Captain Williams served on active duty until 1957 when he entered the inactive Reserves.

He was recalled to active duty in 1961 and was assigned to duty as an information officer with the 113th Tactical Fighter Squadron at Hulman Field, Ind. In 1962 he became 831st Division director of information at George Air Force Base, Calif. He earned a master of science in public communications via Operation Bootstrap before leaving George Air Force Base for duties as director of information, Cam Ranh Bay Air Force Base, Republic of Vietnam. After a 1-year tour in Vietnam, he returned to the continental United States for his present assignment.

Among his decorations are the Bronze Star Medal with "V" Device, First Oak Leaf Cluster to the Bronze Star Medal, the Air Medal, and the Air Force Outstanding Unit Award.

Captain Williams' award-winning letter reads as follows:

LETTER TO A CAPTURED PILOT

CAMP OF DETENTION,
Captured U.S. Pilots,

Care of: Hanoi Post Office.

DEAR BOB: I know that Hanoi censors or stops delivery on most of your mail, but if

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

there's any chance at all that this letter might get through, it's worth the effort.

No doubt the Hanoi Communists tell you every day about all that's going wrong in the United States—street riots, peace marches, hawk-dove feuds, the hippie movement and so on.

There is probably an element of truth in what they say but I don't think they're telling it like it really is. That's why I'm writing—to try to set the record straight.

First of all, it's not all a "bed of roses" here—there are plenty of thorns. These riots in the city ghettos are pretty bad. In the last year several thousand rioters disrupted ten cities and, of course, received a great deal of press coverage. I'm sure Hanoi told you about each riot. But almost 200 million Americans in ten thousand cities didn't riot. They earned their livings, went to church, voted, paid taxes, pursued their studies and maybe enjoyed a ball game or a concert. They didn't get a lot of attention. Good citizenship is still so commonplace in this country that it doesn't rate headlines.

A lot, too, has been said about the fierce debates between "hawk" and "dove." But if Hanoi thinks our country is really deeply split, they're badly mistaken. If Ho Chi Minh thinks he can find support or sympathy in either camp, he's just pipe dreaming.

It's just that there is honest disagreement on how to pursue our country's best interests.

It will probably never dawn on the Hanoi people that in this democracy you can disagree without being disloyal or that dissent is both a right and a duty of our citizens.

Hanoi has probably told you that the drug-ridden hippie movement typifies the decadence of the American people. Sure, the handful of real hippies are weird and just as bizarre as they appear in all the magazines and newspapers. They make colorful copy but so did the goldfish swallowers, the "zoot suiters" and the beatniks who all had their moment then faded and passed, leaving the fabric of American society about as they found it.

I know you've heard about the big "peace" march on the Pentagon. One of the leaders of the march, a man, incidentally, generally thought to be intelligent, described the marchers as "thoughtful, dedicated, courageous young Americans." What a joke!

Maybe he referred to the thoughtful way they smashed windows, their dedicated marijuana smoking or their courageous manner of spouting foulmouthed slogans and waving their Viet Cong flags!

If they've told you that you are a "forgotten man" and that your government doesn't care what happens to you, well, that's just so much hogwash. Every day people in the highest levels of our government apply concentrated effort to get you released or exchanged.

Someday they'll find a way.

I think that all these Americans I've been talking about—the solid citizens, the hippies, the dissenters—realize in one way or another that you and our other men there are paying a high price for their right to be weird or different or whatever they want to be. Most, I'm sure, are grateful. The other day a fighter pilot volunteered to go back to Southeast Asia because, he said, "I owe it to our guys in Hanoi."

No one has forgotten.

I guess what I've been trying to say is that this country, our United States, is still worth fighting for, worth dying for, and, perhaps most important, worth living for.

JOHN.

Yes, Mr. Speaker, we are proud of Captain Williams, the father of two daughters, and the husband of Amelia Griner, of Ocilla, Ga.

It is probable, as we all know, that Captain Williams' letter never reached his friend, and that is a sad thing. How-

ever, I believe that each and every one of us deep down can profit from the reading of his letter.

Captain Williams has put into words what I often feel. I am proud that he is an American citizen, a Georgian, and a native Eighth District citizen.

The Wall Street Journal Looks at Vietnam

HON. WILLIAM F. RYAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 26, 1968

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Speaker, the Wall Street Journal of February 23 printed a remarkable editorial entitled "The Logic of the Battlefield." This potent editorial raises some basic issues about the nature of the war in Vietnam which seem to have escaped our policymakers. The editorial states:

We believe the Administration is duty-bound to recognize that no battle and no war is worth any price, no matter how ruinous, and that in the case of Vietnam it may be failing for the simple reason that the whole place and cause is collapsing from within.

In other words, the charge of "peace at any price?" may be answered with the question—"war at any price?"

All wars have political objectives. When a war's cost has exceeded its political objective, an agonizing reappraisal is required.

The venerable Wall Street Journal is facing up to some hard realities that the administration has ignored too long.

The editorial follows:

[From the Wall Street Journal, Feb. 23, 1968]

REVIEW AND OUTLOOK: The LOGIC OF THE BATTLEFIELD

We think the American people should be getting ready to accept, if they haven't already, the prospect that the whole Vietnam effort may be doomed; it may be failing apart beneath our feet. The actual military situation may be making academic the philosophical arguments for the intervention in the first place.

Granted, there is an opposite theory, the "last gasp" notion that the weeks-long wave of assaults on cities and hamlets is the enemy's final outburst before greatly decreasing the war's intensity and coming to the bargaining table. Perhaps it will turn out that way, but right now the evidence does not lend the theory much support.

Hanoi is believed to have relatively large numbers of troops still uncommitted in North Vietnam. The Communists appear to be getting ample supplies of weapons from the Soviet Union and Red China. As long as the arms keep coming and there are Vietnamese Communists to use them, you would suppose they could keep up the struggle more or less indefinitely. Thus far, at least, they are showing with a vengeance their ability to sow destruction and demoralization everywhere.

Meantime the present South Vietnamese government, never very impressive, looks worse and worse. Most important, the government can't protect the people even in the heart of the cities. The Saigon-U.S. effort to secure villages and woo villagers to the government side has been brought to a halt. This is a government and a nation in chaos; how long can it go on? The failing, it should be stressed, is not in U.S. will or valor, but

February 27, 1968

basically in something lacking in Vietnam itself.

As for the U.S. military undertaking, the current tactic is sad to see: The wholesale destruction of towns and cities in order to "save" them, killing or making homeless refugees out of thousands more civilians. While it is certainly true that an American commander has to destroy a building or a town if he considers it necessary for his soldiers' safety, the scale on which it is going on is hardly endearing the U.S. or Saigon to the populace.

Hence the question: Are developments on the ground making hash of our original, commendable objectives?

The U.S. went in to keep South Vietnam out of Communist hands. But no matter what our forces do, they can't seem to do that. If practically nothing is to be left of government or nation, what is there to be saved for what?

The U.S. also went in to demonstrate to Communist China that it couldn't get away with this kind of indirect aggression and that it hadn't better try direct aggression either. But the Communists are getting away with it; they are putting the mighty U.S. through a wringer, and they may be encouraged to try more of it.

Should such be the upshot, that the U.S. abandons the effort not because it "should" do so but because its purposes have become irrelevant in the light of events on the battlefield and of Vietnamese politics, let no one blink the fact that it will be a disaster. It will be a stunning blow to the U.S. and the West in the larger struggle with international communism. At home it will be a traumatic experience to have lost a war in which thousands of Americans died in vain.

The only thing is that continuing in circumstances so unprepossessing could be a worse disaster. If it had in fact been possible for the U.S. to intervene three years ago and accomplish, at reasonable cost, the objective of saving South Vietnam, it probably would have been well worth doing. But since it seems increasingly doubtful that the original purposes can any longer be achieved, the logic of the battlefield suggests that the U.S. could get forced out of an untenable position.

We don't know that the possibility is being squarely faced in Washington; it seems rather unlikely. The Administration insists that the Communist drives are failing of their aims, which Senator Fulbright describes as "wholly irrational, a fantastic analysis." President Johnson seems more firmly committed to Vietnam than ever.

Now stubbornness up to a point is a virtue, but stubbornness can also go beyond the realm of reasonableness. We believe the Administration is dutybound to recognize that no battle and no war is worth any price, no matter how ruinous, and that in the case of Vietnam it may be failing for the simple reason that the whole place and cause is collapsing from within.

Conceivably all this is wrong; conceivably the Communists are on the brink of defeat and genuine peace talks are about to begin. It doesn't look that way, and as long as it doesn't everyone had better be prepared for the bitter taste of a defeat beyond America's power to prevent.

Estonian Independence

HON. ROBERT TAFT, JR.

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 26, 1968

Mr. TAFT. Mr. Speaker, on Saturday, February 24, 1968, Americans of Estonian descent observed the 50th anniversary of

the Declaration of the Independence of the Estonian Republic. The joy that would normally accompany such an occasion was missing, however. For the past 28 years, Estonia has been subjugated under Communist oppression.

The history of Russia's domination of the Baltic States is well known. It is condemned by all of the free nations of the world. It has, in fact, never been recognized by the United States.

Mr. Speaker, along with many of my colleagues, I join in expressing the wish that Estonia and her sister Baltic State countries will soon walk in the light of freedom.

Fannie Hurst Is Not Dead

HON. LESTER L. WOLFF

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 26, 1968

Mr. WOLFF. Mr. Speaker, I wish to call to the attention of my colleagues and all peoples concerned with freedom and compassion the passing of a truly great and concerned humanitarian, Miss Fannie Danielson Hurst. It was my personal pleasure and privilege to have been the executive producer of the popular "Fannie Hurst" TV program mentioned in the following New York Times article of Saturday, February 24. Those who worked close to this great American lady felt the greatness and strength of her being. Her dedication to her country, her principles and desire and active aid to her fellow man and all of God's creatures is a monument that can never die. I commend all to read the following New York Times story which only skims the width and breadth of her crusade for better living and understanding among all men:

FANNIE HURST, POPULAR AUTHOR OF ROMANTIC STORIES, DIES AT 78

Fannie Hurst, the American short-story writer and novelist whose romances captivated millions, died after a brief illness in her triplex apartment at the Hotel des Artistes, 1 West 67th Street. She was 78 years old.

The author of "Back Street," "Great Laughter" and "Anitra's Dance" was active at her typewriter until her final illness. Only a few weeks ago she turned in two finished manuscripts to her literary agent, Perry Knowlton, president of Curtis Brown, Ltd. One was untitled and the other she called "Lonely Is Only a Word." Miss Hurst's last published novel, "Fool, Be Still," appeared in 1964.

A gifted salonnier who enjoyed the company of celebrities, Miss Hurst was equally at ease with the unsophisticated, for whose emotional crises she displayed great tenderness and understanding. It was largely from the experiences of these friends that she fashioned the heart-throbbing love stories that were read under every hair-dryer in America.

The greatest Fannie Hurst love story, however, was the true-life romance of the writer and her husband, Jacques S. Danielson. She brought about her marriage with the pianist against her family's opposition, maintained it in secrecy from 1915 to 1920, nurtured it with rare tact until her husband's death in 1952 and thereafter continued to feel so close to his spirit that she addressed a weekly letter to him for the rest of her own life.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

Such delicacy of feeling as she showed in marriage was not a quality attributed to her by literary critics. She was frequently called "the sob sister" of American letters. A generation of literature students made fun of her use of clichés and awkward words even while millions of readers, especially women, enjoyed everything she wrote.

Kenneth McCormick, vice president and editor in chief of Doubleday & Co., her editor from 1958 on, said of her recently:

"She is basically a fairly corny artist. We all know people who write beautifully and can't tell a story worth a damn. She is a really wonderful storyteller."

The storytelling gift, the popularity with women readers and the wisdom shown in her marriage all came from a common element. Warm-hearted herself, she had a sensitivity about the emotions of other people. This manifested itself in civic and charitable activities of many kinds and most of all in the love story of the Danielsons.

A variance in age and background stood between them when they first met. Mr. Danielson, a handsome man of the world in his mid-30's, was the assistant to the noted concert pianist Rafael Josephy. His father had been court sculptor for the Czar of Russia but, growing fearful because of the pogroms there, had brought his son to the United States when the boy was 16. The pianist never forgot that in his youth he had seen fellow Jews spat upon in Russia.

BORN IN OHIO

Miss Hurst was in her early 20's. Born in Hamilton, Ohio, on Oct. 18, 1889, she had grown up in St. Louis as an only child after the death of a sister at the age of 4. Her father, Samuel Hurst, who came from Mississippi, owned a shoe factory. Her mother, who was Rose Koppel, came from an Ohio family.

The parents were Jewish, but Mr. Hurst felt that the family had to be extra careful not to go in for any display that would set them apart from other people. Mrs. Hurst had a low opinion of Russian Jews. Young Fannie suffered embarrassment that her Jewish background seemed to set her off from schoolmates.

She was bedeviled, too, by the feeling that she was too fat. Fighting against chubbiness, she played basketball and engaged in other athletics in high school and at Washington University in St. Louis, but she remained sensitive on this subject. It worried her when she came to know her beloved Jack, as she called him, at a Michigan spa and later in New York.

He was profoundly educated in music, she knew nothing of it. She worked incessantly at writing, he regarded her stories with casual interest. He worried about the difference in their ages and the prospect, which developed while they were getting to know each other, that she would earn more money than he, but she swept these considerations aside and proposed marriage.

When he at length gave in, she went to St. Louis and was subjected to an all-night denunciation of the proposed marriage during which her uncles and aunts were dragged in to support her parents. Out of a sense of duty to her parents, she telegraphed her Jack that a postponement was necessary.

He reacted by avoiding her for eight weeks until she went to his apartment and induced him to go to Lakewood, N.J., for a secret marriage. She telephoned the news to her parents. Cold at first, they came to accept the situation and suggested that the secrecy be ended, but Miss Hurst sensed that the marriage had more chance of working if her husband and she were to lead separate lives while also having a life together.

SEPARATE APARTMENTS

For the five years they kept their secret, living in separate apartments, following their own careers, having their own circles of

friends and stealing off together as if they were illicit lovers. Miss Hurst, when she suggested this conduct to her husband, used a phrase that might have come from one of her romances: "We'll keep the dew on the rose."

The secrecy ended in 1920 when Paul Degan, an Associated Press reporter, discovered records of the marriage in Lakewood. He telephoned, and Miss Hurst confessed the truth. She told of the separate apartments. He asked, "You mean, you never meet for breakfast?"

Her phrase for the marriage came to mind. "Oh, two or three times a week," she said. "Our way of keeping the dew on the rose." The phrase enchanted people around the world, and she did not hear the end of it for many years.

CAREER WOMAN'S PROBLEM

Once the news of the marriage got out, she encountered more and more occasions calling for tact in dealing with her husband. He was a gifted musician who hated public appearances and made his career mostly in teaching. She became known as a vastly successful writer. She had to shield him from being treated as "Mr. Hurst."

She avoided any pressure on him to accompany her on occasions when she would overshadow him. Mrs. Franklin D. Roosevelt asked her to join the inner circle of friends who sat with the then Governor of New York on the night in 1932 that he was elected President. Mr. Danielson declined and his wife, understanding the workings of his mind, went alone to spend election night at Hyde Park.

In 1958, six years after her husband's death, the novelist told of her concern for his feelings in her autobiography, "Anatomy of Me: A Wonderer in Search of Herself," published by Doubleday. One of her observations was: "Every career woman with a private-life mate is faced with this problem in one form or another: the dignity of her male."

One of the things that she did was to turn all her business affairs over to her husband. She tried to learn from him about music and gave up only when he recognized her lack of aptitude for the subject and tapered off the instruction. She got back from him, in return for her love and her sensitivity about his feelings, love and gay companionship. He died saying, "Don't leave me . . . don't leave me."

Every Monday morning in the years after his death—Monday being the day he had died—she wrote a chatty note addressed to him. Frequently, she used a simple Fannie Hurst phrase: "We had it nice."

Miss Hurst made a financial success at writing in her 20's, in the years just before her marriage in 1915. However, success came only after much effort. She told friends that her rejection slips could stretch all the way from New York, where she was writing when prosperity came to her, to St. Louis, where she began to try to sell stories to magazines at the age of 14.

Writing at home with her well-meaning but not exactly helpful mother around was not easy. Mrs. Hurst would stand in the doorway of her daughter's room and comment, "You just sit. You don't write. If I had such a terrible time over something I did not have to do, I would quit." But Miss Hurst persevered, attacking an old standard typewriter with ferocity when the words came to her.

DECISION ON CAREER

Before she turned into a professional writer, she had to harden herself against the feelings of her parents and establish herself in New York. She discovered that her sympathies were stirred by the great mass of the people of New York and that the people were individuals.

She worked briefly and ineptly as a waitress at Child's and as a salesgirl in Macy's, went regularly to Night Court, spent days at Ellis

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

Island with the immigrants and roamed the Lower East Side. Characters out of the life she saw appeared in her stories.

Day after day, she pounded the old typewriter for six hours, mailed out her stories and just as regularly got them back. Finally, there were comments in the margin of returned stories, phrases like "Good try," and then sales began. When one of her stories appeared in The Saturday Evening Post, demand for her work began and magazines bought stories of hers that they had previously rejected.

Prices for her work shot up. The Saturday Evening Post paid her \$1,200 for a story, Metropolitan \$1,400 and Cosmopolitan, under Ray Long, editor, began to give her \$5,000 a story and later raised that.

COMMANDING TOP PRICES

Newspapers around the country came to refer to Miss Hurst as the highest-paid short-story writer in America. She herself considered this a legend when such authors as Willa Cather and Edna Ferber were writing, not to forget Somerset Maugham, whose stories were appearing in American magazines. She certainly did command prices near the top, with Cosmopolitan paying her \$70,000 for the serial rights to the novel "Back Street" and Liberty giving her \$50,000 for a novelette in a prize contest.

The description of highest-paid short-story writer gave her an uneasy feeling. She never considered that she had a literary rating with such writers as Sinclair Lewis and Theodore Dreiser, and she was so impressed by Miss Cather that she was tongue-tied with her even when invited to her home in Greenwich Village. Striving for literary recognition, she tried writing novels.

When Miss Hurst started a novel called "Lummox," which appeared in 1923, her mother weighed in by mail with her usual comments: "What are you writing that takes so long? Isn't there more money in short stories than in such slow novels?" Miss Hurst plodded on with this story about an orphan servant girl, and it became her own favorite of all her work.

The story began:

"Nobody quite knew just what Baltic blood flowed in sullen and alien rivers through Bertha's veins—or cared, might be added. Bertha, least of all. She was five feet nine and a half, of flat-breasted bigness, and her cheek-bones were pitched like Norn's. Little tents. There must have been a good smattering of Scandinavian, and even a wide streak of western Teutonic. Slav, too. Because unaccountably she found herself knowing the Polish national anthem. Recognized it with her heart as it rattled out of a hurdy-gurdy."

That was pure Fannie Hurst—a story about an unprepossessing heroine made important by the intense interest of the author. Miss Hurst's stories were not all of one type, however, ranging by her own listing through "realistic, romantic, tragic, buoyant or grim."

The plot of her popular novel "Back Street" (1930), for example, instead of being about a poor girl's life, was about the secret love of an apparently happily married man; the unmarried woman in the case followed the couple wherever they traveled and privately saw her lover and, in the end, when he died sat in discreet sorrow in the back of the church.

Miss Hurst's hundreds of short stories and 30 books came from her observations of many individuals in all walks of life. One thing was certain, as her mother told everyone she met, "She does not get it from home."

Literary critics often jumped with both feet on her writing, as when K. S. Kosin wrote that at her worst her work was "a glorified True Confessions story." Sterling North commented that her writing "flows like the Mississippi—wide, deep and rather muddy."

But the note struck by critics was often that of Wilbur Watson in The New York Times: "The pulse of life is always there."

Some of her stories were made into films that proved popular, even though critics did not join in the praise. Her novel, "Imitation of Life," which was about mother love, home versus business, and racial complications, was made into a film in 1934 with Claudette Colbert and again in 1959 with Lana Turner. The New York Times film critic described it the first time as "the most shameless tear-jerker of the fall" and 25 years later Bosley Crowther, in turn, called it "the most shameless tear-jerker in a couple of years."

It is impossible to determine how much money Miss Hurst made, in the opinion of Mr. McCormick, and others in the book world. When her husband died, he left her \$423,580, some of which probably had been her own earnings. She once discovered that a reporter for a press association had written an advance obituary about her in which he stated that she had made more money writing than any other woman.

"I like that," she told him. "That is true."

Because of her constant worry about being fat, Miss Hurst was always dieting. Linked with that fear was her habit of getting up at 5:30 A.M. and walking around the perimeter of much of Central Park before breakfast. She had natural good looks, with dark hair always drawn back in a bun, and most people took her anxiety about her weight in a light way as contrasted with her seriousness.

Marvin McIntyre, one of President Roosevelt's secretaries, used to tell a story in the nineteen-thirties about Miss Hurst. She had been on a reducing cure just before being invited to be a guest at the White House, and she arranged with Mr. McIntyre to be slipped into the President's office so that she might astound him with the change in her appearance.

President Roosevelt looked up curiously as she suddenly appeared, motioned to her to make a slow turn around in front of him and then commented, "The Hurst may have changed, but it's the same old fanny." Miss Hurst was always mortified at this slang word and she spoke bitterly about her mother for the choice she made of a name for her daughter, between Beulah and Fannie, Miss Hurst observed, "No one ever sat on her beulah."

CHARITABLE ACTIVITIES

Miss Hurst's interest in the poor and forlorn of New York, which probably was actuated in part by a search for material in her early days, developed through the years into a wide concern for social and charitable activities. It was characteristic that she got to know the Roosevelts by writing a message of approval to Mrs. Roosevelt for suggesting that domestic workers should organize.

Some of the organizations that Miss Hurst aided were the New York Urban League, United Neighborhood Houses, the Heckscher Foundation, the Russell Sage Foundation, the American Cancer Society, the Federation of Jewish Philanthropies, Hadassah and the Albert Einstein College of Medicine of Yeshiva University. Miss Hurst gave this institution \$360,000 for cardio-vascular research in memory of her husband.

Miss Hurst also found time to crusade for antivivisection legislation, civil rights, workmen's compensation and slum clearance. She conducted a five-day-a-week television program and on several occasions told stories to children at the Hans Christian Andersen statue in Central Park. Her trademark was a calla lily, which she associated with peace and beauty and which was always a part of any costume she wore.

A funeral service for Miss Hurst will be held Thursday at 1 P.M. at Frank E. Campbell's, Madison Avenue and 81st Street.

February 27, 1968

Commendation of Maj. John W. Kearns

HON. G. ELLIOTT HAGAN

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 26, 1968

Mr. HAGAN. Mr. Speaker, during the years I have been privileged to serve as a Member of Congress I have received numerous and diversified correspondence from the good people of the First Congressional District of Georgia. On occasion, however, a letter is received which somehow stands apart from the others and such a one signed by the solicitor general emeritus, the mayor, the judge of city court, the chief of police, and nearly 100 other residents of Ludowici, Ga., paying tribute to one of their own citizens was sent to me recently.

It is with considerable pride and much pleasure that I join the citizens of Ludowici in recognition and commendation of Maj. John W. Kearns for his outstanding community spirit and his exemplary behavior as a member of the Armed Forces of the United States.

The letter follows:

CITY OF LUDOWICI,
Ludowici, Ga., February 1, 1968.
Hon. G. ELLIOTT HAGAN,
Member of Congress,
First Congressional District of Georgia,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN HAGAN: We the undersigned citizens of Ludowici and Long County take great pleasure in expressing our appreciation to you for the efforts of one of the members of the armed forces, in behalf of this community. As a ranking member of the House Armed Forces Committee, we are sure that you are keenly interested in the constructive activities of a member of the military.

Major John W. Kearns, Department of Primary Fixed Wing Training, USAAVNS, Fort Stewart, Ga. has been a resident of this city since February 1967. During this period Major Kearns has devoted great effort and energy to the betterment of this community, through his unselfish efforts.

Early after his arrival in Ludowici, he proceeded to organize and take a major part in a very effective youth athletic program, which has had great success. Providing coaching and a substantial monetary contribution Major Kearns' Little League Baseball Team, was very effective, and had about 20 boys in participation. His next endeavor was the organization of Little League Football. Working tirelessly as a coach, Major Kearns entered the local team in the Fort Stewart Little League Football Conference. This activity did much to promote a spirit of neighborhood between our community and the post. Over 50 of our boys benefited greatly from the Football Program.

At present, Major Kearns is directing a basketball program in which over 100 boys and girls of the community are participating. This program is enjoying great success, because of the devoted and unselfish efforts of this outstanding young officer. We are sure that these programs will have a long lasting effect on our young people because of Major Kearns' example and teaching of sportsmanship and good citizenship.

Additionally, Major Kearns is a devoted family man who is active in the Ludowici Methodist Church. At present he is teaching the Young Adult Sunday School Class, and has greatly furthered the activities of the Church.

We the undersigned feel that the tireless and devoted efforts of this young officer are worthy of special recognition.

Sincerely yours,

Ralph L. Dawson, Solicitor General Emeritus; J. W. Godfrey, Mayor, City of Ludowici; Richard Phillips, Judge, City Court; R. L. Bally, Chief of Police, Ludowici, Ga.; W. H. Trapnell, J.P., Ludowici; Alta D. Trapnell, School Teacher; George W. Kuntz, Sulla R. Kuntz, Roy L. Miller, Mrs. Roy L. Miller, Teacher, Mother of a little leaguer and fan; Mr. and Mrs. Hugh Gordon, Alma S. Mitcham.

Mr. and Mrs. Gordon Ballance, R. H. Smith, city policeman; Tom A. Morris, city policeman; Betty R. Morris, deputy clerk, superior court; Martin H. Taulbee, teacher, Ludowici High School; Eugene Caison, M. F. Futch, Jr., county forest ranger; Mrs. M. F. Futch, Jr., C. C. Wilkinson, Sr., James Wilkinson. Mrs. Nettie Taulbee, Joan C. Warren, Jay Wingate, coach; Ann E. Parker, Chalmers S. Wheeler, Jean Wheeler, James E. Parker, Jr., Billy Wingate, Catherine Wilkinson, William E. Wilkinson, Mrs. Mary Wills, Mrs. Johnny Gordon, E. T. Simmons, Leslie G. Mitcham (sheriff of Long County).

Tommy Gomers, Sarah Crews, Julia Y. Mitcham, Mr. and Mrs. Norman Mock, Mr. Albert Manning, Colette's Beauty Shop—Colette B. Manning, Nan H. Ellis, Mr. and Mrs. Paul Williamson, Mr. and Mrs. J. K. Hendrix, Jr., Mrs. E. S. McGowan, Mr. and Mrs. Carlton McGowan, Thomas R. Hall.

E. S. McGowan, Deputy Sheriff; Mrs. Matilda Hall, D. C. Combs, Bill Horton, Mr. and Mrs. Hiram Stanley, Mr. and Mrs. Ernest Moulden, Mrs. Sarah Bennett, Miss Rose Baggs, Mr. and Mrs. William Smith, Mrs. George Brown, Mr. George Brown, Mrs. Clyde Howard, Clyde Howard.

Mr. and Mrs. Thomas D. Houston, Mr. and Mrs. Ira Harris, Raymond A. Fulcher, coach, varsity girls' basketball; Kenneth E. DuBose, coach, varsity boys' baseball; Mrs. Doris Billings, Mr. Zip Billings, Mr. and Mrs. Howell Dawson, Mr. and Mrs. Tiniker Gordon, Mrs. Cora Boyd, Mr. and Mrs. Keyton Ryals, J. H. Manning, deputy sheriff, Long County; Mrs. Ruth Swindell.

Mr. and Mrs. T. B. Wingate, Mr. and Mrs. Tom Hill Davis, Mrs. Mabel Brewer, Mrs. Lowell Strickland, Mr. and Mrs. V. R. Chambliss, D. L. Miller, Virginia Howard, Harris Howard, J. A. Griffin, Kathryn Griffin, Leo C. Poole, Mondorea Poole, Alice Manning (school teacher).

Dundalk Man Killed in Viet

HON. CLARENCE D. LONG

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 26, 1968

Mr. LONG of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, Lt. Charles F. Johnson, Jr., a young soldier from Maryland, was recently killed in action in Vietnam. I wish to commend the courage of this young man and to honor his memory by including the following article in the RECORD:

DUNDALK MAN KILLED IN VIET

Lt. Charles F. Johnson Jr., 24, a West Point graduate and a resident of Dundalk, was killed by machinegun fire Jan. 31 during a battle in Vietnam, his widow, Mrs. Mary C. Johnson, said yesterday.

Lt. Johnson, who resided in the 2100 block

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

Cameron Dr., had been stationed at Ft. Holabird from August, 1966 until he volunteered for service in Vietnam and was sent there March 22, 1967. He was killed during a fight in a compound where he was staying in Phan Thiet.

In addition to his widow, Lt. Johnson is survived by his parents, Mr. and Mrs. Charles F. Johnson Sr., a brother, Ronald F. Johnson, and a sister, Judy Elizabeth Johnson, all of West Columbia, S.C.

First Statewide Conference of the Georgia Conservancy, Inc.

HON. ROBERT G. STEPHENS, JR.

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 27, 1968

Mr. STEPHENS. Mr. Speaker, a new statewide conservation agency, created in January 1967, held its first conference in Athens, Ga., at the Center for Continuing Education on January 19-20, 1968. The theme of the conference was "Conservation is Commonsense." The efforts of this new organization are to "either independently or in cooperation with governmental bodies, to preserve or to aid in the preservation of areas of scenic, geologic, biologic, historic, or recreational importance in Georgia in the public interest; to establish or aid in the establishment of nature reserves or other protected areas for scientific, education, or esthetic purposes, to conduct regional and land-use planning studies as a basis for land acquisition, and to develop organized programs in conservation education, to the end that the Georgia Conservancy shall serve the people in Georgia as an agency of popular enlightenment, for cultural improvement, and for scientific advance."

The conference was attended by more than 250 of the 500 members of a new corporate body of the Georgia Conservancy. Among the speakers scheduled for the 2-day conference was James A. Mackay, Representative of the Fourth Congressional District of Georgia in the 89th Congress, who spoke on the subject of "The Georgia Conservancy: A Way To Improve Your Environment." Also, speakers and panel discussion leaders included: Dr. Eugene P. Odom, director, Institute of Ecology, University of Georgia; Donald H. Shedd, regional coordinator, Bureau of Outdoor Recreation, U.S. Department of Interior; Roger P. Hansen, executive director, Colorado Open Spaces Coordinating Council; former State Senator Jimmy Carter; Dr. Hugh B. Masters, director, Center for Continuing Education, Athens; and William S. Morris III, of Augusta. The keynote speaker for the Conference was Stanley A. Cain, Assistant Secretary for Fish and Wildlife and Parks, U.S. Department of Interior. The text of his address is herewith given so that the benefit of its counsel, advice, and encouragement can be made available to a much wider audience than was possible at the conference.

The address of Mr. Cain follows:

CONSERVING OUR COASTAL RESOURCES

At the risk of indulging in some pedantry, I want to start my remarks with a look at the words in my title.

The transitive verb "conserve" means to keep something safe and sound; to keep it unimpaired by preserving it from loss, decay, waste, or injury. A "conservator" is one whose duties are management in a "conservancy" which, for the British at least, is a commission or other public body charged with regulation of forests, fisheries, water bodies, or more broadly, natural resources. Conservancy, like its companion "conservation," can refer also to a specific area of the earth's surface that is designated a "conservation district." This leads me to a useful distinction: a "conservationist" is an advocate of conservation, while a "conservator" does something about it, especially by direct, personal action.

Glancing over American history, we find that conservation's earlier efforts were directed largely toward preservation—preservation of forests and other natural areas—by establishing boundaries somewhere within which the consumptive uses of natural resources were proscribed or circumscribed. To the developer, proscription has meant the locking up of exploitable natural resources—no timber cutting, no mining, no hunting, no damming of streams for power production, flood control, provision of irrigation water, and the like. In its restricted sense, conservation was largely a matter of establishing sanctuaries free from the works of man and their consequences for plants, animals, and the landscape. For some of us the motivation has been largely in the interest of the species, especially if it were rare and threatened with extinction; but many others want to visit such areas to have the personal pleasure of seeing the plants and animals in their natural, unimpaired habitats. So, in this purest of cases, we are confronted with a management problem. Whereas cautious and knowledgeable visits to a sanctuary by a few persons for scientific and natural history studies and for the pleasures of observation and photography may not be detrimental to the species and their natural habitats, there can easily be too much such innocent use of a preserve, reserve or sanctuary.

There seems to be no escape from this problem except by the establishment of controls. There is no conservation except where there are conservators with the authority to enforce regulations, for too numerous visits by people can themselves be a form of consumptive use. This produces the management problems so typical of wildlife refuges, parks, and wilderness areas. Such areas are established for limited uses from among the many potential uses, not for non-uses, as critics so often complain.

I have started with the most limited aspect of conservation and have arrived at the point where I am convinced that all conservation requires management of the environment by restrictions on the uses which people will be allowed to make of it.

Now I skip to the word "resources" in my title, with the implicit understanding that we are talking about natural resources, not human resources. Whereas "natural resources" are generally thought of as things in the environment—such as forests for their useful trees, grasslands for their plants palatable to livestock or wildlife, soil for its support of agriculture, water for the habitat in which sport and commercial fish live, rocks for their iron, copper and other minerals, or, more specifically, the tree, grass, animal, or mineral itself—we now have broadened the concept of natural resources to include a condition of nature, such as a salubrious climate, and a process, such as falling water, that can be put to work. A useful definition, then, is that a natural resource is any thing, condition, or process in the environment that man finds useful.

If such a definition is acceptable, conservation is concerned with the uses of the environment for the extraction of products from it, for taking human advantage of conditions and processes, and even for non-con-

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

February 27, 1968

sumptive and non-disturbing uses of nature. But use is the key, and use requires special management for determined purposes.

This brings me to two other matters that are derivative from the above conclusions. The first is the recent public concern for natural beauty (which President Johnson equated a few years ago with conservation in his message to Congress on natural resources) and for quality of the environment. This is conservation's most significant forward step because it marks the Nation's growing concerns with the pollution of air, water and soil, with the disposal of solid wastes, with the uglification of the landscape by signs and strip mining, for example, with urban sprawl and central city deterioration, and with the loss of natural areas, including estuaries. In short, we have been brought up short with a growing realization that we have been progressively "de-humanizing" our environment at great cost to health, welfare, and enjoyment.

The second point that is derivative from this examination of the meaning of conservation and resources is that in every facet of management we are confronted with conflicts of opinion as to proper uses of the environment. There is no question that man must make use of his environment; the questions and problems arise when needed and desirable uses are incompatible at a given place.

But there is not only the competition for use of a natural resource—including the decision, for example, to construct or not to construct at a given place a road, a paper mill, a power plant, a residential development, or to establish some sort of public area—there is the fact that what goes on at a given site can have consequences elsewhere, even at remote places. This is illustrated by the spreading from points of origin of the substances that produce pollution, including radionuclides, pesticides, fertilizers, and the pouring into air and water of waste products of thousands of kinds. We are now including also within the scope of conservation management of the environment the effort to diminish "sight and sound pollution" by seeking controls over billboards, sonic booms from planes, and manipulations of the terrain itself.

Let me move back, then, to the middle term of my title, the word "coastal," as a modifier of resources. Congress has given us a charge to examine our coastal resources by passage of the Marine Resources and Engineering Development Act of 1966. This Act covers the entire marine field, including the coastal zone, not only of the seas but of the Great Lakes also. It established a Commission to recommend the organization of Government and long-range program for its marine interests, and a Council to examine current substantive matters.

The Commission consists of a representative cross-section of persons in industry, education and state government, as well as the Federal Government. The Council, headed by Vice President Hubert H. Humphrey, is composed of the Secretaries of certain departments and directors of non-cabinet agencies. In addition to its professional staff, the Council has established five interagency committees to advise and assist it, of which I am chairman of the one on Multiple Use of the Coastal Zone. This Committee consists of representatives of a dozen major agencies: the Atomic Energy Commission, the Coast Guard for the Department of Transportation, the Corps of Engineers for the Department of Defense, the Environmental Services Administration for the Department of Commerce, the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, the Department of the Interior, the National Aeronautics and Space Administration, the Council of Economic Advisers, the National Science Foundation, the Office of Science and Technology, the Smithsonian Institution, and the Department of State.

Working with the Council staff, this Committee decided that the term "coastal zone" would include the shoreline in a specific sense—the Continental Shelf seaward, especially their beach waterfront and estuarine on the landward side.

The objectives of this Committee are to examine the characteristics of the coastal zone and the programs of agencies operating within it, to find ways to improve coordination among the programs, and to suggest guidelines for an orderly Federal approach to coastal-zone problems.

The coastal zone, containing a great variety of natural resource complexes, has always supported a variety of human uses of vital importance to the Nation's people and their economy. I will mention some of them.

Ocean Transportation.—Except for Indians who came by land from Asia many thousands of years ago, immigrants who settled the country came to our shores by water: Spanish, French, British, Dutch, and before them the Scandinavians to Vineland. Transoceanic commerce commenced early and despite the rapidly growing air traffic, most such cargo still moves by sea. The Coastal zone provides harbors, external and inland waterways for coastal shipping, and access to navigable rivers. Federal agencies with directly related responsibilities include the Maritime Administration, Customs Service, Public Health Service, Immigration Service and the Corps of Engineers.

National Security.—The earliest forts to protect our Nation had coastal locations at strategic points with respect to harbors, giving rise to the three-mile zone of territorial coastal zone is the favored location for satellite and rocket installations, as it is for many waters on a basis of cannon range. Today the modern military airfields as well as Navy yards.

Federal agencies related to commerce, navigation and security include the Coast and Geodetic Survey, Maritime Administration, and the Coast Guard, as well as the Navy and Air Force.

Harbors and Docks.—Commerce and security require transhipment facilities: docks, warehouses, railheads, etc. Deep-dredged channels and harbor basins as well as protective breakwaters are needed. The large bulk cargo carriers, especially tankers, are calling for ever-deeper and wider channels that may extend miles out on the Continental Shelf, through estuaries, and for miles up rivers. The modernization of harbors will require many docks to be reconstructed, especially to accommodate deep-draft vessels and containerized cargo handling. Agencies involved include the Corps of Engineers, the Coast Guard, the Department of Housing and Urban Development, and the Maritime Administration.

Commercial and Industrial Sites.—Many kinds of commercial and industrial firms find the coastal zone attractive because of the combination of land and water transport, ease of waste disposal, and cheap land. As to the last point, filling behind bulkheads, especially by solid wastes and nearby dredged materials, creates new land worth many times the cost of producing it, a private windfall from public resources.

Non-living Resources.—Bromine and other chemicals are extracted directly from seawater, and iodine is taken from seaweeds. There is a promise of important pharmaceuticals from the sea. Sand, gravel, and shell are dredged from estuaries and inshore coastal waters. There is promise of hard minerals to be recovered from the seabed, including gold from underwater placers. Oil and gas production in the coastal zone has grown remarkably in recent years. All these operations have resulted in factories, mills, distillation plants, and oil and gas tank-farms being located on coasts and in estuarine areas.

Living Resources.—Commercial fisheries have a heavy dependence on the coastal zone,

not only for the landing and processing of round fish from open ocean fisheries, but from estuaries which are extremely fertile production areas for a large percentage of our ocean fisheries, including crustacea and shellfish. The coastal zone supported subsistence fisheries for the colonists and before that the Indians, and today it supports an important sport fishery.

The location of commercial and industrial plants and the acquisition and processing of living and non-living resources of the coastal zone get the attention of several Federal agencies, including the Geological Survey, Bureau of Mines, Bureau of Commercial Fisheries, Bureau of Sport Fisheries and Wildlife, the Atomic Energy Commission, and the Federal Power Commission.

Recreation.—In addition to sport fishing on the waters of the Continental Shelf, there is surf fishing, and fishing in quiet estuarine waters. Recreation includes hunting, sailing, motor boating and water skiing, surf boarding, swimming, beach and dune walking, collecting sea shells and nature observation, picnicking and camping. Vacation shore cottages have long been popular. Today whole new subdivisions are being developed by dredging and filling where estuaries once existed. Atlantic City and Miami Beach with their great hotels are another essentially recreational use of the coastal zone. Federal agencies that are involved include the Bureau of Outdoor Recreation, the National Park Service, the Bureau of Sport Fisheries and Wildlife, the Coast Guard and the Corps of Engineers.

Natural Beauty.—The aesthetic appreciation of nature is an important use of the coastal zone where the beauty of the sea and sky, the experiencing of weather, the sweep of the coastline with beaches, dunes, marshes, cliffs, and headlands, and many interesting and attractive plants and animals abound, often near large centers of population. For many coastal cities estuaries may be the only remaining natural areas that are easily accessible.

The Federal agencies involved with recreation are also concerned with natural beauty, and so are the Bureau of Commercial Fisheries, the Federal Water Pollution Control Administration and the Department of Housing and Urban Development.

Waste Disposal.—Doing an about-face from natural beauty to waste disposal, we have long used the coastal zone for the direct disposal of sewage and sludge from sewage disposal plants, to rid ourselves of solid wastes, chemicals, and garbage, and more recently of nuclear wastes with low levels of activity and a long half-life.

Federal agencies in this field include the Federal Water Pollution Control Administration, the Department of Health, Education and Welfare, the Coast Guard, Corps of Engineers, the Atomic Energy Commission and the Bureau of Commercial Fisheries.

If these are the major classes of our use of the coastal zone, and I think they are, we should next notice that their development has been essentially *laissez-faire*, that is, with a minimum of governmental interference with property rights. The coastal zone has suffered two kinds of adverse change from this approach. First there has been a loss of quality from pollution. Some of this has resulted from the assumption that the capacity of the ocean and estuaries to absorb pollutants was essentially boundless. Some pollution has resulted from leaks and accidents on ships carrying hazardous cargoes and from shore installations; some has come from purposeful dumping, and much of the pollution has been inadvertent because of our failure to appreciate the consequences of waste disposal in the coastal zone.

After pollution, which deteriorated but does not destroy the coastal zone, we must notice that there is physical destruction also. Whereas pollution can be stopped, although

at great effort and cost, much is not all physical destruction is irreversible, at least economically. Dredging, whether for sand, gravel, shell, clay or peat, is destructive of natural bottom and its associated organisms, which may not recover for many years. Bulkheading and filling open estuaries and related fresh and salt water marshes mean that they are gone forever. A little bit here and a little bit there may not seem important, but over time we have in some places along our coasts lost 25 to 50 percent or more of our estuaries acreage with consequent loss to many important uses.

Today we find ourselves confronted by a series of problem complexes which seem freshly acute, perhaps only because the public at long last is dissatisfied with our traditional *laissez-faire* approach.

At every turn we find that we know very little about our coastal zone. This is true of our scanty knowledge of its geology and hydrology. It is true of our understanding of the life histories and ecology of important species, and of the ecological systems to which they belong. We know little about pollutants, especially their chronic effects on the ecosystems of the coastal zone. We have vast needs for survey, inventory, and research, especially on the natural features of the coastal zone. We are little better off when we look at the interplay among commercial and industrial transportation and other uses and our national needs in the coastal zone.

Whereas cities have been receiving considerable planning study in recent years, extra-urban regions, including seacoasts and estuaries, have been largely ignored. Planning studies are desperately needed, and subsequent to them there will be a need for putting plans to work. This is largely a matter of the separation from one another of conflicting uses. Saying this another way, this is a matter of allocating areas of the coastal zone to separate uses.

Among the many possible and often conflicting uses of the coastal zone, some have been preempted by governmental action. This includes the military installations and the national parks, seashores, and wildlife refuges, and comparable areas of state and local governments. Harbor and transportation authorities, often involving several units of government, produce certain developments that preclude other uses or affect them adversely. Cities and counties may have zoning for business, industrial, or residential uses. States may establish bulkhead lines and the Corps may grant permits for dredging and filling behind them.

Such are the limited controls on *laissez-faire*, but speaking generally, the power of zoning lies at the local level of government which is often a weak defender of intruding economic interests. The Federal Government seems not to have general zoning powers and can move into the coastal zone only through its power of eminent domain or special authorities, such as those of the Federal Water Pollution Control Administration.

All of this may sound pretty dismal for the protection of the national interest in the coastal zone, but recent years have seen a number of heartening actions at all levels of government. I will mention only enough to illustrate the point. Whereas there was only one national seashore before 1961, Congress has subsequently authorized eight more. The Federal Water Pollution Control Administration now has broad powers under the Clean Water Act to enforce abatement and ultimate control of pollution. The Corps of Engineers is now paying close heed to recommendations of the Fish and Wildlife Service and the National Park Service under the Coordination Act, and recent decisions of the Federal Courts are affecting the Federal Power Commission, as in the *Storm King* case on the Hudson River and the *High Mountain Sheep Dam* case on the Snake River. The work of the Marine Coun-

cil's Committee on Multiple Use of the Coastal Zone is facing up squarely to Federal interagency and the intergovernmental problems.

Some of the States are moving to give the coastal zone protection, as in the case of Massachusetts, and California for San Francisco Bay. Many municipalities and some counties are moving to halt the despoliation of their beach waterfront and estuarine areas.

I believe that it is fair to say that all such conservation developments are arising from public pressures. The people are leading their elected representatives. In addition to the several national conservation organizations, such as the National Audubon, the Wilderness Society, the National Parks Association, and the Sierra Club, there are now hundreds of local citizens' groups. Some proceed directly, using their own funds to save a piece of marsh as a bird sanctuary or fields and woods as open space, but most of them act as pressure groups to encourage government to act in the cause of conservation. I end, then, with one more example—The Georgia Conservancy, Inc.—with the firm expectation that you will do great things to preserve some of your State's natural beauty and its valuable natural areas for the everlasting benefit of your people.

The Crisis of the Cities

HON. THOMAS M. REES

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 26, 1968

Mr. REES. Mr. Speaker, included in the President's message, "The Crisis of the Cities," is a request for \$2.18 billion for the war on poverty. I support that request. I think the war on poverty is worth the effort and the expense we have committed to it—and more.

Let me cite an example. Since its inception, the Job Corps has trained more than 121,000 youngsters. On entering the Corps, 99 percent of these young men and women were unemployed. They had no jobs and no prospects. Their schools and their communities had just about written them off.

The Job Corps, however, has managed to place more than 70 percent of these otherwise "hopeless cases" in well-paying jobs. When a corpsman graduates after 15 months of training his average starting wage is \$1.82 an hour. I think that is an extraordinary record of success. This and other programs of the poverty effort are accomplishing what they set out to accomplish—they are helping those who are poor become self-sufficient.

Unfortunately, last session the Congress failed to appropriate the amount of money deemed to be necessary to carry on these programs. As a result 16 Job Corps centers have been closed. Other successes of the war on poverty, instead of being expanded, have had to be cut back.

Mr. Speaker, it is utterly unwise to pinch pennies where the poverty program is concerned. When programs have been devised which work well at helping the poor out of poverty, the only sensible course is to expand those programs. That means appropriating enough money to do the job.

Today the President asks us again to come forward and approve the amounts necessary to continue the war on poverty. I will support him.

Hall of Fame Is Dream Come True:

HON. JAMES J. HOWARD

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 27, 1968

Mr. HOWARD. Mr. Speaker, last week the Football Hall of Fame elected seven new members. Among those to join this group of super stars and sports immortals was New Jersey's own Alex Wojciechowicz.

"Wojie" brought much excitement and pride to New Jersey fans. He won 11 letters at South River High School and went on to be inducted into the Collegiate Hall of Fame in 1955. His performances at Fordham, where he anchored the famed "Seven Blocks of Granite," earned him all-America honors in 1936 and 1937.

He was the first draft choice of the Detroit Lions in 1938 and 8 years later joined the Philadelphia Eagles where he played on three eastern division and two world championship teams.

At the present time he is still involved with the game he loves so much. As president of the National Football League Association, Alex Wojciechowicz is trying to work out a pension for those older pro football players who retired before 1958 and could not qualify for pensions.

The Asbury Park Evening Press recently saluted Alex Wojciechowicz for his accomplishments and his fine example for American youth. I insert that article in the RECORD, as follows:

HALL OF FAME IS DREAM COME TRUE:
"WOJIE"

HIGHLANDS.—"It's like a dream come true—something all football players hope for some day."

Alex Wojciechowicz was describing his feelings on his election Monday to professional football's Hall of Fame in Canton, Ohio.

Wojie, as he was known to his teammates, played 13 years in the National Football League, eight with Detroit and five with Philadelphia.

"It's a real honor to be enshrined with such super stars as Jim Thorpe, Ken Strong, Mel Hein, Red Grange, and Don Hutson. I'm looking forward to the Pro Greatest Induction Weekend in Canton."

ONE OF SEVEN CITED

Wojie was one of seven former NFL stars voted into the Hall of Fame this week. The others are Cliff Battles, Art Donovan, Elroy Hirsch, Wayne Millner, Marion Motley, and Charlie Trippi.

The new men will be inducted formally at ceremonies in Canton this summer. The Pro Greatest Weekend, as it is called, includes an exhibition game between NFL teams.

There are now 54 members in the Hall located in a permanent building in Canton.

Wojie first learned of his nomination several months ago when he was asked to send performance sheets, photographs, and other data to the Hall. He was also asked to submit the name of the man most responsible for his success who would be invited to the ceremonies.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

February 27, 1968

"I had to submit three names, my old coaches, Bill Denny at South River High School, Jim Crowley at Fordham, and Earl (Greasy) Neale of the Philadelphia Eagles. All three did a lot for me and I couldn't single out one from the other. I hope they invite all three out there when I get inducted."

IN COLLEGE HALL

Wojie was the first from the Shore area to be inducted in the Collegiate Hall of Fame in 1955. He was formally inducted on Thanksgiving Day 1955 between halves of the South River-New Brunswick High School game at Rutgers Stadium.

He said then, "This has to be one of my greatest thrills."

But Wojie is even more elated over his recent election to Pro's Hall of Fame.

"This is the ultimate. It's like separating the men from the boys. There are a lot of good college players who never make it in pro ranks. Joining that illustrious group is an honor of a lifetime".

Wojie has been instrumental in trying to establish a pension plan for veteran retired pros. As of now only NFL players who retired after 1958 are eligible for pension.

"I heard that Tommy Thompson, my quarterback with the championship Eagles' teams, was down and out and learned that Jerry Wolman, the Eagles owner, was helping him out with his own money.

"I got to thinking about it and felt that it should be the NFL's responsibility, not Wolman's to help Tommy or any other needy old pro out. After all these were the fellows who played with the small salaries to make pro football what it is today."

TALK WITH OWNERS

Wojie got the addresses of players of the 1921-1958 era and told them of his pension idea. About 50 of them joined him in Florida last month for talks with the present players association and league owners.

The players and owners agreed something should be worked out.

The owners plan to discuss it further and advise what can or cannot be done for the old players.

The old pros have formed a National Football League Association with Wojie as president.

Wojie, now 52, played 22 years of football. He started in 1929 and wound up with the Eagles in 1950. He was a center and linebacker during his entire career.

He was born in South River and is recognized as one of the finest athletes to come out of that area. He earned 11 letters—four in football, three in baseball and two each in basketball and track before graduating in 1934. He captained both the football and baseball teams and gained All-State honors in both sports.

AVENGED SETBACK

In 1932 South River lost 9-0, to Asbury Park's state championship team led by William (Butch) Bruno. But in 1933 Wojie's unbeaten team gained revenge with a 36-6 pasting of the Blue Bishops.

Wojie went on to Fordham where he anchored the famed "Seven Blocks of Granite" forward wall which included Vince Lombardi of the Packers, Ed Franco, and John Druze.

After gaining All-America honors in 1936 and 1937, Wojie was the first draft choice of the Detroit Lions in 1938. He played eight years with the Lions, then was traded to the Eagles where he played on three Eastern Division and two world championship teams.

Wojie had no particular interest in coaching but did take a fling at it in 1963 and 1964 when he was defensive coach of the Newark Bears of the Continental League at the urging of his old Eagles roommate, Steve Van Buren.

"Steve was the head coach there and he asked me to help out. I did it more for him than anything else. But I have no interest in getting back into coaching now or anytime."

HANDLES REAL ESTATE

Wojie is a real estate broker in West Long Branch. He frequently does appraisal work for the N.J. State Highway Commission. He formerly lived in Wanamassa, Ocean Township, but he and his wife have been residing for a year and a half in a new home on Mountain street in the Highlands hills.

"It's a beautiful view up here and I enjoy the peace and quiet," Wojie confided.

Wojie has two married sons, a daughter, and eight grandchildren. His daughter is the wife of Pete Jolly, a pianist who has his own group and records for Herb Alpert. His son Alex Jr., known as Frank, was blocking back for Frank Budd at Asbury Park High School. Another son, Raymond, attends Monmouth College and plans eventually to go into business with his brother.

as possible following the reentry of such veterans into the labor market.

It is this language, Mr. Speaker, which, if enacted into law, concerns me and others of the committee. It raises many unanswered questions and no testimony has been advanced regarding the effect of this policy on all future Government contracts.

The full committee held one hearing, receiving testimony from two witnesses—Chairman John W. Macy, Jr., of the U.S. Civil Service Commission, and William J. Driver, Administrator of Veterans' Affairs. The public hearing lasted less than 2 hours—of which I attended all but a few minutes at its opening—and the time immediately following was set aside for executive session consideration of the resolution—something in the neighborhood of 15 minutes.

During the hearing the minority members attempted to develop testimony on certain features of the resolution which deeply concerned us. Many questions are still unanswered. We simply do not have enough information on the scope of this legislation and to attempt to ram through a bill under these circumstances regardless of its merits is, in my opinion, no way to legislate. No opportunity was given in executive session for discussion. A motion for the previous question effectively cut off any deliberation. In my opinion, the voters of the country let it be known that they did not want legislation furnished by the executive branch to be enacted without careful consideration and debate.

Mr. Speaker, I restate my conviction that the committee has given totally inadequate consideration to legislation of this importance. I deeply regret that the motivation of "pure and deliberate obstructionism" was attached to action of any minority member. The point arrived at which it became obvious that discussion of the merits of the resolution was not to be permitted and the minority members of the committee were foreclosed from debate. We were not elected to perform as a rubber stamp for every proposal that comes before Congress and do not wish to be parties to such tactics in committee.

I would further point out that a quorum of the committee need not be dependent on any one minority member. Six of the 15 majority members of the committee were absent during this particular executive session.

As is evident, Mr. Speaker, the issues set forth herein are quite aside from the sense of Congress to assist returning Vietnam veterans in securing employment. I am in complete agreement with veterans' preference and wholeheartedly support programs already in law to give assistance to all returning veterans.

Homeownership

HON. JOSEPH E. KARTH

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 26, 1968

Mr. KARTH. Mr. Speaker, over the years we have made considerable prog-

House Joint Resolution 1052

HON. WILLIAM LLOYD SCOTT

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 27, 1968

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. Speaker, certain remarks were inserted in the February 21, 1968, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD with respect to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service in its consideration of House Joint Resolution 1052.

In these remarks the following charge was made by a majority Member:

Unfortunately, however, due to the departure of a Member of the Minority party, the Committee was left without a quorum and was unable, therefore, to express its will. I consider this pure and deliberate obstructionism on the part of that Member. The Minority had spent much of the hearing attacking—not so much the resolution—but the President's executive order concerning the hiring of veterans; this subject was not under consideration.

Mr. Speaker, I think that a review of events concerning House Joint Resolution 1052 would be helpful in throwing some light on the subject.

The title of this joint resolution states its purpose is "to assist veterans of the Armed Forces of the United States who have served in Vietnam or elsewhere in obtaining suitable employment." However, a careful reading of this legislation discloses that it goes far beyond this purpose and is deserving of the closest scrutiny and consideration of Congress.

I say "legislation" purposely, Mr. Speaker, for this measure has been offered in the form of a joint resolution which, to quote Jefferson's Manual "is a bill so far as the processes of the Congress in relation to it are concerned." Joint resolutions, as we know, when passed by Congress and signed by the President, have the full force of law. I therefore wish to call attention to certain language of the joint resolution which reads as follows:

That it is hereby declared to be the sense of the Congress that each department and agency of the United States—

"... (3) shall follow such policy and take such action, through the process of procurement for the Government of material, supplies, services, and equipment from private industry and through other means, as may be appropriate to secure from private industry for such veterans a priority in employment in positions in private industry as soon

ress as a nation in many areas. In housing we have made great strides. In spite of our national reputation as a country of homeowners a great deal still remains to be done.

Americans can take a measure of pride in the fact that we have broadened the base of homeownership in the country over the years. We have consecutively liberalized the terms under which families may purchase homes with FHA-insured mortgages. Each time we took these steps, there have been those who charged that we were undermining the foundations of mortgage finance—that the new risks were too great. History has proved the validity of a liberal approach to home financing, and conventional lenders have followed the lead of FHA in this regard.

As President Johnson said in his state of the Union message:

Surely a nation that can go to the moon can place a decent home within the reach of its families.

For many low-income families, the decent housing they seek includes the aspiration of ownership. Homeownership can help these Americans develop a sense of independence and dignity.

In my opinion, this country has reached a level of progress from which we can begin to explore the ways and means by which we might extend the benefits of homeownership to families of modest and even low income.

I ask my fellow Members to join with me in supporting the President's new homeownership program.

Soviet Armed Forces Day, 1968

HON. JOHN R. RARICK

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 27, 1968

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, Friday night the Reserve Officers Association—inactive military officers from every State in our Union—participated in the well-attended and successful convention in Washington, D.C.

Down the street the Russian Communists were celebrating the Soviet Armed Forces Day at their Embassy—the social event of the week attended by 500 guests, including some U.S. military officers.

While the ROA was meeting to find ways to bolster our military efforts to combat Communist aggression, some representatives of the military were toasting and socializing with the enemy. And all this on the same evening, the same hours, and in the same city—our Nation's Capital, Washington, D.C.

And the Washington papers, the following day, made no mention of the Reserve officers convention bringing thousands to Washington. But the pictures of militant uniformed Soviet comrades, pretty ladies, and a uniformed U.S. Colonel, Coleman Thacher, embracing Soviet General Mescheryakov made the local society pages.

American guests were said to have been

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

overheard expressing "shame" for the bombing of the Russian Embassy—but no one was reported expressing "shame" for the Russian's role in killing U.S. boys in Vietnam.

Small wonder there is so much noise in Washington about stopping the bombing and abandoning Vietnam—our boys might injure one of the Russian hosts.

Mr. Speaker, I ask that the society column report of the Russian Embassy party from the Washington Evening Star for February 24 and the Associated Press account of February 25 setting forth the \$700 million in war supplies furnished by Russia to North Vietnam to kill U.S. soldiers follow my remarks:

[From the Washington (D.C.) Evening Star, Feb. 24, 1968]

DOUBLE SECURITY AT SOVIET FETE

(By Jean Powell)

Soviet security men had gathered at the Russian Embassy last evening well ahead of the guests. Outside, D.C. police were almost as plentiful as the party-goers.

Double security "for the protection of the guests" was being maintained at the Armed Forces Day celebration. The 50th anniversary fete, one of several large social functions held during the year at the Embassy, came right on the heels of the bombing of the residence on Tuesday.

In the large downstairs hallway each guest was asked to present his invitation. Conflicting answers came from Embassy staff members when questioned about the practice.

One said that it was the usual policy. Another said that the close check was due entirely to the bombing incident.

Ambassador Dobrynin, who has not requested any personal guard, arrived soon after the party got under way at 6:30. Mrs. Dobrynin, who has been in Moscow for almost a year, may come back next month, according to the ambassador. Also attending was No. 2 man at the Embassy, Minister Counselor Tcherniakov.

Hosts were the military attaches, Gen. Valentin Mescheryakov, Col. Vladimir S. Afanasiev, air attache, and Capt. Vladimir Vashenko, naval attache, and their wives, who greeted the 500 guests.

Among the top U.S. military guests attending were Lt. Gen. John J. Davis and Rear Adm. Eugene Fluckey.

Admiral Wayland, native Washingtonian who remembers peddling The Star during his boyhood, has been here two years on what was at first a temporary assignment.

The Waylands will leave soon for New York City, where he's been transferred.

Although most of the conversations seemed to be more on the light side and about everything but the bombing, Mrs. Wayland no doubt voiced the opinion of most of the American guests:

"I'm ashamed of it."

[From the Washington (D.C.) Sunday Star, Feb. 25, 1968]

RUSSIA GIVES MOST AID TO HANOI, UNITED STATES REPORTS

(By the Associated Press)

The Soviet Union is apparently North Vietnam's largest supplier of weapons and economic aid today, and its assistance may climb further if the pace of the war steps up.

According to preliminary Pentagon estimates, aid to Hanoi from her Communist allies probably increased to about \$1 billion in 1967—up considerably from some \$730 million the year before.

Moscow's shipments, valued at about \$700 million, accounted for the biggest share in

North Vietnam's supply line in 1967 and for much of the total increase over the previous year.

Red China sent in an estimated \$250 million worth, roughly \$75 million more than in 1966.

Communist East European states contributed perhaps \$50 million.

COULD SUPPLY MORE

Unlike China's economy, hobbled by cultural revolution upheavals, the Russian economy can divert much more to Vietnam if the Kremlin leaders choose.

Current Soviet deliveries amount to perhaps one-fifth of 1 percent of Russia's gross national product. The Russians have indicated they will step up Vietnam shipments if Hanoi's needs increase.

U.S. spending in Vietnam last year has been put at about \$25 billion.

Information received in Washington indicates that Soviet arms deliveries to North Vietnam came to some \$500 million in 1967 compared with \$350 million the year before, with the emphasis on air defense items.

These include surface-to-air (SAM) missiles, antiaircraft artillery, radar, fighter planes and ammunition.

Most of this equipment is believed to have been supplied out of existing Soviet stockpiles, except for ammunition which may be coming out of current production.

FIRED AT U.S. PLANES

Vast quantities of ammunition have been aimed at U.S. planes. Several thousand SAMs—maybe \$30 million worth—were reported fired at American craft during 1967 along with other ordnance. The SAMs were fired from perhaps 30 launchers, moved around several hundred prepared launching sites in North Vietnam.

The Russians are reported also to have provided some bombers and tanks, but these arms have not played much of a role in the fighting. Nor are the Russians believed to be supplying advanced new weapons systems.

Most of the Soviet weapons—except for such items as large helicopters which cannot be shipped through existing railway tunnels—are believed transported to North Vietnam across the Chinese mainland.

Sea routes are used for material which is classified in Washington as economic aid, but with North Vietnam's economy on a wartime footing these goods have a direct bearing on her total effort.

Some \$200 million in Soviet economic aid in 1967, up \$50 million from 1966, is reported to have included petroleum, trucks, tractors, rail equipment, bridge structures, barges, machinery, food and fertilizer.

TWO HUNDRED RUSSIAN SHIP CALLS

Russian ships are said to have paid around 200 calls at North Vietnamese ports during the year, a five-fold increase over the early 1960s.

Defense Department specialists say most of North Vietnam's industrial output lost to U.S. bombing has been replaced by imports from Russia and China.

At the same time neither Russia nor China has sent personnel to North Vietnam in any scale comparable to the U.S. presence in South Vietnam.

The Russians are believed to have only around 2,000 military personnel in North Vietnam, in noncombatant advisory, technical and training roles, an estimated 40,000 or so Red Chinese are in the country doing road and rail repair work and the like.

Peking's reported aid has included small arms, artillery, planes, trucks, food, light industrial equipment, consumer goods, some ships and ship repairs.

China spent perhaps \$150 million on arms and \$100 million on economic aid to North Vietnam last year.

Rent Supplement Funds

HON. ROBERT G. STEPHENS, JR.

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 27, 1968

Mr. STEPHENS. Mr. Speaker, nearly 3 years ago Congress enacted the rent supplement program, the most imaginative, flexible, and sound instrument for providing housing to poor people in the 30 years of legislation in this field.

Rent supplements filled a basic void in the tools America has for dealing with the desperate housing needs of low-income families.

Rent supplements eliminated the cost barrier which kept private enterprise from serving the low-income housing market directly.

Rent supplements eliminated the cost for poor families to improve their earning capacity by removing the specter of enforced dislocation back to slums when incomes exceed a fixed limit.

More importantly, it enables low-income families to obtain decent housing in a normal environment, and without identification or the implied label of a "project family."

The innovative feature embodied in the program is a supplement to make up the difference between the family's payment for housing, equaling one-fourth of its income, and the market rent for the unit needed. The rent supplement is paid directly to the private owner of rental housing—not to the family. Thus, the owner can accommodate low-income families—those with incomes at the public housing level.

The program is flexible. As family incomes go up, it pays a larger part of the rent and the supplement decreases. Eventually, the supplement ceases when the tenant is able to pay the full rental. Low-income families are able to continue to live in their apartments, and even purchase them.

The program is sound and gives the private sector its first effective vehicle for improving housing conditions of the very poor. This is in the best American tradition. The record so far clearly shows the willingness of private enterprise to respond to this challenge.

During 1966, Congress voted \$32 million to get the rent supplement program underway. It was a modest amount, considering the need, but many felt it would form the basis for a test. The \$32 million was exhausted in less than a year.

In 1967, Congress appropriated another \$10 million for the program.

I have been informed that all of this is expected to be utilized before the end of this month of February.

On the first of February, nearly 41,000 rent supplement units were under various stages of planning, construction, or operation. More than \$39 million of the existing \$42 million in authority had been earmarked for this housing.

The administration now asks that we move ahead with this program. It seeks an additional \$65 million in rent supplement contract authority. The amount is realistic. It will help us to make substantial progress in meeting the well-docu-

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

mented demand for decent housing. A complete appropriation will enable private sponsors to develop more than 72,500 additional housing units for poor families.

I support the President's request for adequate funding of this housing program. When appropriations legislation comes before Congress, I would hope that my colleagues will join me in speedily providing this new authority.

Rent supplements have been widely misunderstood, and more than one Member has changed his mind after a second look.

There are three key features of the program that I urge Members to keep in mind as we consider the legislation:

Rent supplements are available only for good, standard housing—and cannot be used as a subsidy for slums.

Rent supplements are available only for housing that is privately built, privately owned, and privately managed—making maximum use of our private enterprise system.

Rent supplements assure that all families carry their fair share of housing costs, and does not penalize one family at the expense of another.

Three decades ago, this country began working toward the goal of a decent home in a healthful environment for every American family. Progress has been made, but we need to make further strides.

This problem is a basic one. It cries out for solution, and the cry is heard most urgently from disadvantaged families across the Nation.

Can we deny these families the best efforts of our Government to help them toward the mainstream of American life?

I think not.

For these, and for many other reasons I urge that we support the President's request for \$65 million to broaden the rent supplement program to the poor people of this country.

Viets Organize Anti-Red Front

HON. THOMAS G. MORRIS

OF NEW MEXICO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 27, 1968

Mr. MORRIS of New Mexico. Mr. Speaker, many people have some question about our policy in Southeast Asia. They have constantly said that the present Government of South Vietnam was only supported by the military. I have found an article in the Amarillo Daily News, dated February 19, 1968, Saigon, which certainly repudiates this argument. In fact, recent Communist terror, murder, and subversion have given indication of solidifying all of the people in South Vietnam against communism. I, therefore, include the previously mentioned article in the RECORD at this point:

VIETS ORGANIZE ANTI-RED FRONT

SAIGON.—More than 200 South Vietnamese politicians—many of them strongly opposed to the present government—met Sunday to form an anti-Communist front.

An unusual aspect was that the meeting—

February 27, 1968

organized by pro-government figures and government officials close to Vice President Nguyen Cao Ky—attracted politicians who as recently as a few months ago had vowed never to rest until Ky and President Nguyen Van Thieu had been removed from office.

The general theme of speakers at the "People's Congress for National Salvation" was that the coordinated Communist attacks have created such a dangerous situation that all nationalist and anti-Communist groups must stick together.

Leading anti-government figures at the convention were Khac Suu, and Ha Thuc Ky, a man Kuomintang.

All three men ran against Thieu and Ky in the presidential election last September and then claimed fraud when the two generals were elected. Suu was elected chairman of an anti-government front of defeated candidates which announced it would work to have the national legislature reject the Thieu-Ky election as fraudulent.

The legislature approved the election and Suu's group faded from the scene. Suu was last heard from shortly after the Viet Cong's first wave of attacks began when his wife told newsmen that he had been taken against his will into government "protective custody" at National Police Headquarters.

One Vietnamese official, noting the presence of Suu at the meeting, said: "These (Viet Cong) attacks have made a whole new man out of Suu."

The convention elected a standing committee, one of whose three members is Saigon lawyer Tran Van Tuyen. Several weeks ago about 20 of Saigon intellectuals headed by Tuyen anonymously circulated a detailed plan for a negotiated peace in Vietnam. At that time the authors declined to disclose their names for fear of government retaliation.

Organizers of the convention are former Gen. Tran Van Don and Ton That Dinh, both members of the Senate, and Dang Duc Khoi, the information chief in the office of the vice president. Don and Dinh are close to Vice President Ky and their actions in the Senate, where they are leaders of a major block are generally considered pro-government.

Several members of the Senate and house of representatives also were present, as were representatives of the Buddhists—including followers of the moderate Thich (Venerable) Tam Chau and the militant monk Thich Ti Quang—Roman Catholics, Cao Dai and Hoa Hao groups. The Cao Dai and Hoa Hao are nationalist religious groups peculiar to South Vietnam.

The standing committee, and several advisory committees elected at Sunday's session, are expected to meet Wednesday to begin drafting a national program "to organize the people for the safety of the nation."

No Further Attempt To Collect for Rifle Lost in Combat

HON. HENRY C. SCHADEBERG

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 27, 1968

Mr. SCHADEBERG. Mr. Speaker, I was delighted today to learn that the Army has decided to make no further attempt to collect \$70.21 from decorated veteran, Ernest Wagner, of Racine, Wis., for an M-14 rifle lost in combat.

It is encouraging to note that the Army has seen fit to drop the charge against Ernest after making an effort to force payment on grounds that were extremely shaky when the Defense Depart-

ment is apparently wasting money by the barrelful on extravagant and misguided projects such as the TFX. I appreciate the Army's change of heart and decision to forget the whole incident; and I want those of my colleagues who have been deluged with mail about the incident to know that I also appreciate your support for Ernest Wagner.

The 50th Anniversary of Lithuanian Independence

HON. HENRY HELSTOSKI

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 20, 1968

Mr. HELSTOSKI. Mr. Speaker, on February 11, the Lithuanian Council of New Jersey, held an observance of the 50th anniversary of the declaration of independence of the Republic of Lithuania, at the Robert Treat Hotel in Newark.

At this mass meeting, the delegates of the many Lithuanian organizations of New Jersey adopted a resolution renewing their protest against the forceful annexation of their mother country into the sphere of Soviet domination; and rededicating themselves to the spirit of self-determination and freedom.

This resolution is signed by Mr. Valentinas Melinis, president, and Mr. A. S. Treciokas, secretary of the Lithuanian Council of New Jersey.

I commend it to my colleagues and offer it for reproduction in the RECORD as follows:

RESOLUTION

The delegates of Lithuanian organizations of New Jersey, representing 60 thousand loyal citizens and permanent residents of the United States of America, gathered on this 11th day of February, 1968 at the Robert Treat Hotel, Newark, New Jersey, to commemorate the 50th Anniversary of the Restoration of Lithuanian Independence;

RESOLVED

1. To renew their solemn protest against the usurpation by the Soviet Government of the sovereign rights of the Baltic nations of Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania and the transformation of the once progressive and prosperous Baltic States into colonies of the Soviet Union.

2. To ask the governments of the free world, and especially that of the United States, to undertake all ways and means to restore the exercise of the rights of self-determination in the Baltic countries.

3. To request the U.S. delegation to the United Nations to demand that the abolition of Soviet rule in the Baltic States be included in the agenda of the General Assembly of the United Nations.

4. To request the U.S. delegation to ask the United Nations to put an end to inhuman practices of the Soviet government in the Baltic States.

5. To draw the attention of newly emerged nations of Africa and Asia to the evils of Soviet colonialism in Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania.

6. To renew the dedication of the peoples of the Baltic nations to the cause of liberty and to reaffirm their dedication to continue together with other captive nations of East-Central Europe the struggle against Soviet occupation and oppression.

7. To demand that the Soviets return Lithuania's beautiful Cathedral of Vilnius to

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

the people for worship, rather than maintaining it as a pagan museum.
Newark, New Jersey, February 11, 1968.
LITHUANIAN COUNCIL OF NEW JERSEY,
VALENTINAS MELINIS, President,
A. S. TRECIOKAS, Secretary.

Rent Supplements

HON. CHARLES S. JOELSON

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 26, 1968

Mr. JOELSON. Mr. Speaker, if we are going to be equal to the housing task President Johnson has outlined for us—6 million homes in the next 10 years for low- and middle-income families—we must recognize our responsibility to fund all the programs involved.

One of the most promising new tools we have for providing decent housing for low-income families is the rent supplement program.

The President's budget calls for \$65 million in additional contract authority for rent supplement housing. This authorization will make it possible for private housing developers to build more than 72,500 new units for families with incomes at the public housing level.

This is a reasonable extension of a program that has already proven its great potential. Some 42,000 housing units have been approved by the Federal Housing Administration under the existing authorization. Many are nearing construction. Others under way soon will be completed. Some are already in operation.

In spite of its turbulent legislative genesis, once funds for rent supplement were authorized, the program moved ahead rapidly.

The usual testing period for the program has passed and new housing is coming on the market in increasing volume.

Rent supplements has a number of advantages:

It works in the private sector—private sponsors develop, own, and operate the housing. Financing is by traditional private methods.

Tenants have incentive to move up economically because they are not forced to move if their income rises. Low-income tenants pay 25 percent of income as rent and a supplement is paid directly to the private owner by the FHA to meet the balance of the economic rent. As income increases the supplement decreases.

The housing is on the local tax rolls and pays its share of municipal services.

Low-income families served by the program are not identified as "project families" and the apartment developments look like any other privately-owned housing.

The rent supplement program, an innovative approach to meeting low-income housing needs, has gained considerable momentum. We should not take any action that might impede progress we can make with it.

Instead, we should make clear to government and industry that Congress fully supports an active effort to produce more housing for low-income families.

When appropriation legislation supporting this request comes before us, I hope my fellow Members will join me in voting for the full \$65 million President Johnson has requested.

The Travel Tax

HON. JOHN BUCHANAN

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 27, 1968

Mr. BUCHANAN. Mr. Speaker, that we must take definite steps to improve our balance-of-payments position is a well-established fact. The seriousness of the situation warrants a more appropriate solution, however, than the President's ill-conceived "travel tax."

There is little evidence that such a tax will reduce our balance-of-payments deficit in any significant way. Such a proposal, in my judgment, is quite like applying a band-aid to the body when a surette is needed.

The Birmingham News, in an editorial on February 7 entitled "The Travel Tax," has expressed the sentiment of many of my constituents and that which I believe to be the sentiment of most Americans.

The editorial follows, and I commend it to my colleagues:

THE TRAVEL TAX

The President's request for a tax on money spent by Americans traveling abroad would get a more receptive hearing if there were any evidence that a real effort was to be made to curb the overseas spending of the U.S. government.

The amount spent by travelers is piddling compared to that spent—or given away—by Uncle Sam.

Sure, something should be done about the balance of payments deficit. Something should have been done long before now.

But the American tourist or businessman traveling abroad didn't get us into the fiscal mess we're in, and punitive taxation of him now isn't going to get us out of it unless accompanied by real—not illusionary, but real—cutbacks at the governmental level.

It only stands to reason that we can't continue giveaway programs as if nothing had happened, while asking a private citizen to pay a tax to go where he pleases, barring only travel to restricted countries. (That same private citizen is infuriated additionally when those who do travel to countries put off-limits by our State Department get nothing more than a half-heated slap on the wrist when they return to the United States thumbing their noses at the government.)

A man who is being asked to pay a tax on every dollar he spends in excess of \$7 a day outside this hemisphere—and that arbitrary limit must have provoked gales of laughter among those who proposed it—isn't going to look too kindly upon continued grants (more of his tax dollars) to countries which four times out of five reward us with a rough poke in the ribs whenever they have the opportunity.

The foreign aid program has done a great deal of good in some instances; it has been abused in many more. U.S. aid can serve a useful purpose in certain areas in the future, if it is carefully directed and carefully administered, which it hasn't always been in the past. But aid to other nations is one thing when the United States has dollars to spare; it's another when we face a serious fiscal crisis brought on in no small part by the self-same aid program.

Any other nation would have acted long

February 27, 1968

before now to protect its own position. What does the U.S. do? It goes on sending commodities abroad, paying the freight to haul them, and even, according to a report in *The News* yesterday, paying port charges to the recipient countries for handling and storing the free goods when they arrive!

"Start there, if you're going to lay another tax on me," the American citizen has a right to demand, "and while you're at it, collect some of the past due debts owed us. And then, if we still face a balance of payments deficit, come back and we'll talk some more. If sacrifice is called for to meet the crisis, then let's sacrifice together."

**Arthur E. Armitage, of Collingswood, N.J.
Holds Record of Service as a Mayor**

HON. WILLIAM T. CAHILL

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 27, 1968

Mr. CAHILL. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to bring to the attention of the House of Representatives the record of Mayor Arthur E. Armitage, of Collingswood, N.J., who has served this community in Camden County as its mayor for 35 consecutive years.

I am proud, Mr. Speaker, that I have been a resident of this community for more than 25 years. I have, therefore, had an opportunity to observe on a personal basis the tremendous contributions made by Mayor Armitage, not only to Collingswood and the county of Camden, but to the entire State of New Jersey.

I decided to bring Mayor Armitage's longevity in public office to the attention of Congress as a result of a statement by the New Jersey Conference of Mayors, indicating that Mayor Armitage may indeed hold a "world's record for long-term continuous service in the office of mayor." The New Jersey Conference of Mayors, pointing out that Mayor Armitage has served Collingswood for 35 consecutive years, indicated that a search is now being carried out by the National League of Cities, with headquarters here in Washington, through its official publication, *Nation's Cities*, to determine whether any individual in the United States exceeds Mayor Armitage's continuous service as mayor of a community. In bringing his record to the attention of Congress, I am certain that we can establish once and for all whether Mr. Armitage indeed is the record holder.

While I cannot be certain at this time that Mayor Armitage holds the world's record, I can be certain he will continue to serve as the mayor of Collingswood, N.J., as long as he desires to do so. This certainty results from the knowledge that he has served his community and its citizens well for the past 35 years and that this excellence in office is recognized and appreciated by the citizens of Collingswood, regardless of political party. Our community has excellent government, and this is due in a large measure to the leadership of Arthur E. Armitage.

In addition to his great work as the mayor of Collingswood, Arthur Armitage is really the father of Rutgers South Jersey Law School and has been responsible for more lawyers in New Jersey than

any other single man. At a time when most young men, including the person addressing the House, were unable because of finances to attend a full-time law school, Mayor Armitage, through his vision and interest, made it possible for literally hundreds of young men and women in New Jersey to attend a qualified evening law school leading to admission to the New Jersey bar. This is but one of many of his civic contributions in a State in which he has for more than 35 years been one of its truly great citizens.

If the record discloses, Mr. Speaker, that Mayor Armitage does not at this time hold the world's record for continuous service as a mayor, I am confident that the day will come when this record will be his. In the meantime, I am personally persuaded that his right to the title "best mayor" must, based upon his performance in office for these past 35 years, go unchallenged.

Hamilton County Proud of "Lady Who Moves Things"

HON. ROBERT TAFT, JR.

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 27, 1968

Mr. TAFT. Mr. Speaker, Hamilton County, Ohio, is fortunate to have in its midst a very talented, able, and attractive young woman who has been nationally recognized as the moving force behind Alvey-Ferguson Operations of Litton Industries, Inc. Mrs. Jayne Baker Spain has been president of Alvey-Ferguson since 1952, and, one could say, that she has kept it rolling along to even greater heights since.

Recently, NATO's 15 nations, in its February-March 1968 issue, chronicled the exciting career of the "Lady Who Moves Things."

The article follows:

JAYNE SPAIN: A LADY WHO MOVES THINGS
(By Col. Barney Oldfield, U.S. Air Force, retired)

Nothing would appear to be stranger in the pressing military equation of time and distance in rendering support in every material way than an attractive blonde lady, but in this instance, her "power behind the throne" is very real. Mrs. Jayne B. Spain is an important fact of life to commanders in chief as far removed in roles and missions as NATO-SHAPE's General Lyman Lemnitzer and Viet Nam's General William C. Westmoreland, and both depend on her in ways of which even they are unaware. She looks like anything but the woman described by a long ago warrior chieftain of the Chippewa Indians who said: "Women are created for work. One can carry as much as two men. They do everything and cost very little, for since they are forever cooking, they can be satisfied in lean times by licking their fingers." Mrs. Spain, quite contrary to his ancient description of women among fighting men, has practically no time for cooking, yet the products she manufactures—automated conveyor systems and materials handling devices—have removed almost entirely from the straining backs of women and men the great tonnages required by military leaders in modern times. These same trappings have made cargo movements the province of whole transportation systems rather

than several, not necessarily compatible, different kinds of vehicles or carriers.

The work of Jayne Spain in providing the sinews of both deterrence and war is a technological spawning in the modern day from the dim mists of antiquity, where women did nearly all the support chores. This permitted males total planning and conduct of battles pre-occupation, or the making of intimidating standoffs short of conflict. This puts her in the distinguished and widely varied array of Rahab, who hid Joshua's spies as he readied Jericho's downfall; Molly Pitcher, who fed and even fired the cannons of America's Revolutionary war; Florence Nightingale, who lent the first feminine nursing hand to the 18,000 wounded, maddened, and stinking wretches who were evacuated to Scutari, Turkey after they fell in the Crimea; Belle Boyd, the tawny-haired courier for General Stonewall Jackson of the Confederacy in the American Civil War, and those Russian women in World War II who drove herds of cattle in rear of the field armies, milking them twice daily, and butchering them as needed to feed those armies on the move. Jayne Spain is as far away from all those women in the technological applications she makes to all the world areas of military involvement as she is from that segment of the Persian-Iraq border of 6,500 years ago where round logs were first placed under heavy loads to ease their passage over the mountains, precursors of the wagon and potter's wheels.

Jayne Spain is also a rare figure in American industry, the woman president of a firm. Although Alvey-Ferguson¹ dates from 1901, she has been its president since 1952, and it was she who shepherded it by the merger and acquisition route into the Hewitt-Robins Division of Litton Industries, Inc., in January, 1966. Her acquirers made sure that she stayed on as president for at least five years, and five more years after that if she chose to do so. Her industrial concern's activity started at the turn of the century as an aid in the loading and unloading of beer barrels, turning out simple gravity-employing or defeating inclines in combination with wheel or roller conveyors.

Now, in many Alvey-Ferguson modes there are dozens of miles of roller roadways built into supply and cargo assembling and loading interiors of both military and civilian depots, warehouses, storage sites, and supply centers. In Europe, they work in the Netherlands' Heineken, Belgian Spa Monopole, and Denmark's Tuborg breweries, and through a licensee (Stratford Autoflow Systems, Ltd.), the BOAC cargo portion of Lon-

¹ The first roller conveyor system, with accessories, was given U.S. Patent No. 714,432 in 1902 when submitted by Benjamin Alvey, one of the founding partners of Alvey-Ferguson, and his description as filed, read: "The invention has for its objects (sic) to enable goods to be transferred from one point to another, as in a warehouse, expeditiously and with a minimum of hand labor and to allow the apparatus being adjusted to receive goods at different points as may be required, expeditiously and with certainty." Other patents were granted to him in Great Britain, France and Germany in 1903 for the same device. The company added a spiral roller conveyor patent in the U.S. that same year, designed to get barrels from floor to floor. In 1904, the Louisiana Purchase Exposition awarded A-F a Gold Medal. Then the patents continued: In 1905, the pusher bar conveyor; in 1907, the forerunner of the floor type flowing conveyor; in 1912, the roller flight conveyor; and in 1932, the belt driven roller conveyor which was given the U.S. Patent Office number of 1,883,426. It was well after this that Mrs. Jayne B. Spain came to the company, and she was at the helm when the initial beer barrel preoccupation was left far behind and the computer, automation, and a whole world of applications and opportunities loomed.

don Terminal is being outfitted. Her conveyors are at both McGuire and Dover Air Force Bases, in New Jersey and Delaware, as well as in the big Naval Supply Centers of Bayonne, New Jersey, and Philadelphia, Pa., through which go major supply activities for NATO Europe.

Demands of the Viet Nam conflict made of the Oakland Naval Supply Center and the Military Airlift Command's Travis Air Force base (both near San Francisco, Calif.), the key American West Coast facilities for freight and cargo operations. Since 1960, millions of dollars have gone into automated materials handling systems from Navy, Air Force and Marine Corps contracts to Alvey-Ferguson. The requirements were for loading accuracy, speed, and improvement of general efficiency in the flow of supplies to all needing points in the Pacific. In Navy jargon, they were first interested in getting things from "point of pick", or selection, to "point of pack", or palletized for loading. With introduction of the Alvey-Ferguson systems, the Navy and Marine Corps not only had this, but the mechanizing and control for provision of automatic treatment of replenishments and receipts, the return of empty tote boxes for re-use via conveyors, and a supervising computer which held an all-knowing electronic finger on work-load data and movements of materials. Not only did this new magnitude of speed quicken the pulse of the supply line, it also made possible a decrease in manpower from 11,400 employees at the Oakland Naval Supply Center, for example, to a level of about 4,000 where the deadliness of routine had always made for an employee population of floaters. The Oakland Naval Supply Center, commanded by Rear Admiral Edward F. Metzger, has to have a competence to move nearly all of the 1,500,000 items stocked by the Navy, with 60% of them sent to Viet Nam and the rest to other Pacific storage sites located as far north as Japan and as far south as New Zealand.

Viet Nam likewise turned nearby Travis Air Force Base into the world's most feverishly active air freight terminal. As Jayne Spain had provided more than four and a half miles (7-plus km) of conveyor linkage of the Naval Supply Center's complex of 4-story buildings, she also responded with the 463L mechanized air freight handling system which did 80% of the Air Force task of mechanized cargo manipulation and disposing. In air movement, where extended turnaround time is costly, the 463L makes possible a full cargo load in the same time it takes to refuel the aircraft—from 60 to 90 minutes ground time—where five or six hours were needed before. In that important equation of time and distance, flight time from Travis to Saigon being what it is and a munitions and materiel-consuming military force employed 6,800 miles from the U.S., this saving of ground time for four aircraft makes an additional Travis-Saigon flight possible.

The 463L is an indiscriminate feeder of aircraft. Some of the transports bear USAF markings of the 60th Military Airlift Wing, commanded by Brig. Gen. Maurice Casey. The rest of the trans-Pacific shuttling is made up of chartered cargo planes of Pan American, United, World-Wide, Slick, Northwest, Flying Tiger, Alaska, Trans-International, World Airways, Continental, Airlift International, Seaboard World Airlines and others. The by-air tonnages from Travis alone run as high as 30,000 a month. Unlike Oakland Naval Supply Center which services the Pacific area, Travis focuses entirely on Saigon. Airlift originating from Norton Air Force Base, Calif., and from McChord Air Force Base, Washington, cares for Air Force dispositions other than Viet Nam, but Alvey-Ferguson conveyors are ubiquitously present at those sites, too. In fact, from the East Coast to the West Coast, the miles and miles of rollers, selectors, packers, and other carrier and inventory accountments of Alvey-

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

Ferguson are found at Charleston Air Force Base, S.C. (servicing the Caribbean and Latin American military advisory groups, missions and installations), Olmstead, Wright-Patterson, Robins, Tinker, and Kelly Air Force Bases (all interior US material centers), the Naval Supply Centers of Bremerton, Wash. and Long Beach, Calif., and the Marine Corps Depot in Barstow, Calif.

Basically, they are much the same, a combination of conveyor belts and rollers formed in main traffic arteries and feeder lines coming from consolidated bins and popularity storage areas, and all managed off a push-button console. The popularity items are the fast moving and frequently called for, while the consolidated bins embrace everything which could be conceivably called for so arranged that they can be retrieved on call from any location in one of several storage buildings and presented at a single spot by an off-ramp of the main conveyor. There it is palletized, encased in weather-proof plastic, weighed and loaded. Remarkable as has been the time-saving and expediting character of unit conveyor materials handling, the strains of the Viet Nam war supply line have shown both Air Force and Navy systems to now be obsolete requiring drastic revisions and upgrading. This is natural in that they were on drawing boards in 1960, and initially installed in 1962, '64 and '65. Brig. Gen. Casey, his eyes on the horizon where the Lockheed C-5A will soon appear, sees a matching need for greater conveyor capacity. "We are anticipating a plane which will lift more than 100,000 pounds," he says. Only the very biggest in today's air fleets can manage as much as 70,000 pounds.

As is nearly always the case, war or deterrence of war tends to inflict colossal pressures on any system. From what is learned of those pressures and the reaction of equipment and devices subjected to them, come many useful applications in nonwarlike civil uses. Alvey-Ferguson's initial military contract (long after it had started with the beer barrels and other mundane relieving of men of back-breaking loads) was in various Army arsenals, and shell-loading plants in World War II. Even before that, it first began government contract activity in 1910 with the U.S. Post Office Department for which it delivered belt-powered conveyors and slider beds (or belts running over a solid bed). Today's great baked goods supplier, Sara Lee, and Colgate-Palmolive, with its outpouring avalanche of toilet goods, both big warehousers, use the unit-conveyors order-filling method.

War or peace, the human race and the servicing of it, will demand more and more of materials handling systems, in the opinion of Mrs. Spain, and more and more sophisticated systems. The people who used to tote, select, monitor, sort, pack, inventory and deliver are being steadily replaced in the drudgery aspects and are steadily being upgraded into the role of overseers of all these slave systems. The amount of effort it takes to activate a button pallet, in contrast to the naked power of men needed to accomplish a similar lift is inconsequential. If it is true that Man is the only thinking animal, and his appeal is increasingly to brains rather than brawn, the materials handling splice—which really makes the bridge from mere transport into transportation systems possible—permits emphasis on brains while adding vastly superior capacities in mechanized brawn incapable of being dulled or made careless by routine.

The great historian Will Durant placed "mechanisms of transport" first among those ancient developments leading to economic civilization, and the invention of the wheel, or roller, is enshrined by historian and engineer alike as Man's most interesting, beneficial, and valuable mechanical contrivance. Had neither come about, it's likely that these two handicaps would still have Man fighting animals for his sustenance, and life would be primitive beyond our comprehension.

This simple fact may explain in part a concern of Mrs. Spain for another kind of limitation, and for the relief of this limitation she has used simple wheel conveyors to illustrate their versatility, even by indirection, in humanity's service. She is Vice Chairman of the President's Committee on Employment of the Handicapped, an honor bestowed by President Johnson on her as reward for more than 25 years of dedicated work in behalf of the physically impaired. Such is her championship of them as an employment resource, she maintains a ratio in her plants of one physically handicapped employee to each ten. These range from design engineers and marketing people down to wheel-chaired assembly line workers. All are hired by her for their ability to perform the job for which they apply rather than as an act of charity because of the disability they bear which would neither help the job-seeker nor the company to whose payroll they were added. Each man and woman of the 500 on her job roster does the task assigned.

In Algiers, Greece, Yugoslavia, Czechoslovakia, Hungary, Poland and India, she has been featured at International Trade Fairs. For each of these appearances, she learned enough of the basic required language, and asked each country to bring her 12 to 16 of its indigenous blind. She first trained them in the construction of a 450-part wheel conveyor, and then, during the life of each of the Fairs, these blind people constructed and operated the conveyors. Her purpose was to show that there is an important employment resource in the physically handicapped in every country, and that they possess many overlooked capabilities to serve themselves and some agency or business. In this way, Jayne Spain has operated at a level considerably above and beyond mere materials handling and has literally transported many people from the miseries and denials accorded the frail, the pained, and ignored opening the doors for them into useful occupations and contributing citizenship. When she did this in Communist-bloc countries, she has been the Free World's most effective rebuttal to the anti-capitalistic cliches that industrialists are without compassion and are not so much people as profits-oriented. In her regular role as a profit-making, product producing, woman business executive, Jayne Spain has not only taken great weight off the muscles of men with her materials handling equipment, in her other role as a practicing humanitarian she has given liberally of her own life to reduction of the weight of physical insufficiency as a bar to employment.

Last July 24, 1967, the National Federation of Business and Professional Women's Clubs gave her its much coveted "Top Hat Award" and said of her: "This award is given in recognition of her outstanding contribution toward increasing employment opportunities of handicapped women and men . . . for her previous People to People award by the President of the United States for her work with overseas blind . . . for enhancing the role of the woman executive in business by her compelling and persuasive speeches and her appearances on many platforms and panels in this and other countries." Among those applauding this honoring were her husband, a prominent Cincinnati, Ohio lawyer, and her two sons, 11 and 13 years old.

That Jayne Spain is clearly a lady who moves things, and people, and is much respected therefore is also indicated by the fact that she was one of the first to introduce publicly the brandnew Secretary of Transportation, Alan Boyd, shortly after he had been named by the President for the most recently established cabinet position.

The mark of a good executive is measured not only in time saved, but in wise use of the saved time. As Jayne Spain sees it, the more sophisticated and efficient she can make the materials handling field, the more time it will give her for helpful involvements elsewhere, as leisure she knows not.

**Rhodesia's Responsible Government
Solves Crime Problem**

HON. JOHN R. RARICK

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 27, 1968

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, peaceful self-governing Rhodesia, under the Ian Smith government, has all but abolished crime resulting from Communist trained and inspired terrorist attacks.

Their solution to intimidation, threats of violence, possession of fire bombs and offensive weapons, and subversive political blackmail, is in reality very simple and inexpensive, for example, the banning of unlawful organizations established to overthrow constitutional government or those which pose a threat to preservation of law and order.

Our leaders would do well to follow the leadership of Rhodesia.

One thing for sure, Rhodesia has never had to pass laws to keep her people in or out of Rhodesia, the way her antagonist, Britain, proposes.

The Rhodesian Ministry of Information has issued a short and concise treatise on the effective handling of their Communist infiltration called "Who Are the Puppet Masters" which I here insert in the RECORD followed by the UPI release from London for February 23, 1968:

WHO ARE THE PUPPET MASTERS?

It is natural for any group of people anywhere in the world, to support the legitimate objectives of political parties if they give promise of a better life socially and economically.

Yet when violence and intimidation become a party's means to gain support, then any Government which cares for its peoples must intervene.

That is exactly what happened in Rhodesia. Self-styled leaders of African political parties posed a considerable threat to the preservation of law and order in Rhodesia, and they were simply and effectively, banned.

But let's take the story from the beginning. It is probably not widely known that in Rhodesia no person lost his life as a result of police action in civil disturbances between 1896 and July, 1960.

This record was lost when two people were killed during riots instigated by a subversive political organisation.

Since July, 1960, until the present time—and including the deaths resulting on both sides from action against communist-trained terrorists—the number of people who have died in Rhodesia from violence perpetrated with political objectives in view, is less than 50 deaths suffered by the British Army in Aden.

Since a State of Emergency was declared in Aden in December, 1963, some 329 soldiers and civilians have been killed, and 1,604 wounded.

Nationalist politics began in Rhodesia with the establishment of the Southern Rhodesia African National Congress on September 12, 1957.

This party was succeeded, after being banned in 1959, by the National Democratic Party, Zimbabwe African People's Union, People's Caretaker Council, and the Zimbabwe African National Union, all under the same leadership.

Without exception they dedicated themselves to the overthrow of constitutional government in Rhodesia by adopting the well known methods of subversive organisations, that is, to recruit and train guerrilla fighters and to give them military assistance and to supply them with arms and equipment.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

proved communist tactics of violence and subversion.

On June 5, 1957, the then Prime Minister, Mr. R. S. Garfield Todd, was quoted in the *Rhodesia Herald* as saying:

"There are directing brains outside and behind this. The Government is not unaware of the fact that there are other forces at work. Much as we deplore the emergence of a racialistic organisation, the Government will not take any action so long as there is no subversive activity or any kind of threatening behaviour towards those who may not agree with the promoters of this organisation. If there should be any attempt to use the organisation as an instrument of intimidation or provocation, the Government will act without hesitation."

Self-styled leaders of African political parties once proclaimed to the world that they enjoyed the full support of the African population in Rhodesia in fighting a war of liberation against colonial oppression. But the real truth is that their support was minimal because the African people as a whole, being conservative in outlook, viewed with great suspicion the bona fides of self-styled leaders.

A complete revulsion has taken place within the last five years against these leaders and what they stand for, because the net result of their activities was the creation of human misery and terror.

Now the only supporters of these parties within Rhodesia number around 500, or .001 per cent of the population—being those who have been restricted or detained in order to prevent them from committing acts of violence and intimidation against the population in general and the African in particular.

To protect Rhodesia against terror tactics, it was necessary for the former administration of Sir Edgar Whitehead to take action as forecast by Mr. Todd. Normal democratic processes and law were quite inadequate to deal with communist inspired subversion and new legislation was required to close loopholes in the Public Order Act, 1955, which had been promulgated by Mr. Todd's Government.

The main prop of this legislation was the Law and Order (Maintenance) Act of 1960, which has been amended from time to time to meet each threat as it arose.

This statute, which would be invaluable if promulgated in the United States to meet the unhappy situation there at the present time, has been criticized by left-wing elements overseas as being "repressive" and as providing the "apparatus of a Police State".

Nevertheless it is an essential counter to subversion and terrorism and deals with crimes which are committed to further subversive political purposes.

Leading British Government members recently repeated their opinion that violence and terrorism—particularly terrorism—has been a direct result of Rhodesia declaring its independence.

No doubt this opinion is based on information supplied by permanent officials in the Commonwealth Relations Office, whose business it is to collect facts and provide the Labour Government with an accurate assessment of the Rhodesian scene.

The British Prime Minister and his colleagues should be well-primed with factual information provided by the British Residual Mission in Salisbury.

Terrorist infiltration in Rhodesia began in 1962—more than three years before the declaration of independence. Before then, more than 80 terrorists who entered Rhodesia, were caught and sentenced to long terms of imprisonment.

Terrorist infiltration is not the result of U.D.I. but a continuation of the existing policy of communist backed organisations.

These are the official figures of the number

February 27, 1968

of crimes committed in Rhodesia with the object of furthering subversive political purposes between 1961 and July, 1967. They relate to intimidation, threats of violence, the possession of bombs or offensive weapons, petrol bombing, bombing by grenade, stoning and erection of road-blocks—

1961	901
1962	1,112
1963	961
1964	4,910
1965	1,660
1966	609
1967	98

In 1961 there was an increase in political crimes caused by the activities of the N.D.P., which was banned by the Whitehead Government on December 9 of that year.

In 1962 Z.A.P.U. was formed and there was more violence by that organisation until it was banned again by Sir Edgar the same year.

In December, following a general election, the Government of Mr. Winston Field took over and the remaining detainees and detainees held by the previous Administration were released in January, 1963.

In August, a split in the nationalist ranks resulted in the formation of the People's Caretaker Council and Z.A.N.U. It led to violent rivalry between the two factions, and a reign of terror in Salisbury and Bulawayo African townships.

This caused the declaration of States of Emergency in Highfield Township in August, 1964, and in Harari in October. Both P.C.C. and Z.A.N.U. were declared unlawful organisations.

Violent crime mushroomed to five times that of the previous year, but in 1965, following the restriction of organisers of violence, the crime rate dropped sharply.

It was during 1964 and 1965 that terrorist infiltration posed a serious threat to life and property. In 1966, the first full year after independence, there was a significant decrease in political crime and an even greater decrease is shown for the first six months of this year.

These figures hardly indicate vast discontent and national sympathy in support of the subversive political organisations which have been based in Zambia since 1964.

This decrease in crime has been achieved in the face of hostile broadcasts by the B.B.C. sponsored relay station at Francistown and the inflammatory broadcasts inciting violence propagated by Zambia Radio.

This lack of support must be a deep disappointment to the terrorist political organisations in Zambia and possibly the reason why they attempt to justify their existence to their communist supporters by sending large bands of terrorists to penetrate Rhodesia and South Africa.

These latest figures make a complete mockery of nationalist claims of wholehearted support among the alleged oppressed population who have in fact assisted the Security Forces in locating and arresting terrorists.

Little threat is posed by remnants of subversive organisations in Rhodesia, because of lack of support for them within the country.

There is no "explosive situation" in Rhodesia, or any threat to world peace, although no doubt these hackneyed phrases will continue to be used by members of the Afro-Asian Group.

The only threat to life and property in Rhodesia now is that posed by barefaced aggression on the part of terrorist organisations supported and trained by the communists and harboured by Zambia.

Rhodesians of all races merely wish to be allowed the courtesy of working out their own problems on the spot, which they are doing at the present time.

Any future constitution of Rhodesia will be

that agreed by Rhodesians and not one imposed by political dogmatists.

The Constitutional Commission of black and white Rhodesians is at present considering written and oral evidence in Rhodesia.

There is no doubt that communist inspired attacks on Southern Africa will continue long after there has been a general settlement of the Rhodesian constitutional issues, with or without the agreement of the United Kingdom.

Over the last two decades Britain has indirectly encouraged by appeasement, the use of communist methods of violence to achieve political ends, the latest instance being her surrender in Aden.

The lesson which has been learnt by demagogues seeking political power anywhere in the world is that investment in violence pays handsome dividends.

Such appeasement however, plays no part in the thinking of the Rhodesian people for the simple reason that such action would mean the inevitable destruction of their country.

There will be no retreat on this issue.

BRITISH MOVE TO BLOCK ASIAN RUSH FROM KENYA

LONDON.—The government introduced in Parliament today a bill to shut the door on thousands of Asians fleeing to Britain from alleged discrimination by black Africans in Kenya.

It could become law in five days.

Home Secretary James Callaghan, who introduced the legislation following a three-hour cabinet meeting, said the government was convinced the flood of Indians and Pakistanis must be restricted in the name of good race relations.

Even as Parliament convened, two planes were due in London with 240 more Asians from Nairobi and a third with at least 110 more was prepared to leave.

In Nairobi, thousands of Asians crowded airline offices trying to book passage to Britain. But travel agents said all regularly scheduled airlines were sold out until the middle of next month.

MEASURE DRAWS ATTACK

Liberals and Asian community leaders attacked the legislation and accused Callaghan of giving in to racist propaganda.

Callaghan said the law would merely close loopholes in existing immigration laws for British subjects throughout the world. But it was obviously intended for Asians fleeing East Africa.

Callaghan said in the last 90 days 7,000 immigrants, nearly all Pakistanis and Indians from Kenya, had arrived in Britain.

Under the proposed legislation the influx would be reduced to 1,500 heads of families a year. And these, Callaghan said, would be limited to persons with substantial ties to Britain such as birth, marriage or parental connections.

DATES BACK CENTURY

The problems in East Africa go back 100 years when British colonial officers imported Asians to build railways and become shopkeepers and small merchants.

Over the years, the Indian and Pakistani population in East Africa grew to perhaps 200,000.

In 1963, when Kenya was granted independence, Asians who refused Kenyan citizenship were given British passports, giving them the right to enter Britain without restriction.

The deadline for Asians to take up Kenyan citizenship has passed, resulting in an exodus by thousands fearful they would be discriminated against.

Part of their fears resulted from Africanization policies in business and industry in Kenya and other newly independent East African nations.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

President Acts To Bring Jobs to America's Hard-Core Unemployed

HON. JACK BROOKS

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 27, 1968

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Speaker, President Johnson has asked the directors of the State employment services to join with him in creating jobs for the jobless—and hope for the hopeless.

Today, more than 75 million Americans are at work. During the present administration alone, our economy has created more than 7½ million jobs—and this year we hope to add another million and one-half.

Yet hundreds of thousands of unemployed Americans do not know the self-respect and hope of a regular paycheck. They are unskilled, untrained, unschooled—and ill prepared for our modern technological age. Their frustration and anger at our affluent society must be our concern. Their plight must not be theirs alone—because it affects everyone in our Nation.

The President's proposed manpower program is a historic effort to employ the hard-core unemployed. Through close cooperation with private enterprise, the administration—with the help of Congress—can find 500,000 new jobs for them.

This imaginative proposal—in tandem with a new work incentive program—will, in the President's words, "replace the dole with the payroll" and "rescue tens of thousands of Americans from the waste of welfare."

The time for talk and promise has past—the need for urgent action is clear. The choice is whether we are willing to bring the blessing of prosperity to all Americans—or allow the frustration of the jobless to flourish. The choice is whether we have the courage to build a more just America—or allow our society to smoulder in its own flames.

Finally, the decision for us today is whether we can build a society worthy of our historic ideals and our fondest hopes. I share President Johnson's conviction that America will face up to the challenge before her.

The full text of the President's statement to the directors of the State employment services follows:

REMARKS OF THE PRESIDENT TO THE STATE EMPLOYMENT SERVICE DIRECTORS

Secretary Wirtz, State Employment Directors, ladies and gentlemen:

I know you will understand if I am a little late. My morning was spent in a good cause. The time of yours that I spent was pursuing a subject that all of us want to obtain more than anything else in the world—that is peace.

I had a very pleasant visit with the Secretary-General of the United Nations at some length. We ran over some of the allotted time.

I met with our own Security Council. That explains why I have asked your indulgence.

Part of the promise of America is that all of us should have a chance to earn a living.

We are happy to say that today more Americans are working than have ever worked before—some 75 million of us.

Our economy has been moving forward, surging ahead. In the last four years, we have

created more than 7½ million jobs. This year, God willing, if the economy continues as we hope, we will add another million and a half jobs.

I said the other day—and I repeat now—a very realistic person informed me the other evening that outside of peace in the world, there were two extremely important things for every man in public life to keep in mind. Since you are in public life—handling the Employment Service, I think I should remind you of this story.

One is the ballot. The remedy that we seek for almost anything that needs a remedy is the ballot. Everybody is equal on election day. You can pull that lever and you cast that vote.

The next thing he said was vitally important was the buck—the buck and the ballot. People are much more rational when they have some money in their pocket. They are much more rational and tolerant. There is a better atmosphere—even here in the East Room—when all of us have jobs. And that is not an application for renewal.

But there are tens of thousands of people who are not here with us—scattered through the country—who do not have jobs. They don't have a real opportunity to work at all. There are reasons for this. They are unskilled and untrained and unschooled. There are many other reasons. Some of them are handicapped. Some of them are shut off because of discrimination. Some of them have incurred bad habits and have bad records, or diseases that keep them from becoming employable.

All these people need our help.

I have found through my years in dealing with folks like this that there is no one who can do more to help them than the State Employment Services.

Now, the plight of these folks is not their plight alone because you can see that it affects everyone in the Nation. When a person down the street shows up with smallpox, we all head for the basement and they put on a quarantine. When we have poverty in our cities and the riots that have taken place in Detroit and Newark—the civil rights problems that we have—then I think America is going to have to answer that question.

I think America must.

How and where are we answering it?

One way we are answering it is that I have recommended to the Congress a manpower program this year that contains a budget that is the largest in the Nation's history. It is \$2.1 billion.

We have initiated an historic effort to find jobs in private industry. We have a goal of 500,000 hard-core unemployed.

Mr. Henry Ford and a blue ribbon group of businessmen—employers, management people—have set up their own organization. They are going to come in this weekend and report to me about what they are trying to do in the cities of the Land, trying to reach the hard core unemployed. That is a great step forward—and I hope it will be productive.

We have strengthened and streamlined the Manpower Administration.

Now we are going to launch the Work Incentive Program.

Its objective is very simple: Replace the dole with the payroll. Rescue tens of thousands of Americans from the waste of welfare.

Start them along the pathway to productive lives.

This program will begin in six weeks. Between April 1 and June 30, we plan to help more than 32,000 people now on relief rolls. In Fiscal Year 1969, we will help another 116,000.

The welfare check provides only food and clothing and a roof. But the paycheck does more. It brings hope and respect and dignity to its recipient. A paycheck is a man's passport to opportunity, for himself and his children.

As administrators of the State Employment Services, you are America's agents in this work. With the group of Employment Services I dealt with back in the dark days of the Depression in 1935—we had an objective to work ourselves out of a job by getting everybody a job. We would go in there and see who you had registered and what their qualifications were—and try to get them jobs. We did and we went out of existence a short time later because we put boys in school—and on highways—and in parks—and in CCC camps. We kept this country from undergoing a frightening, perilous situation.

So today I think you have that same chance and responsibility again. We don't have the unemployed walking the streets that we had then. We have a more dangerous thing these hard-core unemployed who are unskilled and untrained and unprepared.

We must do something about it.

You have that chance and that responsibility, I think, to help us fulfill this part of what we believe is America's dream. It is a dream that we all share. It is a dream of a much better world than we are living in now. It is a dream of a Nation and a world at peace. It is a dream of peace in the world and peace for themselves. It is a dream of an America with a sound currency and a sound economy. It is a dream of a happy Nation. It is a dream of a busy, bustling, thriving, "go-go" Nation. It is a dream of a Nation that is productive; it is turning things off the assembly line with every click of the style.

We need you; we count on you.

We hope that you can put yourselves in the position for the moment of one of these hard-core fathers or mothers or sons or daughters.

As President Roosevelt used to say, "Ill-fed, ill-clad, ill-housed, ill-prepared and ill-trained and ill-skilled"; say to yourself "There except for the grace of God would be I."

Keep that person constantly in front of you. Then you help us find him and take him by the arm and put him over here where he is no longer a tax-eater, but a tax-producer and a taxpayer.

If you do that, we can preserve this land; we can move it forward to new heights.

If you can't do it, I don't know who can. That is the reason I took the time and I asked each of you to come here to meet with me.

I said to your dynamic and inspiring leader, Secretary Wirtz, that while you were here I wanted to personally try to give you this mission.

Go back home, find out who they are, where they are, what they can do, what they cannot do—and then help us find the answer to it.

If we don't, we will just smolder in our own flames. If we don't, we will be failures. If we don't, we wouldn't be worthy of an appellation that we often give ourselves—"The leader of the world."

But I don't want to think about what will happen if we don't—because we are going to.

Thank you very much.

The Star Takes a Constructive Stand

HON. ED EDMONDSON

OF OKLAHOMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 27, 1968

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Speaker, the Washington Star on February 21 had some constructive and thoughtful things to say about the program of President Nguyen Van Thieu of the Republic of Vietnam.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

Granting that the challenges are many and the problems are great in this embattled country, the fact remains that President Thieu is calling for a united national effort to deal effectively with those challenges and problems.

The Star has words of wisdom for all of us when it says:

Its critics would do well to hold their fire at a crucial time when attacks upon it can serve only to please and help the enemy.

The full text of the editorial follows:

THIEU'S PROGRAM

President Nguyen Van Thieu, in his address the other day to the National Assembly, spoke with deep and understandable emotion of the atrocities committed by the Viet Cong in their savage campaign against South Vietnam's cities. Among the grim examples cited by him: The systematic, cold-blooded killing of the wives and children of 1,000 government militiamen.

To cope with this Hanoi-directed strategy of terror, and to strengthen the overall defense effort against the Communist North, Thieu has announced to the Assembly—as a plan to be set in motion at once—a revised series of mobilization measures. The measures, designed to add substantially to the size and flexibility of the armed forces, include the drafting of 18-year-olds on a faster schedule; the recall of veterans who have served fewer than five years; a halt in discharges except for medical reasons; and special military training for all over 17 in school and for civil servants under 45.

In proclaiming this program—and in asking the Assembly for authority to rule by decree in economic matters during the coming year—Thieu has embarked on an unpopular course and is likely to meet with very strong opposition. But he has acted with admirable firmness on the basis of hard facts and urgent conditions that his political foes can neither dispute nor belittle. Not the least of the conditions is what the South Vietnamese people have suffered as a result of the fighting unleashed by the enemy's Lunar New Year offensive—in the first nine days, over 3,000 civilians killed, nearly 8,000 wounded, and 196,000 made homeless.

As Thieu has put it, the offensive has "proved that the Communists also regard the people as their enemies." That is why he has called upon his countrymen to take on new defense burdens: "These measures may infringe somewhat on democratic rights, but without them the situation may get out of control. We must first defend our nation; if we cannot defend our nation, our democratic rights will become meaningless." To the South Vietnamese, so weary of war, this sort of talk might be wholly unappealing under ordinary circumstances. But they have suffered cruelly at the hands of the enemy, and they may well react by rallying behind the Thieu government and its program.

It is a program, in any event, that merits the American support promised by United States Ambassador Ellsworth Bunker. Saigon, under the leadership of Thieu and Vice President Nguyen Cao Ky, is plainly striving to do better in an exceedingly difficult and dangerous situation. Its critics would do well to hold their fire at a crucial time when attacks upon it can serve only to please and help the enemy.

Neighborhood Development Program

HON. B. F. SISK

OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 27, 1968

Mr. SISK. Mr. Speaker, I would like to call to the attention of the Members a

February 27, 1968

section of the President's message on the crisis of the cities which I believe to be of utmost importance to all of us who represent districts in which urban renewal programs are taking place.

Specifically, I refer to the section dealing with the neighborhood development program, which has particular applicability to what is generally known as West Fresno in my district.

At the present time, there are something like 800 dwelling units in West Fresno which are in such a state of deterioration that they should be red-tagged immediately because they are not fit for occupancy. Unfortunately, under the procedures presently required, nothing can be done to begin improving this housing under urban renewal until a project area is designated, and the planning and design are completed for the complete project. This means months and months of delay, accompanied by mounting frustration and disappointment.

Under the neighborhood development program, it would be possible for the Redevelopment Agency of the City of Fresno, and the city of Fresno to establish temporary housing without delay, possibly utilizing the advanced technology of the mobile home industry, which would be used while substandard housing is being rehabilitated or replaced. This means the people would be able to continue to live in their own areas where their family ties are and not be cast out on the street. It means a more stable, more solid community.

Another example would be the case of an industry which wants to locate in an urban renewal area. Now, industries frequently are told they face long delays before locating in a project area until the entire planning and design work is completed. As a result, the industry may go elsewhere. Under the neighborhood development program, an industry could be accommodated and early action taken to assure its location in the area with the resultant creation of new job opportunities for the redevelopment area residents.

Mr. Speaker, I hope the Congress will act favorably on this program because it holds great hope to get more action taken more quickly in urban renewal areas.

Sixteenth Annual University of Michigan Congressional Dinner

HON. MARTHA W. GRIFFITHS

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 27, 1968

Mrs. GRIFFITHS. Mr. Speaker, on February 21, the 16th annual University of Michigan congressional dinner was held in Washington, D.C., at the Mayflower Hotel. At this time, I would like to insert in the RECORD the address delivered at the dinner by Lynn Townsend, chairman of the board and chief executive officer of Chrysler Corp. The address was particularly impressive because it showed the leader of one of America's great industries turning his time to one

of America's great problems—the problem of education. The address is an eminently worthwhile contribution to the discussion of education:

REMARKS BY LYNN TOWNSEND, CHAIRMAN AND CHIEF EXECUTIVE OFFICER, CHRYSLER CORP., AT THE MICHIGAN CONGRESSIONAL DINNER, MAYFLOWER HOTEL, WASHINGTON, D.C., FEBRUARY 21, 1968

I'm sure there must be a few people here tonight who for one reason or another have been deprived of the privilege of being students at the University of Michigan. Fortunately for them, our country is rich in great universities. And in all fairness and honesty we Michigan graduates will have to concede that it's quite possible for people to serve their country with distinction and to make signal contributions to civilization without having spent part of their lives in the Athens of the West.

In all seriousness, I think we can all agree that the spectacular expansion and enrichment of American education during the middle third of the century is the principal driving force behind the continued growth of our national economy and the industrial leadership provided by our country in other parts of the world. And our growing economic strength in turn is building a deep and strong foundation for a constantly advancing and maturing educational system.

Many of us can remember the time when Europe, not the United States, was the center of professional education. It wasn't too many years ago, for example, that physician could hardly hope to achieve great distinction in his profession without a few years of study in Vienna or Paris or Berlin. And what was true for those in the medical profession was also true for engineers, scientists, artists, and musicians.

Now the United States is the envy of the world for its system of education, which has brought more educational opportunity within the reach of a greater percentage of population—and covering a greater variety of subjects and professional fields—than has ever been enjoyed by the people of any country at any time in history. This has been a stunning achievement, one which we Americans can be very proud of indeed. The trouble is, however, that much as we have done, we have by no means done enough. The plain fact is that in this time of accelerating technological change, the demand in every sector of our society for well-trained and well-educated people has far outrun the supply.

My personal opinion is that the most critical shortage facing our country today is the shortage of educated brainpower. Back in the days when I was a student at Ann Arbor, we used to hear a lot about the danger of running out of petroleum, iron, and other mineral resources. But in recent years we have learned that with a sufficient application of educated brains, the earth can be made to yield the necessary mineral resources for centuries to come.

A group of eminent scientists at the California Institute of Technology have suggested, for example, that with the application of enough ingenuity—in combination with nuclear energy—we may be able before too many years to crush the surface rocks of the earth and reduce them to their elements in much the same way that we fractionate crude petroleum at the present time. This could give us almost unlimited supplies of uranium and thorium as well as all the other mineral resources we need to support a growing worldwide industrial civilization. But to develop the technology to get and use results like these we are going to need an increasing output of scientists and engineers.

The job of meeting the increasing demand for qualified people at every level of our society is in my opinion the most important

single task facing the nation—and the success of all our other undertakings will depend on how well we do this job.

One good place to start is to make better use of the many gifted people who are now being wasted. A few weeks ago I was given some interesting estimates about the numbers of our gifted young people who are now being overlooked. I was told, for instance, that approximately seven percent of the people of this country have IQ's over 130. This means they are blessed with a mentality which could qualify them, with proper training and motivation, for distinguished careers in the professions. It is also estimated that of the people with an IQ of 130 or better, well over 90 percent finish high school—more than 60 percent enter college—and 50 percent graduate from college. These estimates seem to support what most of us would assume to be true—namely, that mentally gifted young people appreciate educational opportunities and tend to stay with a course of instruction until they see it through. In other words, they are a sound educational investment.

Notice, however, that four out of every ten of our young people with exceptionally high intelligence do not enter college. This means that well over 100,000 gifted young men and women each year are either unable to go to college or are insufficiently motivated to do so. To put it another way, every ten years we are failing to provide a college education for well over a million of our best prospects for the critically important professions. This is a waste of human resources that our country simply cannot afford.

If it is true that trained intelligence is by all odds the most important capital resource of our country—and I for one believe it is—then from now on the total educational effort of this country is going to demand more and more support, financial and intellectual, from every sector of our society. Fortunately, the American people are overwhelmingly in favor of providing as much education as possible for as many people as possible. This was shown to be true beyond any reasonable doubt in a definitive study by the University of Michigan Survey Research Center just a few years ago.

The costs of higher education will climb sharply in the years ahead. But because of the high value placed on college education by increasing numbers of families, because of the heavy demand for professionals in every field, and because of the continued growth of our national economy, I feel confident that the country will find the means to keep our colleges expanding and improving.

The fact is that a relatively small increase in the percentage of the Gross National Product now being allocated to higher education will be enough to meet the very heavy expenses of our colleges in the decade ahead. Consider these facts. According to the United States Office of Education, the total expenditures for higher education in this country during the educational year 1966-1967 amounted to \$16.6 billion. This was 2.1 percent of a GNP of \$785 billion. Ten years from now, in the educational year 1976-1977, the Office of Education estimates a total cost of higher education—and this includes capital outlays for new facilities as well as operating costs—at \$27.8 billion. By that time our GNP, if it continues to grow at the same rate it has grown in the past ten years—that is, at four percent a year in terms of constant prices—will be in the neighborhood of \$1.160 trillion. And the cost of higher education as projected will amount to about 2.4 percent of the GNP. In other words, what seems to be a staggering increase in the total cost of higher education in the next decade will actually require a shift of only .3 of one percent of our GNP.

Considering the immense returns that can be realized from what amounts to a relatively

minor reallocation of the nation's resources, I am confident that the private and public contributions to higher education will measure up to the task. I'm sure the industrial community, for sound and highly practical reasons, will give enthusiastic support to investment in higher education on this scale.

The phase of the total educational challenge that is of special concern to many of us in the business community at the present moment is the problem of providing the right kind and the right amount of elementary and secondary education in the troubled inner cities.

As a matter of fact, the problem of finding adequate support for public school education in virtually all local communities is a particularly difficult one. It is difficult because public school education depends to a very great extent upon the willingness of local communities to vote bond issues and millage increases. It is fair to say that the public school system is the only part of the total educational system of our country that is subject to a direct vote of the people for its support. Support for the rest of the system is voted by elected representatives.

In a period of high and rising taxes we can expect people to express their resentment against the taxes over which they have no direct control by voting down the only taxes over which they do have control. We can almost predict, for example, that if the federal government imposes a ten percent surtax on incomes during the present session, the negative impact will be felt in every school district in the United States. Already, without such a tax, people have been voting down badly needed millage increases and bond issues. The Inkster problem in the Detroit area is only one of many similar situations from coast to coast.

In any discussion of this complex problem, the question of federal support and what some consider the threat of federal control of education is bound to come up. I'm sure the industrial community, for sound and highly practical reasons, will give enthusiastic support to investment in higher education on this scale.

The phase of the total educational challenge that is of special concern to many of us in the business community at the present moment is the problem of providing the right kind and the right amount of elementary and secondary education in the troubled inner cities.

As a matter of fact, the problem of finding adequate support for public school education in virtually all local communities is a particularly difficult one. It is difficult because public school education depends to a very great extent upon the willingness of local communities to vote bond issues and millage increases. It is fair to say that the public school system is the only part of the total educational system of our country that is subject to a direct vote of the people for its support. Support for the rest of the system is voted by elected representatives.

In a period of high and rising taxes we can expect people to express their resentment against the taxes over which they have no direct control by voting down the only taxes over which they do have control. We can almost predict, for example, that if the federal government imposes a ten percent surtax on incomes during the present session, the negative impact will be felt in every school district in the United States. Already, without such a tax, people have been voting down badly needed millage increases and bond issues. The Inkster problem in the Detroit area is only one of many similar situations from coast to coast.

In any discussion of this complex problem, the question of federal support and what some consider the threat of federal control

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

February 27, 1968

of education is bound to be raised as a central issue. My own attitude on this issue is that our country has been doing fairly well in coping with this danger ever since the Survey Ordinance in 1785 set aside one section of every township for the support of education. In the nearly two hundred years since then we have had the Morrill Act in 1862, providing grants of land for agricultural and technical colleges, the Smith-Hughes Act in 1917 for the support of vocational education, and the GI Bill in 1944. These are only a few of the most important and best known of the many federal acts in support of education. And as far as I know, they have not yet resulted in an undue or destructive federal interference with the autonomy of the states in the conduct of their educational programs.

I suggest that if a healthy system of primary and secondary schools is as necessary to the continued strength of our country as most Americans believe it is, we are going to have to use all the kinds of support—both public and private—that we can muster. There seems little doubt that in the years immediately ahead—this support will have to be much greater than in the past. In my opinion we are going to have to do a better job than we have done so far to make sure that the increased educational funds are being used effectively. And we will almost certainly need to give much more serious attention to the advisability of allocating an increasing proportion of educational funds to some inner-city school districts that have unusual needs in this troubled period.

From the point of view of the businessman, it seems absolutely necessary to impose a tighter control on the costs of education for the purpose of getting the most for every tax dollar. It might include using more funds for libraries and less for swimming pools. And it might also include a departure from the lock-step approach to the salary schedules of educators. If the experience of the businessman has any valid application to the management of education, it might seem that more effort would be directed to giving exceptional rewards to educators who make exceptional contributions to educational quality and effectiveness.

We in the business world are beginning to realize that it is no longer possible for us to stay outside the educational world and participate only at a distance by making financial contributions or offering professional advice on how to stretch available funds. The time has come for us to put our experience to use and to get involved in the job of helping young people prepare themselves for fuller participation in American society.

A few weeks ago we at Chrysler entered into a cooperative arrangement with Northwestern High School in Detroit aimed at bridging the gap between the needs of business and the educational programs of the high school. We are putting some of our best people on this job. We think that a company like ours with many years of experience in human relations and job training, and with a pragmatic and flexible approach to new and difficult problems, should be well equipped to reach the young people at Northwestern and help prepare them for jobs in the world of business and industry.

We are proposing to offer practical advice on adapting such high school courses as physics, chemistry, mathematics, and drafting to the needs of industry. We are proposing to offer extensive personal counseling of students by our executives. We are proposing to make equipment available from our labs and shops. And in many other ways we are offering the full range of our know-how in the field of industrial education to the faculty and students of Northwestern High School.

We know this job won't be easy. But we

are prepared to give it an all-out try. And if one approach doesn't work, we'll experiment with others. The important thing is to make a start.

What we are doing at Northwestern is not an entirely new kind of undertaking for us at Chrysler. In recent years we, like many other companies, have made our staff and facilities available for training young people in industrial skills, under contracts with the federal government. As a result, several thousand young Detroiters have received training in such varied fields as clay modeling, drafting, truck driving, welding, metal finishing, paint spraying, power sewing machine operation, and automobile maintenance and repair. I might add that in connection with these programs we have worked closely and effectively with the schools in this area to develop the kind of courses that would get the best results.

We at Chrysler think this is a productive way to combine the practical expertise of private industry, the professional talents of the educator, and the support of government so as to help people improve themselves and in turn improve their community. Early this month we announced a new joint training program with the federal government that is larger than any previous program of this kind that we have undertaken.

Too often in the past, education has been designed to prepare young people for college. We are beginning to learn that education of this kind fails to meet the needs of great masses of our people. As a result, it leaves many of them outside our society, unemployed and discouraged.

We are only beginning to understand how to cultivate all our human resources through education. As yet we haven't learned how to allocate either our educational funds or our teaching talents to get a balanced social result. Here, as in many other phases of our complex urban civilization, we are groping for answers.

Feeling as I do about the University of Michigan, I hope that it will provide some breakthrough solutions in the field of education, as it has in so many other fields over the years. I would also hope that in all our efforts to provide a balance of educational opportunity to meet the needs of all the people in our society we will keep in mind the desirability of creating new centers of excellence like Ann Arbor. In a democratic society there always exists the tendency to level off standards of education and culture—and the related tendency to underemphasize the virtue of distinguished achievement. It would be unfortunate if our present nationwide effort to broaden educational opportunity should have this effect. To put it another way, as we work at the never-ending task of improving our educational system, maybe we should try to make it a source of distinguished leadership and a seedbed of culture and inspiration for a world that stands in need of both.

Delaware's "Outstanding Professional Engineer" for 1968

HON. WILLIAM V. ROTH, JR.
OF DELAWARE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 27, 1968

Mr. ROTH. Mr. Speaker, most of our colleagues who travel the eastern seaboard and are familiar with the Delaware Memorial Bridge have noticed under construction a second identical parallel span. When completed later this

year the new structure will provide four lanes of one-way traffic from New Jersey into Delaware, while the existing bridge will be modified to carry four lanes of one-way traffic from Delaware into New Jersey.

Perhaps our colleagues are also familiar with the Cape May-Lewes Ferry whose modern, automobile-carrying liners ply year-round between Lewes, Del., and Cape May, N.J. This enjoyable 16.3-mile trip, the seaward route of the ocean highway, allows travelers to add a 70-mile cruise to their trip.

The Delaware Memorial Bridge and the Cape May-Lewes Ferry are operated by the Delaware River and Bay Authority. The authority's director, Mr. William J. Miller, Jr., recently was honored as Delaware's "Outstanding Professional Engineer" for 1968. This award is given annually by the Delaware Society of Professional Engineers to recognize individual achievement in a State where distinguished engineers are numerous. For our colleagues' reading I insert the following article concerning Mr. Miller and his achievements which appeared in the Wilmington Evening Journal:

FROM DELAWARE GROUP: MILLER GETS 1968 ENGINEER HONOR

William J. Miller Jr., director of the Delaware River and Bay Authority, has been honored as Delaware's "Outstanding Professional Engineer" for 1968 by the Delaware Society of Professional Engineers.

The 11th person to be honored with the annual award, Miller was presented a plaque last night by Gov. Charles L. Terry Jr. at the Delaware National Engineers' Week Banquet at the Du Pont Country Club.

In his remarks accompanying the presentation, Terry said "The Award of 'Engineer of the Year' depends not only on the technical ability for which the individual receives compensation, but also on that something the individual gives of himself for the betterment of the engineering profession, the improvement of his community and his state and the fostering of the extension of knowledge."

Miller began his career in 1936 as a rodman and later became an instrumentman and draftsman for the State Highway Department in New Castle County. In 1940 he was made an assistant traffic engineer in New Castle County and served in the post until 1942 when he was commissioned a 2d Lieutenant in the Army Corps of Engineers.

In 1946 he returned to the State Highway Department and was named a traffic engineer. A year later he was assigned as a traffic and planning engineer and in 1956 was made deputy chief engineer. In 1961 he was appointed director of operations for the department and for the Delaware Interstate Highway Division which administered the Delaware Memorial Bridge.

Since 1964, Miller has served as director of the Delaware River and Bay Authority, which operates the Delaware Memorial Bridge and the Cape May-Lewes Ferry and is now building the second bridge.

A Wilmington native, Miller attended city schools and later Drexel Institute of Technology, Philadelphia, from which he holds his bachelor's degree in civil engineering. In 1967 he received the "Fifteen-Year Honor Man of the Year Award" for graduates of Drexel Institute of Technology Evening College. He was the first graduate in Delaware to receive the honor.

Miller is a director of the Delaware Safety Council; Blood Bank of Delaware; International Bridge, Tunnel and Turnpike Association; Delaware Racing Association; Delaware

Motor Club, AAA, Highway Research Board, and American Road Builders Association.

In his professional affiliations, Miller is a Fellow in the American Society of Civil Engineers and is a past president of the National Association of Professional Engineers and of the Institute of Traffic Engineers. He is a registered professional engineer in Delaware, New Jersey and Maryland and is a registered land surveyor in Delaware.

Miller has remained active as a reserve officer in the Army Corps of Engineers. He currently serves as director of training and deputy commandant of the Wilmington Army Reserve School.

In 1967 Miller served as Delaware chairman for the March of Dimes. In the same year he served as one of the six lay members of the first 14-member Pastoral Commission set up by the late Bishop Michael W. Hyle of the Catholic Diocese of Wilmington.

Miller and his wife, the former Helen Hughes, live at Manor Drive, Moore's Lake, Dover. They have four children.

Morton Baum: He Will Be Missed

HON. THEODORE R. KUPFERMAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 27, 1968

Mr. KUPFERMAN. Mr. Speaker, in every age there are members of a community whose special service gives them preeminence. Usually though, the recognition comes during their lifetime.

Occasionally, there are those who work in helpful silence dedicated to the proposition that work is to be done for their fellow citizens and that it is the job and not the public relations of the job that needs their talents. Such a man was Morton Baum.

A member of a family active in public service, his brother Lester is part of the local government scene in New York City as councilman at large from Manhattan and has held many important public positions.

The measure of Morton Baum is demonstrated best by the fact that when the late, revered minority leader of the New York City Council, Stanley M. Isaacs, was called upon to nominate a Republican for president of the Borough of Manhattan, to fill a vacancy, his sole choice was Morton Baum.

His career spanned a generation of the fight for good government from Mayor Fiorello H. La Guardia to Mayor John V. Lindsay, but it was his love of the arts and humanities that brought him the greatest and well deserved credit.

As the guiding light of the New York Center, he was in the forefront of the fight for culture in New York City. His spirit will continue in support of the city center by his many friends and admirers.

To give some idea of his fine work, here follows the Clive Barnes article from the Sunday Times of February 18 with the very appropriate heading:

DANCE: MORTON BAUM—HE WILL BE MISSED

(By Clive Barnes)

Life is like an air raid in which, simply to survive, you have to have faith that a bomb will never hit you. You believe you have a charmed life. Most of our decisions

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

are based on the assumption that we will live forever—and not only that we will live forever but that all the people who intimately affect our lives will live forever. A few days ago a man died who intimately affected the lives of all interested in dance and music. His name was Morton Baum. I hardly knew him—a few casual meetings, a few rather more prolonged and intimate phone calls. I always imagined there would be plenty of time to get to know him better.

The last words I heard about him were spoken by the managing director of the Netherlands Dance Theater, here in New York to make final arrangements for the company's season at City Center. He said, "Baum has been wonderful, every help he could give he has given. He is a gentleman." Neither of us knew it, but even as he spoke, Morton Baum was already dead.

The last words I myself spoke about Baum during his lifetime were, I admit, uncharitable. He had been playing around with the idea of bringing modern dance into the City Center complex. He had talked to many people, including myself, about the possibilities, and in the end I felt he behaved badly by having an unrealistic attitude to modern dancer's budgetary needs. (He seemed to think that modern dancers could starve more elegantly than their counterparts in classic ballet.) This was a disagreement. But I had no doubt that eventually Morton Baum would have brought modern dance into the City Center institutional family. And now?

And now? This is the question everyone is asking. Who will replace Morton Baum? Who will look after City Center, that fantastic complex of the arts? It was easy to disagree with him because I felt he botched a certain scheme. But then I imagined he would live forever (like all of us) and put it right in the end. Now who will put it right?

In the very moving and pertinent note Lincoln Kirstein has contributed to the current New York City Ballet programs, he says many fine and true things. One phrase in particular seemed to sum up our loss. Kirstein referred to Baum's "ferocity for excellence." Ferocity for excellence—think what it means. To me it conjures up not only a divine fire—and certainly Baum's fiery choice for the best is evident in the legacy of his achievement—but also of a tiger padding through a jungle.

One reason why Baum was so remarkable at his job was his way of being able to walk through the political jungle, to get what he needed and yet not dirty his paws. He was both a political animal and an artist. A trained amateur musician as well as a tax lawyer of remarkable abilities, Baum was the perfect man to run City Center.

His first involvement in ballet came in 1948. George Balanchine and Lincoln Kirstein were running Ballet Society. They had a company, based upon the School of American Ballet, and they gave special subscription performances which were highly successful in every respect bar one. They lost a great deal of money. In fact they lost so much money that by 1948 they were pretty well doomed.

At least Ballet Society, if it was going out, was going out in a conflagration of glory with the world premiere of the Balanchine and Stravinsky "Orpheus," and for this it was decided to give some public performances at the City Center, which the organization hired in the usual commercial fashion. Morton Baum, no lover of ballet, turned up at one of these performances to see what was happening. He at once understood the seriousness and importance of the undertaking.

He asked the theater manager who was running the show, and the very next afternoon called on Kirstein at his Ballet Society office. Kirstein greeted him with a stream

of vituperation aimed at the present setup—its managers, its audiences, its dancers, its critics, its finances. Baum, who had never previously met Kirstein, must have been aghast. At last able to get a word in edgewise, Baum made to Kirstein the proposal that had occasioned his visit.

He offered to take Ballet Society under the protective wing of the City Center. (At that time seasons were already being given by the New York City Opera and also the New York City Drama Company.) Baum would give Ballet Society a permanent home, a new name, and help to cut its deficits and establish it as America's first institutionalized dance company.

In words that have often been quoted, Kirstein replied, "If you do that for us, I will give you in three years the finest ballet company in America!" The two men shook hands and New York City Ballet was founded.

Once involved in dance, Baum never gave up. He became personal friends with Balanchine and Kirstein, and he helped the company with invaluable advice and support. He was a friend of the company in every respect, fighting for it, protecting it and generally making it practicable for Kirstein and Balanchine to get on with the creative job.

It was a link broken only by Baum's death. For after Baum and City Center had assumed control (for most of the year) of the New York State Theater at Lincoln Center, Baum was still there with the ballet company. But now, left also with a City Center from which both the New York City Ballet and the New York City Opera had departed, Baum found himself diversifying his dance interests.

One remarkable thing he did with the advice of Balanchine and Kirstein was to acquire a new ballet company for City Center. This was the City Center Joffrey Ballet, and Baum showed much the same kind of horse sense he had revealed nearly 20 years earlier. And, at the time of his death, he was encouraging some of the new regional companies (both the National Ballet of Washington and the Pennsylvania Ballet played seasons at City Center) and planning to do something about modern dance.

Many worlds will mourn Morton Baum. But in the dance world our sense of loss is particular because he was perhaps the one essential person in the general institutionalizing of American dance. Opera and music already had strong, well-established organizations with solid homes and equally solid subscribers. But in dance there was more improvisation than solidity. Baum helped give American dance (not just New York City Ballet) a structure, an organizational pattern. It was work well done.

Low-Income Housing

HON. JOSEPH G. MINISH

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 26, 1968

Mr. MINISH. Mr. Speaker, President Johnson has now called for legislation that can lead in the next 10 years to construction and rehabilitation of 6 million housing units for low- and middle-income Americans. He has recognized the need and called on us to act.

For any who question the need to deal vigorously with the problem of substandard housing, I call attention to the types of our citizens who are in need of this assistance—now.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

They include elderly individuals and couples whose incomes are so low they cannot possibly pay market rentals of new or rebuilt homes.

They include the sick, the infirm, and handicapped of all ages.

They include fatherless families in which the mothers cannot earn decent incomes while tending to their young children.

They include families displaced not only by such public improvements as highway building and code enforcement but also by private construction and fire and other causes of home destruction.

They include many Negroes, Mexican Americans, and other minorities who cannot work because they cannot live near enough to where the jobs are.

The low- and moderate-income who now live in slums can be found not only in the big city ghetto but in the small cities, the suburbs, and the rural countryside as well.

Ten years is not too soon to help these kinds of Americans.

The President has offered us a strategy to lend this assistance in that time. The need is clear.

To meet it I ask all of you to join me in support of the President's proposals.

San Rafael Wilderness

HON. JEFFERY COHELAN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 27, 1968

Mr. COHELAN. Mr. Speaker, I hope the Members of the House will take the time to read the editorial carried by the Washington Post on Sunday, February 10, 1968, before the vote on the San Rafael Wilderness conference report is brought to the floor.

The Wilderness Act provides for public participation in plans for the saving of wilderness land, and this is something we should all keep in mind as we vote on this important conservation measure.

Mr. Speaker, I call the editorial to my colleagues' attention by inserting it in the RECORD at this point:

SAN RAFAEL WILDERNESS

A fight over the San Rafael Wilderness in California may have an important bearing on future legislation in this field. This is the first bill expanding the wilderness system, and the pattern set may become an important precedent. For this reason conservationist groups are making an all-out fight for the inclusion of 2200 acres in the protected area over the protest of the Forest Service.

The Forest Service recommended that the San Rafael Primitive Area be expanded to 143,000 acres by means of this first bill under the Wilderness Act. But the act also provides for public participation in plans for the saving of wilderness land. Under these provisions a Citizens' Committee for the San Rafael Wilderness, consisting of most of the country's leading conservation groups, surveyed the area and called for the inclusion of an additional 15,000 acres. In the give-and-take of the legislative process, this figure was whittled down to 2200 acres, and the House passed the bill in that form. The additional acres were included because of their

unusual scenery and their Chumash Indian pictographs and because they provide a flyway for the rare California condor.

In the Senate-House conference, however, the 2200 acres were excluded because the Forest Service deems them to be essential to fire control measures in the area. But the conservationists insist that these acres are outside of the projected plan for a firebreak and that other lands can be used for that purpose. Representative Saylor and others in the House are so convinced that these scenic-pictograph-condor acres should be in the protected wilderness that they will seek to upset the conference agreement when it comes before the House.

The weight of the evidence is on their side. Fire protection is vital, of course, but it is not necessary to take these few highly valuable acres from the conservation viewpoint for that purpose. We hope that the House will take a candid look at the area on its merits with full understanding of the values the conservationists are trying to save. Certainly the House should not merely register a pro forma endorsement of the Forest Service position. It is a decision that Congress itself ought to make on the basis of the national interest in saving the best of our wilderness.

Practically Impossible To Convict Anyone

HON. WILLIAM LLOYD SCOTT

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 27, 1968

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. Speaker, a judge of a court of general jurisdiction in my district has written me regarding the recent trend of the U.S. Supreme Court in favor of persons accused of crime which he states makes it "practically impossible to convict anyone." This man practiced law for a long period of time and served several terms in the State senate before being elected by the General Assembly of Virginia to serve as judge of the ninth judicial circuit. He is a fine lawyer and jurist who has expressed the concern of many lawyers and judges in our country and I share his letter with my colleagues in the hope that we can find a way not only to protect the rights of persons accused of crime but also to protect society against the criminal element in our country. The letter from the Honorable Harold H. Purcell, of Louisa, Va., is set forth in full:

LOUISA, VA., February 5, 1968.
Congressman WILLIAM L. SCOTT,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR BILL: It was a pleasure seeing you recently at the Governor's Mansion.

I am deeply concerned about the increased crime in the Nation. This is not an academic matter. It is something that is developing everywhere. The direct cause of which is in the decisions of the Supreme Court of the United States. It appears that the Supreme Court is continuing with its course of protecting the criminal at the expense of the public, and having no regard for the rights of society.

The *Wade Case*, recently decided by the United States Supreme Court, now requires that there be a lineup before a criminal can be identified, and states further that if the criminal is identified without a proper lineup

February 27, 1968

it is improper identification, and the accused cannot be convicted.

This is ridiculous in this area where everyone knows everyone, and is another example of the Supreme Court adjudicating on the basis of legal theory, rather than on a basis of sound legal principles. Identification has always been a matter to be determined by the Jury, according to the weight of the evidence, and has in no way been involved in any Constitutional question. It appears that our Supreme Court wants to make every matter pertaining to evidence a Constitutional question.

There is no reason to discuss increased crime in the United States, when you get decisions like this, which make it practically impossible to convict anyone.

I suggest that you pass this letter on to Congressman Poff, who has been working on this matter.

It would appear to me that a Committee of State Judges might be of some value to Congress to discuss the various recent cases, and advise Congress in reference to legislation to correct it. It may be that such a Committee is in existence now.

With kindest personal regards.

Very truly yours,

HAROLD H. PURCELL,
Judge, Ninth Judicial Circuit.

Progress Report, Second Session, 90th Congress

HON. ROBERT V. DENNEY

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 27, 1968

Mr. DENNEY. Mr. Speaker, I will soon send to the constituents of Nebraska's First Congressional District my second progress report of the second session of the 90th Congress. For the information of my colleagues, I submit that report for the RECORD:

VOLUME 2, No. 2

DEAR FRIEND: In this report I would like to enumerate more of my voting record and discuss legislation I've introduced or co-sponsored on your behalf, especially the Truth-in-Legislation bill that is receiving national approval.

During the First Session of the 90th Congress there were 245 Roll Call votes and 202 Quorum Calls. My attendance voting record was 95 percent.

When I am not in Washington, many times I can meet with you personally in the First District. Since my term began, I have held regional meetings in York, Beatrice, Fremont, Fairbury, Lincoln, Columbus, Falls City, Norfolk, Nebraska City and Ashland. My staff and I are available to help you solve problems you may have relating to the Armed Forces, public works projects, taxes, pensions, the Agricultural Department, Social Security, civil service, in addition, of course, to supplying information about legislative matters.

CROSS SECTION OF VOTING RECORD

I voted for: Block Grants for Education Funds, Veterans' Pensions, Social Security Increase, Police Benefits, Defense Appropriations, and Mental Health Programs Extension.

I voted against: Seating Adam Clayton Powell, Space Administration Appropriation, Rent Supplements, Demonstration Cities Funds, Appalachian Regional Development, and Increasing the National Debt Limit.

(Note.—All votes are a matter of public information. I will be pleased to furnish you

with additional information requested and my reasons for voting "yea" or "nay".)

INTO THE HOPPER

Among the bills I have introduced or co-sponsored are the following: The Human Investment Act to allow a credit against income tax to employers for the expenses of providing job training programs; Standards and Conduct to provide for disclosure of assets and liabilities and certain business and lobbying relationships of Congressmen; Ambulance Drivers to exclude them from the minimum wage and overtime compensations; National Home Ownership Foundation to provide home ownership opportunity for aspiring low-income families; Agricultural Advance Payments to require the Secretary of Agriculture to make a 50 percent advance payment to farmers who participate in the '68 and '69 Feed Grains Program, both the payment to diverted acreage and the Feed Grains payment itself, (nine days after I introduced this bill, Mr. Freeman announced that partial payments would be made); Meat Importation to revise the quota-control system on the importation of certain meat; Highway Trust Fund to prevent the Transportation Secretary from arbitrarily withholding obligated highway trust funds apportioned to the states; Panama Canal resolving that the U.S. in no way forfeit, cede, negotiate or transfer its sovereign rights over the Canal, and Industrial Personnel Security Program to coordinate the administration of personnel loyalty and security programs, necessary because of the U.S. Supreme Court decision that Communists have a right to work in defense plants.

TRUTH IN LEGISLATION

I introduced a Truth in Legislation bill to provide that each public bill, or resolution introduced in the House shall contain an estimate of the cost to the federal government and to require the Bureau of the Budget to submit to the Congress certain monthly estimates concerning national income and expenditures. It's a simple measure and the purpose of it is to allow us in Congress to know how much money we can expect as receipts and how much money we have spent in our appropriations—a single entry ledger sheet, so that at all times when we vote on appropriations bills we would know whether or not we are running in the red.

I don't think the ordinary citizen realizes that many times members of the House are not aware until after the Session is over that we have been engaged in deficit spending because of the fact that we do not know at all times what our fiscal bank balance amounts to. I'm happy that a great number of large newspapers have written favorably about the Truth in Legislation bill. There's no reason we shouldn't run the Congress on a business-like basis.

The Folly of Overpromise

HON. CHARLES S. JOELSON

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 27, 1968

Mr. JOELSON. Mr. Speaker, I must decry the practice of overpromising, the occupational disease from which most politicians suffer in the autumn before elections. Over the years, I have tried to immunize myself against this virus, and I hope I have been successful.

The candidates for political office on all levels of government and representing both major parties often insult the

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

intelligence of the voters by claiming that they can overnight solve problems which have been festering for decades and centuries. Candidates might be surprised to learn that it is not only good ethics but also good politics to acknowledge that the voters are mature and will resent being the targets of sweeping promises that cannot be kept.

In the legislative branch, there has also been an unfortunate tendency to oversell the potential of some very good laws which have been enacted. Such a practice often excites expectations in some quarters that cannot possibly be met and serves to fan frustration and discontent.

I therefore urge political candidates to exercise restraint. The candidate who promises quick and painless solutions to complicated problems should remember that there is always the danger that he might win and be caught with his pledges down.

I do not mean to suggest that candidates should not vigorously discuss their positions on issues. I merely hope that more of us would level with the people.

A Diplomat in the Pentagon

HON. ROMAN C. PUCINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 27, 1968

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, the Chicago Sun-Times in one of its recent editions carried an excellent editorial praising President Johnson's selection of Clark M. Clifford as the new Secretary of Defense.

I join the Sun-Times in commanding President Johnson for this outstanding appointment and, with permission, I insert the editorial in the RECORD at this point.

The Sun-Times editorial follows:

A DIPLOMAT IN THE PENTAGON

Hawks and doves have joined in approval of the appointment of Clark M. Clifford to succeed Robert S. McNamara as secretary of defense. Clifford will bring to the Pentagon a wealth of experience not only in military affairs but in the field of diplomacy, foreign and domestic.

Like McNamara, Clifford has a well-deserved reputation for intellectual brilliance. McNamara was a World War II Air Force officer; Clifford was a Navy officer. McNamara left his private job at great financial sacrifice. So will Clifford. But there the comparison virtually ends.

Unlike McNamara, who came to Washington from the Ford Motor Co., Clifford's career has been in law and government affairs. Clifford has been a trusted counselor to Presidents Truman, Kennedy and Johnson. He has a large law practice.

Clifford was one of the drafters of the 1947 law unifying the armed forces under the secretary of defense. President Kennedy appointed him chairman of the President's Foreign Intelligence Advisory Board, a position he still holds. In 1966 he was President Johnson's adviser at the Manila conference and last year he and Gen. Maxwell Taylor visited a number of Southeast Asian and Pacific countries as personal emissaries of the President, discussing Vietnam.

Clifford was one of the persons McNamara recommended to Mr. Johnson as qualified for the defense post.

No two men approach the same job the same way and Clifford undoubtedly will be a striking change from McNamara. But each may prove to have been just the right man for the job at the time.

McNamara served longer than any other person in the job (seven years). He brought the efficiencies of private industry and he put a firm civilian hand on the military brass.

Clifford will inherit the more streamlined establishment created by McNamara and it is to be hoped that he will prove as tough in asserting civilian control over the generals and admirals as McNamara did.

Clifford's own particular contribution, however, may be in helping to unify Washington behind a course for peace. Although he has a reputation for being more hawkish than McNamara, his appointment was praised by a thoroughgoing dove, Sen. J. William Fulbright (D-Ark.).

Fulbright said that he felt that Clifford will at least listen to critics of the President's policy. And since the President leans on Clifford for advice, a better understanding of the various positions might result.

On the other hand, Clifford's appointment means that the President will feel that he has greater personal control over the office; Mr. Johnson inherited McNamara from President Kennedy. Clifford is his own personal choice.

With a new defense chief some of the nation's priorities may be subtly adjusted. We hope the appointment of Clifford, a Johnson adviser on diplomacy as well as defense, will mean a stronger emphasis on the political and diplomatic aspects of the Vietnam problem rather than the purely military. Meanwhile it is salutary that the appointment has been generally applauded.

Low-Rent Public Housing

HON. JAMES J. HOWARD

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 27, 1968

Mr. HOWARD. Mr. Speaker, I believe President Johnson's call for the construction, beginning in fiscal 1969, of 300,000 low- and middle-income housing units. His proposals would step up the low-rent public housing program to 75,000 units, and the rent supplement program to 72,500 units, with the remainder coming from the interest payment programs which he has recommended.

The need for more federally assisted housing will increase as our population grows.

One of the programs which the President will rely on to meet this need is the low-rent public housing program. Established under the Housing Act of 1937, as amended, that program is designed to help provide decent, safe, and sanitary dwellings within the financial means of families and individuals with low incomes. This low-rent housing is locally owned and operated by local housing authorities.

Federal loans and annual contributions are provided to local housing authorities to assist in financing the acquisition or construction and rehabilitation of low-rent housing and for maintaining low rents of such housing.

The increased public housing proposals together with the other programs which the President has outlined to meet our housing needs deserve our fullest support. I urge all Members to join in backing these proposals.

Georgia's Attack on Rural Poverty

HON. ROBERT G. STEPHENS, JR.

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 27, 1968

Mr. STEPHENS. Mr. Speaker, recently at the National Legislative Conference of the National Association of Counties, the Honorable Hugh Logan, one of the county commissioners from Clarke County, Ga., and vice president of the Georgia County Commissioners Association, was a commentator on a panel discussion dealing with rural poverty. Commissioner Logan, a member of a body of advisers appointed by Secretary of Commerce Trowbridge, made some very important observations about rural poverty and specifically about the success of planning and development groups in the State of Georgia which has been a pioneer in this field, financing the area planning groups from local and State sources. Commissioner Logan was accompanied to the conference by the Clarke County engineer, James Holland, and the county attorney, Upshaw C. Bentley, Jr. A summary of the observations of Mr. Logan are important in the national field and especially to emphasize what can be done on the State level in planning and developing rural areas if the States are willing to finance the organization of planning boards.

Remarks of Mr. Logan are as follows:

About 30% of our total population lives in rural America. It has been stated that one out of every four persons living in rural America is poor. Unemployment, percentage-wise, is much greater in this area than in urban America. Much of rural America's housing is substandard.

Due to technical advancement in agriculture and price stability job opportunities have been lost for many citizens of rural America. These opportunities have not been sufficiently replaced by other industries located in our rural areas. Due to limited job opportunities, competition for employment is keen, compounding the problems of the less talented and less educated rural citizen.

In the quest of "greener pastures" and the desire for a better standard of living, many of rural America leave native soil. They often find that the grass of the "greener pasture" was only false illusion. This leads to further despair and frustration for the individual or family that migrates from the rural area. Many of our urban problems of today actually originate from rural America. How then can we make our rural areas more attractive, not only to people, but to industry? How can we bring about a change in our social and economic environment in rural America to compete with that of urban America?

I am sure that you will agree that "local government is the bulwark of democracy." The means of deriving revenues by our local governments have been usurped by both State and Federal government. The demand for adequate health, educational, recreational, transportation, cultural and road pro-

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

grams are just as important in the rural area as in the urban area. In many areas of America, local government finds itself plagued with a decreasing population, and a sagging economy, largely due to agricultural or other economic changes, and without sufficient resources to "pull itself up by its boot strap."

By not having a broad tax base or sufficient resources on the local level to plan, initiate, update or expand programs dealing with education, health, recreation and transportation, often the community becomes an economically and socially depressed area.

Often due to our immigration, many areas of rural America finds itself without sufficient leadership to bring about the thrust needed to compete with the urban areas. In some isolated areas, much of the wealth of the community is concentrated in the hands of a few who are happy and content to keep the status quo.

Due to the financial inability of many rural towns and counties, they cannot employ professional assistance to combat their social and economic problems as individual entities of government. By joining several counties together as area planning groups or area economic development groups, the individual county or city should be able to financially support this effort. In having common problems and collectively seeking solutions multi-county planning and development groups can furnish the mechanism to attack problems on an area basis, rather than on a town or county level.

I had the opportunity to assist in creating in Georgia such an area program. This area organization is composed of nine counties, all with about the same basic economic and social problems.

Each county contributions 25¢ per capita, which is matched by State funds and this is used to staff an Area Planning and Development Commission. Representatives to the Commission are appointed by the counties and towns represented. By having an organization such as this, our area is able to secure professional, full time services of planners and other personnel, that can collect data and give careful evaluations, thus pinpointing the assets and liabilities not only on the area or district level, but down to the individual communities.

This agency serves as the clearing house and technical staff to assist in administering any and all State and Federal assistance programs. They provide a framework for developmental activities.

I would point out that it would be impossible for just one of the nine counties that I mentioned earlier to have such a staff or specialized personnel, but each county has the services available under such a cooperative arrangement in the area planning commission.

By using this agency multi-county resources can be pooled. Team work on a multi-county level makes it possible to create new job opportunities, with proper planning and evaluation of area resources on an area basis, rather than stopping at a county line.

The possibility of establishing area trade or technical schools across county lines is enhanced. The results of labor surveys can be used to a better advantage. A broader health program can be implemented on a regional basis. For example, one rural county probably could not take advantage of any mental health assistance given by either State or Federal government. On a multi-county level, by pooling resources, a mental health program, along with professional personnel might be obtainable, and the patient load would justify such a program.

Knowing the plight of rural counties, I strongly recommend creation of multi-county agencies as a mechanism to work with the various agencies of the State and Federal government.

February 27, 1968

This multi-county unit should be established by groups of counties having common interests and common problems. These units should be controlled on the local level with its governing board selected by the counties represented in the organization.

By establishing multi-county districts not only can professional assistance be obtained, but the individual community becomes aware of its shortcomings. Priorities can be established on areas of improvement. By having the facts and figures, the community can judge itself through its own eyes.

Some of my personal recommendations:

1. Continue to make planning grants for technical assistance to area planning or development groups.

2. Continue and enlarge the program of water, sewerage grants and loans.

3. Continue grants for airport construction.

4. Expand programs giving assistance to both states and counties for recreational facilities.

5. Direct grants for rural roads through the various state highway departments to counties in depressed areas.

6. Broaden the program now furnished by several federal agencies in the field of home loans. Move away from public housing and rent supplements to the field of loan guarantees, encourage home ownership.

7. Continue assistance to the land grant Universities for more research and extension education into problems of local government, local people, and local communities. Seek the answers to the problems brought about by the changes in economic growth or the lack of growth. Particular attention be given to the problems of small business and the small community.

a. Grants to Vocational Technical Schools.

8. That the Cooperative Extension Program of the land grant Universities be expanded to include areas other than agriculture. Probably the county agents have a better understanding about the needs of grass root rural America than any other groups.

9. Federal assistance programs should be redefined, establishing the responsibility with the specific agency or Secretary. Processing time of applications for assistance should be expedited, and much of the red tape should be cut. A yes or no answer should be given in a short period of time after request of assistance.

10. Establish a Models County Program similar to the model city program. This will serve as an incentive for a self-analysis program on the local level. At the same time furnish information to both the State and Federal government. Rural poor are not well organized and have very few spokesmen calling attention to their problems. Similar model district programs should be established.

Rural America does have problems. Attention needs to be focused on these problems. A Models County Program could accomplish much in combating the problems of rural America.

Savagery Cannot Be Condoned in Schools

HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 27, 1968

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, the South Suburban News which carries the masthead "Largest Negro Oriented Weekly Circulated in Chicago Area," presented a front-page editorial in its February 3 edition which is typical of the blunt understandable editorial technique of that publication. The editorial follows:

SAVAGERY CANNOT BE CONDONED IN SCHOOLS
 We do not buy the story that because there are inequities within our ghetto schools this gives hoodlums the right to rush in to a school and beat teachers into unconsciousness. We say this because in spite of what we are confronted with in our daily lives—the inequality, the frustrations, the prejudice, the contempt in which minority groups are held in—we are still living in a civilized world.

But are we really?

What happens in some of our schools today makes our statement a lie about our living in a civilized world. It does not matter what the provocation was or what happened to make boys beat up these teachers, when it happens it is deplorable. It is also frightening and disgusting. Those of us who still maintain some sense of responsibility and respect and character can not and must not condone the action of these students in any way.

These are acts of savagery. These incidents, however, are another sad confrontation of the growing hostility within the black community and the school establishment.

What is still needed is more active cooperation and willingness to work together between the community, the school and parents instead of more talk of armed guards in the school. Very little or nothing can be done until these facts are realized.

Statement by Congressman Thomas G. Morris on Gasbuggy Nuclear Explosive Experiment for Recovery of Natural Gas

HON. THOMAS G. MORRIS

OF NEW MEXICO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 27, 1968

Mr. MORRIS of New Mexico. Mr. Speaker, a very significant event in the efforts to expand the Nation's available energy resources took place on December 10, 1967. This involved the detonation of a 26-kiloton nuclear device at a depth of 4,240 feet underground in the Pictured Cliffs formation in Rio Arriba County, N. Mex. The purpose was to investigate the feasibility of using an underground nuclear explosion to stimulate the release and thereby increase the ultimate recovery of natural gas from a gas-bearing geologic formation of low productivity due to the low permeability of the rock. This detonation was carried out by the Atomic Energy Commission under a program aimed at the development of peaceful use of nuclear explosives. The program is called the Plowshare program. This particular test under the Plowshare program is called Gasbuggy.

It will take at least a year to fully evaluate the results of the Gasbuggy experiment. However, some information is in. These are some of the results obtained to date:

GROUND MOTION EFFECTS

In the immediate ground zero area there was no damage except for a bent axle on a cable reel. Some electronic equipment at the recording trailer park and control point suffered minor damage. No adverse effects on the other gas wells in the vicinity of ground zero have been observed. The nearest one was 335 feet away. Seismic records taken at El

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

Vado and Navajo dam sites were about as expected. Surveys of the Navajo Indian irrigation project and the San Juan Chama project tunnels have revealed no damage. Two complaints have been received of minor damage to homes.

One was an adobe house about 17 miles southeast of ground zero. The other was to a frame house 25 miles southwest. These claims are being investigated.

CHIMNEY

The top of the chimney, a roughly cylindrical chamber of broken rock created by the explosion, is 3,907 feet below the surface of the ground. The length of the chimney is approximately 335 feet. The radius of the chimney is estimated to be about 78 feet, which was about as predicted in the design of the experiment. It is estimated that the volume of the void that was created is about 2,000,000 cubic feet. Within this void at the current gas pressure it is estimated there is about 125 million cubic feet of gas. The estimated initial gas flow rate into the chimney was about 5,000,000 cubic feet a day.

RADIONUCLIDES

Calculations made before the Gasbuggy explosion predicted that several radionuclides, which are radioactive atomic nuclei resulting from the nuclear reaction, would be present in the gas after the explosion including krypton 85, iodine 131, xenon 133, and tritium. Some six samples of rather large volumes of gas are being analyzed for radioisotopic content. The presence of xenon 133 has been determined. There appears to be less tritium, less iodine, and some of the other isotopes than expected. Xenon 133 has a 5-day half life. It will disappear in a few months because of decay.

GAS PRESSURE

Preshot pressure in the rock formation was 1,050 pounds per square inch. After the explosion, the pressure dropped to about 950 pounds per square inch. The gas pressure is increasing and is now about 1,010 pounds per square inch, as the gas flows in to fill the chimney void. As gas enters the chimney, the pressure is building up to the original level.

ROCK FRACTURE

At the time of the explosion instruments indicated that fractures in the rock around the chimney extended out to 440 feet. This compares with the preshot prediction of about 390 feet.

Radiation monitoring is continuing. The preliminary data on the test is being studied. Gas samples are being analyzed in the laboratories. Additional tests have been planned to obtain data flow rates to compare the production economic factors with conventional gas recovery techniques. As the gas pressure builds up, it is planned to pump down and see how fast the pressure comes back up.

This is the first joint Government-industry experiment in the AEC's Plowshare program. In addition to the Atomic Energy Commission and the El Paso Natural Gas Co., the U.S. Bureau of Mines is participating in this experiment. Overall technical responsibility rests with the Atomic Energy Commis-

sion's Lawrence Radiation Laboratory, Livermore, Calif. The total estimated cost of Gasbuggy is \$5.2 million, of which nearly \$2 million is the El Paso Natural Gas Co.'s contribution. AEC is funding the remainder. The El Paso Natural Gas Co. deserves a great deal of credit for their participation and excellent support in this program.

Organized Labor Under Attack

HON. JOHN R. RARICK

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 27, 1968

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, the use of court injunctions to temper labor unions has become so commonplace that the Justice Department now intends to use injunctions to control unions.

And organized labor has lost. The case is in a Federal court.

The Justice Department bluntly seeks a Federal court injunction to prohibit a union from striking—on the grounds that the strikers are all white while no Negro union member voted to strike.

Classic is it not? A Federal judge now is asked to assume vote control of all labor unions. And if permitted to proceed, this far-reaching type of injunction can be expected to spread to every court, State, and union in the United States.

The interesting question is why the U.S. Attorney General and Justice Department are afraid of democracy? Majority vote?

Before a union can strike must 51 percent of the black members vote to strike before it is legal? Should the blacks vote to strike but the whites refuse? What rights, if any, besides dues-paying, will white union members be permitted to enjoy?

I include the Associated Press release from the February 14 New Orleans Times Picayune followed by accounts from the Baton Rouge Morning Advocate and State Times:

[From the Times Picayune, New Orleans, La., Jan. 21, 1968]

UNION PRESENTS STRIKE NOTICE: CROWN ZELLERBACH GETS ANNOUNCEMENT

BOGALUSA, La.—For the second time in less than six months Local 189 of the United Papermaker and Paperworkers Union has given Crown Zellerbach Corporation a strike notice, this one that they will strike the mill Feb. 1.

Previously in Sept. 1967 the union served notice that they would strike Sept. 19 because of disagreement in a contract. At that time a new three-year contract was signed on the eve of the strike, which guaranteed increased employee benefits while leaving a seniority clause open for negotiation.

The company now, under the prodding of the Office of Federal Contract Compliance, has notified the union that it intends to institute a government seniority system on Feb. 1.

The union has responded with a 854-16 strike vote and will close the mill at 6 a.m. Feb. 1.

In May the OFCC circulated a consultant memorandum, which in effect said if a division of the government was contemplating purchase of paper products before buying

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

from Crown Zellerbach they should consult that office. This tended to eliminate Crown Zellerbach from getting any of this business because purchasing agents would just not take the trouble but just remove the company from the list.

The company and union met and attempted to work out proposed seniority alternative but the federal department would not accept it.

They offered their own plan which said that mill time (time on any company job) and their job time (on a specific operation) should be added together to determine how much seniority a particular employee has when promotions on any job is available. Edward C. Sylvester, a Negro, director of OFCC is author of the unprecedented program, known as A plus B seniority.

In Dec. and Jan. court proceedings were brought in U.S. District Court in Washington by the company and union and a restraining order was issued against Sylvester and Secretary of Labor Willard Wirtz.

The order, however, did not block implementation of the new seniority system. It did restrain the Labor Department from invoking sanctions against the company until a formal hearing is held.

The union would take part in these hearings, which are unusual in themselves. Meanwhile the company has offered to keep two sets of personnel records to preserve the rights of its employees, should the old method be retained.

It is reported that the present seniority plan is typical of the Southern paper industry and has been brought to light only because of the court suit. Crown Zellerbach is the first test of its kind with the only question being whether the government can force a company and union to institute a system upon which they do not agree.

[From the Morning Advocate, Baton Rouge, La., Jan. 19, 1968]

CROWN-ZELLERBACH DISPUTE RUSHING TOWARD SHOWDOWN

BOGALUSA.—Whether the federal government can require a company and union to institute a system of seniority on which they do not agree is apparently headed for a showdown as a result of a strike vote taken here by Local 189 of the United Papermakers and Paperworkers.

Crown-Zellerbach Corp., in an effort to head off a full-fledged debarment proceeding in which the Office of Federal Contract Compliance would seek to cut off all government business to the company, served notice on the union that it expects to institute the government's seniority system on Feb. 1.

The union responded with a 854-16 strike vote, serving notice it will shut down the Bogalusa papermill on Feb. 1 at 6 a.m.

Both union and management here have sought for some 10 months to avoid the showdown with the Office of Federal Contract Compliance. And, in fact, both went to federal court in Washington to try to stave off what is now apparently inevitable.

DICTATES CHANGES

The Office of Federal Contract Compliance, an agency of the U.S. Department of Labor, some 10 months ago decided Crown-Zellerbach ought to make some changes in the plant here to provide more equal job opportunities for Negroes.

Company and union officials met with officials in Washington and enlisted the aid of Mayor Curt Siegelin's office and the office of Sen. Russell B. Long in the problem.

Since that time, the various steps demanded by OFCC have been taken—except one.

SENIORITY SYSTEM

That one is the seniority system proposed by OFCC to replace the long-standing job seniority system that has been traditional in the American labor movement.

A Negro, Edward C. Sylvester, director of

OFCC, came up with the unprecedented system, known as A plus B seniority.

What Sylvester proposed to give more job opportunities to Negroes is that both their mill seniority (A) and their job seniority (B) be added together to determine how much seniority a particular employee has when promotions are available in the mill.

In the labor movement, only job seniority has counted in the past for promotions. Years of employment with a company (mill seniority) has only determined the length of an employee's vacation in the past.

The effect of the Sylvester system would cause Negro employees, integrated into the white job progression ladders within the past few years, to jump over whites who were in the progression ladder ahead of them. And, in some instances here, it would cause whites to jump whites, whites to jump Negroes and Negroes to jump Negroes.

STRIKES UNIONISM

The issue has boiled down to more than just a question of equal job opportunity or civil rights here. It strikes at the heart of trade unionism in America, and the international union has fully backed its Bogalusa local in fighting the Sylvester seniority plan.

Off and on for the past 10 months, Crown Zellerbach officials from Bogalusa and San Francisco have been meeting with top Labor Department officials in Washington in an effort to resolve the question. There are even reports that the White House itself has been involved in some of the talks.

By December, OFCC's threats of invoking sanctions against Crown Zellerbach reached a point that both company and union went to court.

Following a Dec. 22 hearing in the U.S. District Court for the District of Columbia in Washington and further court action on Jan. 2 when the Crown Zellerbach and United Paperworkers and Papermakers suits were consolidated, the court issued a restraining order against Sylvester and Secretary of Labor W. Willard Wirtz.

The order, however, did not block implementation of the A plus B seniority system proposed by Sylvester. It does restrain the Department of Labor and its agency, the OFCC, from invoking sanctions against the company until a formal hearing is held.

The court said Crown Zellerbach and UPP are not entitled to an injunction to stop Wirtz and Sylvester from instituting administrative proceedings to debar Crown from eligibility for government contracts.

ONLY QUESTION

In such debarment proceedings the government could be expected to "throw the book" at Crown Zellerbach, one of the biggest paper producers in the nation. This company has sought to avoid since the only question is the seniority question in the Bogalusa mill.

To confine the issue to the seniority question, the company proposed to put the A plus B seniority system in effect Feb. 1, pending a hearing by OFCC (which would be appealable to the courts), and thus keep the mill here operating. The company proposed to keep two sets of records in the meantime to preserve the rights of its employees.

But, the union feels that if its members ever work under the A plus B seniority system, any hopes for keeping traditional job seniority is gone.

In fact, the A plus B seniority issue has been before the union earlier. Last August when negotiations between the union and company over a three-year contract were underway, the issue was discussed and Local 189 voted rather overwhelmingly to refuse the A plus B seniority system.

A brother local, Local 189-A comprising some 250 Negro employees in the mill, also turned down the A plus B seniority system by a vote of 82 to 51. In the newest situation, the Negro union has not yet taken a strike vote and it remained uncertain whether that local would vote or not. Even if it does, the

February 27, 1968

Negro union's membership is not sufficient to overcome the 98.2 per cent vote cast early this week by Local 189 in favor of the Feb. 1 strike.

When the A plus B seniority system failed in contract negotiations last summer, a new three-year contract was signed between company and union, but the contract left open the seniority question giving either side the right to raise the question.

Raise it the company did this month under heat of the OFCC which apparently has legal authority to forbid all government agencies or government contractors from placing any further orders with Crown Zellerbach.

Under the existing contract between company and union, all other matters are subject to mandatory arbitration. But, not the seniority issue. This was deliberately left open by both company and union last summer in order to complete the contract, and it took assistance of a federal mediator then to reach agreement.

Neither company nor union is talking about the apparent impending strike. Both are still hopeful that something can be done before the end of the month to keep the mill running since it is the prime source of a livelihood here.

OFCC is apparently determined that the seniority system must be changed. But the problem is fraught with legal questions that will make precedents in union-management-government relationships.

[From the State Times, Baton Rouge, La., Feb. 14, 1968]

BOGALUSA MILL CASE IN COURT

NEW ORLEANS.—A test of the government's will to enforce President Johnson's executive order prohibiting racial discrimination in firms holding government contracts goes to federal court today.

The Justice Department is asking U.S. Dist. Court Judge Frederick J. R. Heebe for a permanent injunction to keep white workers from walking off their jobs at the Crown-Zellerbach Co. paper mill at Bogalusa.

The result of the dispute could set the pattern of Negro-white relations in Southern labor unions for the next 10 years.

The all-white local of the United Paper Makers and Paper Workers, AFL-CIO, voted to strike when the mill said it would eliminate segregated seniority systems in the plant by Feb. 1.

Crown-Zellerbach said it would establish the new system under an agreement with the Justice Department.

A temporary injunction stopped the walk-out and the company began to use the new system.

There is no indication what kind of permanent settlement will emerge.

The dispute cuts into a number of business, labor and government policies.

OUTCOME IMPORTANT

The outcome is particularly important because the initial agreement that touched off the union vote to strike was the "first in the paper manufacturing industry in the South and can be applied to other segregated seniority lines and unions in the South," said Herbert Hill, national labor director for the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People.

"If there is a retreat, the . . . executive order will be understood by all sections of American business enterprise to be a monumental hoax."

He earlier called for "immediate cancellation" of the contracts if there is retreat.

A Crown-Zellerbach spokesman in Bogalusa who asked not to be identified said the company planned to challenge the agreement. It complied with the agreement only because "the way the regulations are written, you have to comply before you can complain."

The government, he added, had "ordered the institution of the system outside a collective bargaining process."

Hill also called the dispute "a fundamental test of the AFL-CIO's publicly declared civil rights position."

A union spokesman who requested anonymity, said, "the company is threatening to put in a seniority system which advances the Negroes over many whites in the seniority system."

He termed the issue "unilateral implementation of a seniority system . . . at the urging of the OFCC," the Office of Federal Contract Compliance.

Edward C. Sylvester, director of the OFCC, described the system the company agreed to eliminate as "a classic case of industrial segregation."

Under it, he said, Negroes were hired for jobs at the bottom of the ladder and worked their way up slowly.

But when whites entered several rungs up the ladder and when they moved up, the company hired more whites to take their places, instead of promoting Negroes with seniority, Sylvester said.

Hill said the result was that Negroes were locked in menial jobs, losing the opportunity for higher paid and more skilled positions.

The agreement also eliminated all other forms of segregation at the Bogalusa plant, including segregated lockerrooms, eating areas and work units.

Estonian Independence Day

HON. JAMES J. DELANEY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 21, 1968

Mr. DELANEY. Mr. Speaker, for over two and one-half centuries Estonia lived under the full weight of Russian oppression, yet survived severe attempts at Russification until independence became a reality on February 24, 1918.

Unfortunately, all hopes for continued independence were dashed with the coming of World War II when this small nation was occupied first, in 1940, by the Soviets, later, from 1941 to 1944, by German occupation forces, and from 1944 to the present time it has been, once again, under the iron rule of Soviet colonizers.

It would be understandable for the Estonians to regard their unfortunate history with a feeling of futility. However, such is not the case, for this proud people's knowledge of oppression is exceeded only by their firm belief in the eventual independence of their nation.

The Estonian people have always been characterized by tenacity and fortitude based upon a rich cultural heritage and tradition, and through the immigration of Estonians to the United States our own country has been enriched. Although comprising one of the smallest American minorities, they have made outstanding contributions in the fields of history, economics, science, painting, and music.

On the occasion of the 50th anniversary of Estonian Independence Day, it is appropriate that we pause to pay tribute to the freedom-loving Estonians, and express our concern for the contemporary situation in that captive nation. We look confidently forward to the time when the Estonian people, with their tenacious love of liberty, will once again join the family of free nations of the world.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

A Union Helps the Disadvantaged

HON. CORNELIUS E. GALLAGHER

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 27, 1968

Mr. GALLAGHER. Mr. Speaker, it is extremely important that the Congress act promptly and favorably on President Johnson's request for a full \$2.18 billion appropriation for the Office of Economic Opportunity in the next fiscal year. This was the amount authorized by the Congress last year and I was pleased to hear the President ask for the full appropriation.

Last year, this Congress authorized a broad antipoverty program, including several new approaches to the problems that exist, and then failed to appropriate the funds necessary to even continue existing programs. We are beginning now to see the damage of that related action.

Local community action programs, including Headstart, are being cut back around the country. And 16 Job Corps centers are being closed. The unfortunate implications of the Job Corps closings hit home when you consider the fine work that is being done with disadvantaged youngsters in these centers.

As an example, Mr. Speaker, I want to call to the attention of the House an article from the January 11 issue of the Engineering News-Record which tells of a success story from the Jacob's Creek, Tenn. Center. It is a story of a local union's involvement in the antipoverty program but it is also the story of a helping hand for a young man in distress.

The article follows:

A UNION HELPS THE DISADVANTAGED

Times are changing. So is the construction industry.

Two years ago, Joe Foley was a disillusioned young Negro in Taylor, Tex. He was a ninth grade dropout working as an unskilled laborer at \$1.00 an hour. Averaging only 10 to 15 hours of work a month, he was trying to help his father support a family of 10. In 1966, he joined the Job Corps in search of a skill and more earning power.

Now, a junior engineer trained in the operation and maintenance of earth-moving equipment, he is a member of Local 137 of the International Union of Operating Engineers (IUOE) in Westchester County, N.Y., and is working on Consolidated Edison's \$158.8-million Nuclear Power Project in Buchanan, N.Y. He is also studying for his high school diploma.

Foley's big leap was no accident—and it is not unique. Many others have had similar breaks.

The story, told by the IUOE at the Mayflower Hotel, in Washington, D.C., last week, goes back to October, 1966, when the IUOE, its Local 917, the Office of Economic Opportunity, the U.S. Forest Service, the Labor Department and several other government agencies reached agreement for IUOE operation of a heavy equipment training program for disadvantaged youths at the Job Corps Conservation Center in Cherokee National Forest, Jacob's Creek, Tenn.

From the first class, which started with 67 young men, there were 51 graduates (25 Negroes, 20 Caucasians, one Eskimo, one American Indian), all of whom were placed as junior engineers and future apprentice candidates in 39 different locals of the IUOE. A second class is now under way with an enrollment of 74, of whom 70% are Negroes.

When the program started, IUOE General President Hunter P. Wharton said, "Today the operating engineers have established two important points. First, we have accepted a part of the responsibility all of our society has for extending a helping hand to the less fortunate among us. Secondly, we have opened a new reservoir of potential talent for our union without compromising on the level of skill required to operate safely and economically. . . . We knew what poverty was in the thirties. We're ready to do our share to help deserving youngsters out of poverty in the sixties."

Trainees in the Jacob's Creek Center are recruited by the Job Corps from among those who have been in the Job Corps for at least three months and who have demonstrated an aptitude for heavy equipment work. They stay in the IUOE program for a year, dividing their time between classroom, in-shop and on-the-job training. They have already relocated one Cherokee National Forest road and are now building another.

Through this pre-apprenticeship program, the trainees are brought up to the apprenticeship level and graduate as junior engineers with enough skill to work on construction jobs. The cooperating local unions with which they are placed take them into membership, will encourage them to compete for apprenticeship openings, and find them jobs. Before the onset of winter, all of the graduates were working and averaging \$3.25 an hour. "I feel real good that I'm now going some place," one said.

Job Corps Director William T. Kelly says the Jacob's Creek program shows that Wharton and his IUOE "have heart, interest and imagination." Last year, the Job Corps gave the IUOE a gold award as a tribute to its success in training and finding jobs for needy youngsters.

The program is part of what IUOE Training Director Reese Hammond calls the union's "continuous, total training program" which embraces pre-apprenticeship, apprenticeship and journeymen retraining.

The story of Foley and his classmates and of the IUOE's emphasis on skill and training are now recorded in a new color film called "The Builders." The film was produced by the IUOE in cooperation with the Forest Service and the Bureau of Apprenticeship and Training under a grant from the Department of Labor and the Office of Economic Opportunity. It was previewed at the Washington meeting.

Urban Renewal

HON. FRED B. ROONEY

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 27, 1968

Mr. ROONEY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, in his recent economic message, President Johnson called for "decisive steps" to correct the ills of our cities. His call for us in Congress to take those steps should have our unfaltering support.

I want particularly to urge approval of the full and expanded program of urban renewal that the President has proposed. This, to my mind, is the keystone for action in our cities.

Urban renewal today has become a far more effective instrument than was foreseen at its enactment 18 years ago. Some one thousand communities today look to it as the prime resource for carrying out far-reaching urban development.

Urban renewal is not just a program to clear and rebuild. It is a program to upgrade neighborhoods, to rehabilitate older housing. It is a program to help

February 27, 1968

low-income homeowners improve, and continue to live in their homes. It is a program to enforce codes, to provide needed land for moderate- and low-income housing, to plan comprehensively for the correction of a city's deficiencies.

Every community on the model cities list has made the urban renewal program a core part of its plan to rescue major areas and upgrade the lives of its people.

The President's call for a greatly increased authorization for this program in model cities areas is not only justified—it is indispensable to the whole undertaking. His call for authorized funds, aside from model cities, to keep this program moving in all our cities for the next 2 years or more, is equally vital to the plans and projects that are waiting to go ahead in our towns and cities today.

City Insurance

HON. JOSEPH Y. RESNICK

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 27, 1968

Mr. RESNICK. Mr. Speaker, I would like to express my support for the proposals in the President's message in our cities. He has rightly called on us to face our urban crisis—and given us an imaginative program for action. In particular, I agree with his proposals extending insurance protection to the people who live in what has been called the inner city.

Many of these families invest their life earnings in their homes, or in small stores, or in other property in the neighborhood in which they live. But the earnings of a lifetime can disappear in a burst of flame from an incendiary bomb, or from the blast of a gun.

They live on the brink of financial disaster because they cannot get the insurance they need to protect them in the event of a riot or any other form of disturbance that causes damage to property.

The insurance companies of this country have understandably avoided this type of coverage because of the high risks involved, and because there is little room for profit.

Yet these families need protection—perhaps more so than their more affluent neighbors in the suburbs. This protection can now become available through the insurance measures outlined in the President's message. It urges the establishment of State pools to insure properties that individual companies might not want to accept, and the creation of a National Insurance Development Corporation to back up the companies in the event of large riot losses. Also, it permits the Federal Government to defer taxes for companies participating in the program.

These incentives should encourage the insurance industry to venture into formerly forbidden territory, and in return for reasonable insurance rates the home or store owner will have the incentive to keep up his property.

The program will do much toward rebuilding the blighted areas of our cities. It is realistic and forthright. It should receive our full and enthusiastic backing.

Counting America's People

HON. WILLIAM J. GREEN

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 27, 1968

Mr. GREEN of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, one of the Government's most important agencies is the U.S. Census Bureau, in the Department of Commerce. As chairman of the Subcommittee on Census and Statistics of the Post Office and Civil Service Committee, I have become aware of the important role that accurate and timely census data play in the operations of government, business, and our whole national life. Last month, the Census Bureau and the forthcoming 1970 census of population were the subject of a WMAL television program "Close Up." In the program, Dr. A. Ross Eckler, Director of the Census Bureau, was interviewed by Mr. Joseph McCaffrey, a well-known television commentator. Because of widespread interest in the upcoming census of 1970 and in the Census Bureau, itself, I insert in the RECORD an excerpted transcript of the television program:

THE CONTINUOUS COUNT

(Transcript of a television interview on "Close Up," WMAL, January 14, 1968, with Dr. A. Ross Eckler, Director of the Census Bureau, and Joseph McCaffrey, WMAL commentator)

McCaffrey. Much of the 1970 Census, I understand, will be done by mail unlike the other years. How is this going to work?

ECKLER. About 60 percent of the country will receive forms that are mailed to them and we expect to have them respond and send the information back to us. In previous Censuses, we have sent out copies for information, but we have never used the mails as a means of going out to collect the information. In some cases, they make it unnecessary for an enumerator to call. We will have a mailing list of all of the addresses in the large metropolitan areas and in the surrounding territories. This will be our control list. We will mail out after a good deal of publicity and appeals hopefully by television and other media and we hope that a great proportion of the people will respond and send back their forms. Now those who do not, will be followed by enumerators in the usual fashion. But we want to keep that number as small as possible because that pulls down the costs.

McCaffrey. Should a citizen feel cheated that he isn't being interviewed in person? He receives an impersonal envelope with all the blanks to be filled out or do you think you're going to get as much cooperation by mail as you do with the personal enumerator?

ECKLER. We hope that there will be fully as much cooperation. What we'll be able to avoid is many of the awkward circumstances that come about when an enumerator arrives. Suppose the enumerator arrives just as the woman of the house has had a baby sick or something like that, or maybe something has boiled over on the stove. She is distraught with this, and an enumerator comes around and wants to have information. This is not very convenient. The enumerator hates to make another trip back there, the woman hates to take time out right then. This gives the household a chance to fill out the form at the convenience of the members. It enables them to get information from the other members of the family unit. We believe that many of them will welcome the chance to mail it directly to an office

rather than to give the information to another person, and may feel that that is a little bit better protected. So I believe that with the publicity we give on it, this will be welcomed by people and they will say, why didn't the Census Bureau do this before—it makes sense.

McCAFFREY. You raised a point there—being an enumerator could be a rather risky business, couldn't it? Have you ever had any who were seriously injured by people who took umbrage at the questions asked?

ECKLER. There have been unpleasant incidents. I am not sure that anyone was seriously hurt, but there can be situations in which a person is under the influence of liquor.

McCAFFREY. Not the enumerator.

ECKLER. Not the enumerator, I hope—no the respondent, or there may be a person who is very annoyed with the Government for some reason or another, or suspicious. There could be a number of unpleasant incidents.

McCAFFREY. This is the reason you prefer the mail poll?

ECKLER. This is an element in it. One of the elements is the problem of finding enumerators. This is a large number of people—

McCAFFREY. This was easy in 1940 wasn't it?

ECKLER. 1940 was a good deal better. Unfortunately, we had a large unemployment load then, and it was easier to get people. But in 1950, 1960 and I hope in 1970 that we will have a large scale employment and I hope that there won't be so many people that are just looking for jobs.

McCAFFREY. What are you going to pay the enumerator or don't you know yet?

ECKLER. It will average I believe, something like \$2 an hour for the work that they do.

McCAFFREY. Unless they are very nosy, that's not much money.

ECKLER. It isn't very attractive. It's not highly competitive with other work.

McCAFFREY. I guess many people volunteer because they're interested in doing something like this.

ECKLER. Many people are interested in doing this, they respond to it as a public duty. I think a great many are of that sort, but it's harder in the big cities to find them than in the country.

McCAFFREY. Mr. Eckler, experts tell me that the Bureau's monthly population survey is probably the best poll in the world. They talk about the Gallup poll and these other polls, but your poll they say, is without a doubt the best and the nearest to accuracy. How is it conducted and how do you recruit and train the people you use in this program?

ECKLER. Well, it's a long story. I'll give you the highlights, Joe. In the first place it is a very carefully designed sample. It is a sample which covers some 60,000 addresses maybe a little over 50,000 dwelling units. It covers nearly 1 county in 3 in this country. The samples are designed in a very precise fashion so that the enumerator is not given a chance to ask for the people that he finds it convenient to inquire from, friends or something of that sort, but he has to go to particular addresses in particular areas. He has to follow those families until he identifies them and makes contact and gets information from that family, so it is controlled mathematically and in a practical operating fashion very specifically. That perhaps is part of the reason why it has good reputation. I'm glad that you mentioned that. Now in the selection of the people, we have sources in the various areas from which we get recommendations of people who might be available for this kind of work. We may have in some cases to use employment services and other sources. These people stay with us a good while. Many of them are housewives, most of them are, in fact, and they're interested in work say perhaps a week each

month something like that, and these people first of all have to take an exam before they can do the job. Then they are trained both in their homes and in their classes, then the enumerator or supervisor goes around with them the first two or three days to inspect their work and then they are checked on periodically to see that they are remaining up to standards.

McCAFFREY. In other words, these people will become experts then.

ECKLER. They do become experts and we keep in touch with them, so that if they're slacking off on their work, we give them a little more training, or if they are seriously deteriorating, we may have to change and put in other people. We do keep careful control and this is the important part of the job, I think.

McCAFFREY. I know you have been waiting for me to mention this, but there are some 14 bills, maybe more by now, in this 90th Congress seeking to limit the questions in the coming 1970 Census and also to remove the penalties for failure to answer all the questions by a citizen. What is the objection to answering all the questions and wouldn't the deleting of many of the questions that you now have roughed out for your '70 Census jeopardize the real overall value of the Census?

ECKLER. I think there's no question that eliminating a third or two-thirds of the questions would constitute a first rate loss to this Nation. As a matter of fact, I want to refer to the investigation and report on this that the Federal Statistics Users Conference made. This, I believe you know, is an association which includes business groups, labor groups, research organizations and so on. They are impartial, they are concerned with Federal statistics and the supply, quality and so forth. In a report that they made on this they said that one of the most serious blows that could be made to Federal statistics would be the passage by the Congress of any one of these bills for limiting the number of questions and putting most of them on an optional basis. I would like to add to that our own provisions for mandatory reporting in the Census go back to 1790. This has been carried out without exception over the years since then, and to the best of my knowledge in all countries of the world which have comparable statistical needs. In these large industrial countries, they have these censuses on a mandatory basis, so we would be running counter to our own experience from the beginning of the Republic and counter to the experience of other countries. I believe that many of the programs which are important to the Nation would be seriously handicapped by the loss of the information that would result from this kind of legislation.

McCAFFREY. Congressman Jackson Betts of Ohio, is a Republican. In fact, almost all of these bills that have been introduced I noticed by Republicans, there's only one introduced by a Democrat. St Germain of Rhode Island is the one Democrat of this group of more than 14, but Congressman Betts and the others who have introduced these bills claim that the questions involved serve no public purpose and that they violate an individual's privacy. What are some of these questions that are objected to, Mr. Eckler.

ECKLER. One question—I need to make a slight detour here and mention one which has been distorted in the press. You perhaps have seen in the press that one of the questions proposed is "Do you share your shower?" In that connection I thought it might be interesting to glance at a card which has been put out in this connection to indicate that the public may be taking this as a joke. This card says "Save water, share a shower with a friend." As a matter of fact, this wording of the question was intended to put us on the spot because it sounds like obviously a ridiculous question. But the actual

wording of the question is to determine whether the household has a bath and shower for its own use, whether it has one which has to be shared with another household or whether there's none at all. Now this is one of the elements which determine the adequacy of housing. It's a question which has been used in essentially this form in the 1940 Census, in 1950 and 1960 and this is important information because the programs having to do with urban housing, renewal, change and so forth depend very importantly on this. There are many questions, a number of questions concerning employment status, occupation and industry, income. These are of great importance. For example, the poverty program is very much concerned with the level of income and the sources of income and the lack of information on this has very seriously handicapped a number of the elements of the poverty program. As a matter of fact, there's very little difference between the 1970 proposals and those which were sent out in 1960.

McCAFFREY. Was there any great human cry against the 1960 Census?

ECKLER. There is a certain amount of this which always comes before each Census. This is part of the standard occupational risk that a Census Director faces. There are going to be some people that have forgotten what was done the last time because only one family in four gets the long form and they get this only once in ten years, and they perhaps spend 30 minutes filling it out. So it is easy to forget what you did ten years ago. So some of this is just that kind of failure to remember what they did before.

McCAFFREY. Mr. Eckler, questions and the answers may not violate privacy, but what is done with the information gathered might well violate privacy. What is done with the information? For instance, if I fill out this long form and talk about my income and everything else that's requested, is my name always attached to this information now as it flows to the machines or does it just become a statistic of a nameless and unidentified American?

ECKLER. It becomes a statistic of a nameless American. It's combined with the similar figures for other nameless Americans and then we put them all together and we find out how the incomes are in a certain area in Washington, or in a certain area in McLean, or wherever you happen to live, and this is compared with the people who live in other areas, so we get some idea of the differences in the income level. The information pertaining to an individual cannot be disclosed in any way, cannot be made available to anybody outside, anyone who is not an employee of the Department of Commerce, cannot be made available to regulatory agencies, investigating agencies and so forth. So he is completely protected. This is not an invasion of privacy in any way and we are scrupulously observing that. We've done so over the years and I don't know of any case in which there's been any violation of the confidentiality rules. We are concerned only with summaries, combinations, aggregates and the individual himself gets lost in this. Now there is one way in which you might want to make use of it, and that is if you sometime in the future wanted a record of your own for purposes of proving your age for social security, if you had no other basis, or to prove your citizenship.

McCAFFREY. Can your machine find me again?

ECKLER. We'd find you through copying the original record. We make a transcript of microfilm record.

McCAFFREY. It seems to me, Mr. Eckler, that the trouble involved here is perhaps the statisticians are more concerned with picking up the information and may not be as concerned with privacy as they should, whereas the privacy people are not interested at all in the statistics and are concen-

trating on all of a possible invasion of privacy and it seems to me that you have to row a middle road between the two. Does this sum it up?

ECKLER. There is certainly some truth in that. I would like to emphasize the fact that we in the Census Bureau, I believe, have been concerned with matters of privacy and invasion of privacy over the years, because if we get a question which people regard as improper, one which doesn't belong in the Census, we're going to damage our ability to do the rest of that Census, and we're going to damage our ability to collect information in the future. So we are concerned with this. Perhaps not as much as we should be, but I think we have given a great deal of consideration to this, and some of the questions which are not to be included in the 1970 Census reflect this concern.

McCAFFREY. It seems to me too, Mr. Eckler, we're in an age today that appreciates information. If there is anything we need today is more information about this Nation, about the people that make it up, and if you strike out some of these questions, especially questions that you've had over the last one or two or three censuses, you're going to severely limit the value of the entire census in many ways, perhaps we should think about giving it up.

ECKLER. That may not be so extreme a point of view if you're going to get a count and not take advantage of that opportunity to find out about the characteristics of your people, how they've changed, something about the vocational training, the disabilities, their educational level, the origin of these people, where they came from, how long they've been here, and many other factors. You will not have the information that is needed by the various departments of Government, for educational purposes, or vocational training, for the poverty programs, for social security planning, for urban development, for housing and so on. All these programs have become accepted, I believe, as a part of the responsibility of Government.

McCAFFREY. Actually, for planning by private industry, as well, certainly.

ECKLER. Indeed, for planning by private industry, the decisions that private industry makes with respect to where it locates plants, where the labor market is good, what advertising it should engage in and so on. Another point that is extremely important is that the total amount of money which is distributed by the Federal Government to the States and localities amounts to something like probably \$15 billion a year and much of that should be determined on the basis of population changes. In some cases, it is directly so determined. It ought to be taken into account in all other cases, or in most other cases. This is a tremendous amount each year and this alone would justify much of the information which is collected in the Census. I believe that there are tremendous needs for this and that we ought not to shackle ourselves by depriving the country and the agencies of the State and local government. The planning by State and local governments, the whole matter of transportation, planning for hospitals, schools and so forth, all turn on the location of people and their characteristics, and this would be seriously handicapped by some of the bills which you mentioned earlier.

McCAFFREY. About every 10 years, no matter how good a job you do, and from what I see, I think you do a better job every ten years, but you still miss many Americans. How many do you think you missed roughly in 1960?

ECKLER. The best estimate that we can make and this is admittedly quite rough is something between 5 and 6 million Americans.

McCAFFREY. How does that number missed in 1960 compare with the number estimated in 1950 and 1940?

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

February 27, 1968

ECKLER. The number would be a little larger but in proportion, I believe we did a little better job in 1960 than we did in 1950. I think that we were able to reduce somewhat the miss rate of earlier censuses. As a matter of fact, this mailing approach that I mentioned will we think help cut it down a little because it gives us an address list to begin with and it gives us a basis of checking to see whether we have gotten a response from this particular address. So this will be a step. We're going to take some other steps and we hope to cut it down somewhat further, but it's a difficult job because some of the people in the ghetto areas and other areas are unable to see much advantage in being counted, maybe a disadvantage, and the problem is to communicate with them.

MCCAFFREY. I think it was Dan Moynihan who pointed out that actually the number missed by the Census seriously affects the unemployment figures because probably the largest single group missed is the young male negro and of course, there's great concern about him and the unemployment figures today, so therefore, actually our unemployment figures may be a little off.

ECKLER. They may be a little off because of this. Certainly some of our figures on which programs are based can be significantly affected by this. For example, the miss rate in some of the ghetto areas is such that your decisions about what to do there can be affected very definitely and we are, to some extent, handicapped because we don't have as good information as we ought to have, and we hope in 1970 to improve somewhat. We're working hard on it and we're having a conference in which we shall include Mr. Moynihan in the very near future. We had one or two already with him and count on his advice and that of others to help us to do a better job.

MCCAFFREY. I see we only have about a minute and a half left, but I do want to get something in here and compliment the Bureau. The Census Bureau is actually a pioneer in the use of computers.

ECKLER. I'm very pleased you brought that up, Joe. The very first punch card machines also originated with us, but let's stay with the computers. We had the first one that was produced in the line by Univac, Univac 1, model 1, number 1, which was delivered to us in 1951. This was the first machine of this sort for large-scale data processing and was especially designed with the help of the Bureau of Standards to meet our needs. It did a great job for about 10 or 12 years and then it retired for old age; the first case that I know of a computer retiring for old age and turned over to Smithsonian.

MCCAFFREY. How much of an investment would you say you've had in computers and all these modern electronics out there?

ECKLER. Well, this runs up pretty fast, actually. One of these machines will be \$3 or \$4 million and I guess we have probably on the order of \$15 million. I should have gotten that figure but it's quite a few millions of dollars. We have bought all these.

MCCAFFREY. They've paid their way too.

ECKLER. They've paid their way, they're already paid for in terms of savings up to now.

MCCAFFREY. One other question, Mr. Eckler, are we using fully all the information that we get from the Census, do you think, or do you think we're not taking advantage of all the information?

ECKLER. We're not using it fully. There are opportunities with the new techniques for providing information for local areas, special tabulations of materials that they need for their own areas which I think would make the Census in the future even more valuable than in the past and we're moving in this direction.

MCCAFFREY. Thank you very much, Mr. Eckler.

Savings on New Contract To Cost Government Money

HON. CHARLES A. VANIK

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 27, 1968

Mr. VANIK. Mr. Speaker, a situation has just occurred at the Lewis Research Center, the National Aeronautics and Space Administration installation in Cleveland, which is undoubtedly paralleled in many other places throughout the country.

Over the past several years, approximately 107 building and maintenance personnel residing in the Greater Cleveland area have been working at the Lewis Research Center as employees of various maintenance contractors. Under this arrangement, substantially the same employees remained on the job as members of the Building Service and Maintenance Union of Cleveland.

On January 31, 1968, the National Aeronautics and Space Administration at the Lewis Research Center awarded the maintenance contract to a new, nonunion contractor by reason of a small business procurement set-aside. The successful bidder, an employer using nonunion labor, intends to proceed under the terms of his contract with a new complement of workers, dismissing from employment approximately 87 present maintenance workers who have been working at the facility for a long period of time.

As a result of the competitive bidding on the NASA Lewis Research Center, the lowest bidder received the contract for \$615,000, while the present contractor submitted a bid of \$657,000. The successful bidder was without competition in this matter because of the small business procurement set-aside, which was not available to the other bidders. The differential in the bids reflects the added cost to the present contractor resulting from the payment of fringe benefits to union employees for medical care and retirement. The low bidder under the set-aside using new and nonunion employees is free of these obligations.

The difference between the successful bid and the next bidder utilizing union personnel totals \$42,000 for the 18-month life of this contract. This differential of \$42,000 coincidentally equals the cost of fringe benefits including medical and hospital care, retirement, and seniority benefits which the union contractor would be compelled to pay if he was awarded the contract. This \$42,000 savings under the NASA contract will undoubtedly be lost several times over in the unemployment benefits which will have to be paid to the discharged members of the union who were substituted by the new nonunion workers provided by the new contractor. Therefore, this small contract set-aside to a nonunion contractor results in a disruption in employment and a substitution of personnel compelling former union employees to lose their proper recognition for seniority and consistency on the job, medical care benefits, retirement benefits, and

other benefits to which they would be entitled if they were allowed to remain in the employ of the new contractor.

Although the Federal Government saves \$42,000 on the basic contract, 87 present employees and members of the Building Service and Maintenance Union will face immediate dismissal from employment and loss of all seniority, retirement, and medical benefits. If these 87 employees are unemployed for more than 7 or 8 weeks and draw unemployment compensation benefits for this period, the Government's savings in the basic contract will have been washed out. In addition, the employees will have sustained an irreparable loss in medical, retirement, and seniority benefits.

It appears to be a very shabby kind of economy. The privilege of contract set-aside was not meant to create unemployment and deprive workmen of their legitimate rights and benefits.

Case for a Nuclear Navy

HON. CHET HOLIFIELD

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 27, 1968

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Speaker, recent articles in national magazines present what appears to be authentic summaries of Soviet advances in numbers and perhaps quality of their conventional and nuclear submarine vessels.

In my humble opinion the United States should, without further delay, reassess the comparative status of the Soviet advances and, their potential threat to our position as the number one naval power.

Control of the seas is just as important as control of the air. If we are to protect the vital interests of our own country, not to even mention the interests of non-Communist and free nations, we must not sleep while others work.

I include an editorial from the Los Angeles Times under date of February 27.

The article, titled "Case for a Nuclear Navy," follows:

[From the Los Angeles, (Calif.) Times, Feb. 27, 1968]

CASE FOR A NUCLEAR NAVY

With Russian shipyards working overtime to build a navy capable of challenging American power anywhere in the world, this country obviously cannot afford to take future U.S. naval supremacy for granted.

Thus, incoming Defense Secretary Clark Clifford should give the most serious consideration to the cries of alarm which are coming from the Pentagon admirals and from the Joint Congressional Committee on Atomic Energy.

Soviet Adm. Sergei Gorshkov has been quoted as boasting that "sooner or later, the United States will have to understand that it no longer has mastery of the seas."

In testimony released by the joint committee over the weekend, Vice Adm. Hyman G. Rickover warned, in effect, that Gorshkov may be proved right unless the Administration can be nudged into building more nuclear submarines, and setting a faster pace on surface warships.

Other Navy spokesmen are expected to say much the same thing in a hearing today before the House Armed Services Committee.

At present, the U.S. Navy has 78 nuclear-powered warships. These include 74 submarines, the aircraft carrier Enterprise, the guided missile cruiser Long Beach and two guided missile frigates.

Thirty-six more nuclear vessels have been authorized or under construction, all but four of which are attack submarines. The Defense Dept. is asking for a handful of additional surface warships in next year's budget.

Welcome as the latter development is, military affairs experts in Congress are disturbed by outgoing Defense Secretary Robert McNamara's refusal to start construction on some of the ships already authorized, and the decision to build only four more atomic subs before closing out the program.

When McNamara took over the Pentagon in 1961, he quickly accepted the wisdom of using nuclear power for submarines. But nuclear propulsion for surface warships failed to meet his cost-effectiveness tests.

Thus, he blocked nuclear power for the carrier John F. Kennedy, and has been rather unenthusiastic about it for other vessels.

Experience has proved that McNamara was too cautious—that nuclear-powered warships are not only more effective in military terms, because of their long range and much lesser dependence upon logistical support, but are as cheap as or cheaper than oil-fired warships in the long run.

The carrier Enterprise and three smaller nuclear warships have now steamed over 10 million miles without having to cancel a single mission because of reactor plant failure.

If our navy is to keep its lead over the Russians in this era of tight budgets, we must get the most for our money. That being so, surely the time has come to build nuclear warships instead of arguing over their merits—which have now been amply proven.

Copper Strike

HON. ARNOLD OLSEN

OF MONTANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 27, 1968

Mr. OLSEN. Mr. Speaker, because of the urgency of the copper strike, I have again written to the President urging that he call together the parties concerned in an attempt to get them to reconcile their differences as recommended by his fact finding commission.

The plight of the miners and the economic situation in my district is so desperate that I would urge any and all of my colleagues whose district is affected by the strike to also contact the President as I have done in the following letter:

FEBRUARY 26, 1968.

The PRESIDENT,
The White House,
Washington, D.C.

MY DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: Although the proposals of the special Advisory Panel on the copper strike have been rejected and the deadlock appears to continue, I have reason to believe the Panel's recommendations could still be used as a basis to begin negotiations.

I respectfully urge that you consider calling together representatives of labor and industry with you and the three panel members at the White House. I believe it is unfair to expect one side or the other to accept the Panel's proposals unilaterally. Such a concession would surely place those who accept at a disadvantage in any negotiations which would follow.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

No doubt both labor and management see areas of possible agreement, but I do not think either will give ground with no assurance whatsoever that some concession will be given by the other side.

I am very optimistic that a confrontation such as I am recommending could set the scene for meaningful discussion, compromise, and, hopefully, a settlement.

With kindest personal regards, I remain
Respectfully yours,

ARNOLD OLSEN.

Tribute to Francis Cardinal Spellman

HON. JAMES J. DELANEY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 27, 1968

Mr. DELANEY. Mr. Speaker, many people throughout this Nation and the world mourned the passing last December of one of the world's great religious leaders, His Eminence Francis Cardinal Spellman, archbishop of New York.

On February 22, in New York City, there was a memorial tribute to the Cardinal, and I would like to bring to the Members' attention an address by Mr. Charles H. Silver, consultant to the mayor of New York City, on that occasion. Mr. Silver forcefully brings out one of the cardinal's most endearing qualities—his love for his fellow man.

It would be inspiring, Mr. Speaker, in this day and age if more and more people throughout the world would emulate the brotherly love so well demonstrated by the cardinal.

Under leave to extend my remarks, Mr. Silver's speech follows:

BROTHERHOOD IN ACTION

(Address by Hon. Charles H. Silver at memorial tribute for His Eminence Francis Cardinal Spellman, February 22, 1968)

There is a bond of friendship—perhaps more than friendship in the rare and wonderful ties of loyalty and understanding—that can grow between two men.

It was such a friendship that I enjoyed with His Eminence for more than a score of years.

As I go about my daily tasks, there are so many reminders of the causes we worked for together, the things we tried to accomplish . . . that it is impossible not to remember him at almost any hour of every day.

But it is not easy to put these cherished recollections into words.

You have heard the Cardinal referred to as a "simple man." The term is misleading. Perhaps it would be more proper to describe him as a "direct" man.

It was his love of people that set him above and apart from any routine concept of the usual Prince of the Church. Many a priest is imbued with a profound and sincere love for his Creator. Cardinal Spellman also had that love—but more than this—and most of all—he had a love of people.

He moved easily, but not conspicuously, through the prescribed and solemn patterns of ceremony and tradition. He mingled with the great on the highest levels of government. And yet, it was his local ministry that pleased him most. He loved his people. He was impatient with the obligations of his powerful office when they interfered with opportunities to meet his neighbors and to serve the members of his parish.

He was—and enjoyed being—an unpretentious New England clergyman, conscientiously pursuing the vocation that fate and

ability had called upon him to play as head of the world's wealthiest, most cosmopolitan archdiocese.

Loyal to his subordinates, he earned more loyalty than one man ever needed. He rarely gave orders and usually expressed his authority by seeking advice, suggestion, correction or admonition.

He was always available. I never knew anyone with a good cause who found it impossible to see him.

He lived a life of "good causes."

There was a time, my friends, when the new State of Israel needed his help after victoriously ending a nightmare of constant attack by five Arab enemies.

It was an April day in 1949, and we walked outdoors together. I mentioned that I had been asked to learn what position he would take in the matter of Israel's application for membership in the United Nations. I told him that his endorsement would mean a great deal in that crucial hour.

He said, "Charlie, I am all for it."

I said, "I felt you would be. Your Eminence, will you issue a statement to that effect?"

And then he answered, "I will do something that may mean a great deal more."

He said that he would call on several of his very good friends in the South American countries and share with them his fond wish that Israel be elected a member of the United Nations.

Well, my friends, for a moment my heart seemed to stop beating. It was such a terrific gesture of support. He had made it without a moment's hesitation—and it was much more than a gesture. He meant every word.

You can imagine the things I felt as we strolled quietly together there on Fifth Avenue.

That very night, His Eminence began to make contact with delegates and persons of the highest importance in each country.

The rest is history . . .

When the dramatic vote was taken, Israel became the 59th member of the United Nations, winning by almost exactly the same number of countries to which His Eminence had gone for assistance in furthering our cause.

I recall other afternoons, my dear friends, when the Cardinal's health was perfect, and we went for these outings at least twice a week.

There was one particular Saturday, about five o'clock, and we had strolled from his home at Madison Avenue and 50th Street up Fifth Avenue to 79th. Coming back, he turned to me and asked:

"Charlie, are you tired?"

"Not particularly," I answered.

"Good," he said. "Let's walk over to Park Avenue between 58th and 59th Streets. There's a movie house I want to show you. We may buy it to rebuild as a chapel. I want to know if you think it's a proper place for one."

When we reached 59th Street, the lights were against us. As we stood waiting on the sidewalk, I said:

"Your Eminence, this is a wonderful country we're living in. Here you are, a Prince of your Church, and I was just elected President of Congregation B'nai Jeshurun, and you—the Cardinal—are asking me—a Jew—if this is the right place to build a chapel. Where else could this happen anywhere in the world, but here in America?"

These walks became a kind of good will mission. He returned every greeting with a smile, a handshake and a "thank you."

His memory was remarkable. One afternoon, we encountered an aging lady, shabbily dressed. The years had not been kind to her—but His Eminence knew her at once as a housekeeper who had worked in the home of a friend in Boston—years before—when he was just a youngster at school.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

He greeted her with the warmth and courtesy one might have accorded a queen. As they talked together, the years seemed to slip away from her face. She was young again, chatting with a dear friend from days long past.

Her smile as he left was ample return for the regard she had been accorded by this great man who walked humbly with his God—and with his people that he loved so dearly.

—And I remember his rich and splendid sense of humor.

There was the day Vice President Humphrey was a luncheon guest at the Cardinal's home.

As he was getting into his coat, he remarked to the Cardinal:

"You know, Your Eminence, I admire these Catholic prizefighters. I notice that just before they begin—they cross themselves when they get into the ring. Does it really do any good?"

"Yes, it does," the Cardinal answered, "but they have to have a punch to go with it."

His Eminence was the recipient of many high honors—but there was no token of esteem given to him by a grateful city that could compare with his own great gifts to the people of New York.

He was a builder of schools and of hospitals, constantly crusading for better educational opportunities, the spiritual architect of a vast elementary and secondary school system as well as numerous colleges and universities.

He was a builder of morale. When the United States entered World War II, His Eminence, in the role of military vicar, began his yearly journeys to the combat zones, however remote they might be and whatever the risk he must take.

Only a few months ago, at the Alfred E. Smith Memorial Foundation Dinner, His Eminence was discussing plans to spend the holidays with the boys at the fighting front.

But this time he added:

"I will certainly be on my way to them—or to heaven."

His Eminence—almost to the end—thought nothing of working 18 hours a day—day after day. He said once with a grin:

"I don't get to bed very early—so, instead of saying my night prayers, I say my morning prayers twice."

And now, so many memories come flooding back.

I recall the night when President Zalman Shazar of Israel, tired and ill, on a long visit to the United States, could not accept the invitation to dine with the Cardinal at his home.

The Cardinal understood. He always understood. A message soon came—asking whether the President of Israel felt well enough to have His Eminence come instead to call upon him at his hotel.

I shall never forget that evening when I escorted the Cardinal on his visit to the President of Israel. They talked of conditions in the Holy Land and the chances for war and peace. When the evening ended, they were very, very good friends, indeed.

I recall an earlier occasion—when Chaim Weitzman, then President of Israel, Abba Eban and I were invited to dine with the Cardinal. Weitzman was almost totally blind. When their historic meeting was over, the Cardinal insisted that he, himself, walking arm-in-arm with Weitzman, guide his steps until we were back at the Waldorf.

Just last year, Abba Eban recalled my friendship with His Eminence at the time that a resolution was introduced by Russia in the United Nations to censure Israel for aggression—one of the grimmest jokes in all international diplomacy.

The success of such a censure vote—unjust and inexcusable as it was—could still have embarrassed Israel. Ambassador Eban asked me to intercede with His Eminence in the hope that he would again enlist the aid of

his friends among the South American countries.

History has a way of repeating itself—especially when entrusted to someone as wise and influential as His Eminence.

And history did repeat itself! The Cardinal marshalled the same solid block of votes that ushered Israel into the family of nations in 1949. They again responded to his call—and protected the honor of a courageous land in its almost incredible hour of victory.

Members of the Jewish Faith, and indeed, of every faith, have reason to honor the name and to mourn the memory of Francis Cardinal Spellman.

At this time—in this place—it is of significance to recall that when he was appointed Archbishop of New York, His Eminence declared:

"My completely absorbing interest will be the salvation of souls—including all. And the welfare of my fellow man—excluding none."

Tonight, we have met in a building on whose face are carved the words "Brotherhood In Action." This phrase itself could serve as the touchstone and total expression of Cardinal Spellman's long and rewarding career—his meaningful mission as a servant of God.

He was, indeed, in every breath of his being—brotherhood in action. And he will never cease to be. For such a man can never die.

He lives in the confident smile of the aged and the poor who know that there are some who care—and that, because of His Eminence, others will be inspired to carry on the work he began.

He lives in the wondering eyes of a little child, guided through the perilous beginning of life at a friendly orphanage created by his charity and compassion.

He lives in every Catholic hospital where the ill and needy are comforted and healed.

His spirit walks the aisle of every parochial school.

And, somehow, I feel that his friendly presence is here—with us now—to walk the aisles of this very meeting.

I can see him as if he were standing beside me—very warm, very human, always cheerful . . . eyes sparkling . . . a witty observation ready on his lips . . . his hands reaching up in their familiar greeting . . . a greeting for all the world and its people—a greeting to transcend any narrow borders of race or creed, joining all men in the goodness of God and the hope of universal peace.

And we return this greeting from beyond life—not only in appreciation of unforgettable and cherished friendship—but for so many acts of charity, loyalty, understanding, patriotism and fellowship.

The men, women and children of our city will never forget his long and fruitful years of service.

We will never forget the gift and example of a life whose eternal testament are the great monuments of learning, healing and hope—his legacy to the people of New York—to the people of my faith and of every faith—to the world—to you and me—and to all mankind.

But the greatest legacy of all is the lesson of his life itself—this great, good man whom we have lost—and yet shall never lose.

His life itself was shaped like some rare and precious jewel in the crown of his Creator.

How proud his mother would have been . . . his mother who uttered this fervent prayer when her son was consecrated a bishop some three decades ago:

"God bless and guide my boy. Keep him good. Keep him humble."

He was good.

He was humble.

—And, outside the soaring cathedral, multitudes of the lowly bowed in sorrow and wept bitterly at their bereavement.

—And, inside, where he had preached so often, the highest estates and powers of the earth had sent their titled heads and lofty

emissaries to mark his greatness and mourn his passing.

He was good.

He was humble.

—And his mother must be very proud to know that her prayers were answered in a noble life—and in the loving praise of the countless millions who inhabit the parish of his heart.

Many will pray for the repose of his soul in the ancient phrases of my own people: "Yis-ga-dal, V'yis-ka-dash Sh'mayra-bo."

"May his soul be bound with a bond of life immortal and may his memory be for an everlasting blessing."

—And in the solemn prayer uttered by those of his own faith who mourn a dear one so deeply loved:

"Eternal rest grant unto him, O Lord—and let perpetual light shine upon him."

Amen.

Federal Aid?—A Distressing Question for Local Authorities

HON. ROBERT McCLORY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 27, 1968

Mr. McCLORY. Mr. Speaker, one of the most distressing decisions facing those who are responsible for the administration of State and local government in America today is that concerning the acceptance of Federal aid. On the one hand there is the appealing argument that local authorities should accept for their citizens anything that is available and free. Running counter to this suggestion is the strong traditional American reliance on individual initiative and local effort.

An example of this difficult dilemma can be seen in the recent action of the Streamwood, Ill., library board in the 12th Illinois Congressional District which I represent. The Streamwood library board decided to decline Federal aid by a tie vote of 3 to 3. The president of the Streamwood library board, Mr. Sid Cato, cast the deciding vote, as recorded in the January 17, 1968, edition of the Hanover Township Times.

I bring this action to the attention of my colleagues to suggest that it is a good reason for the development of some form of Federal revenue sharing. If the funds which find their way so readily to Washington could be returned to our localities for local needs without the necessity of Federal red tape, delay, control, direction, and the other impositions of the central government, so obnoxious and oppressive to our self-reliant citizenry, I am sure that Americans would move forward much more quickly to solve the problems of our times.

FEDERAL AID VETOED BY STREAMWOOD LIBRARY BOARD; CATO TIES VOTE

Streamwood's library board this week dealt federal aid for the new library a knockout punch.

The village is planning a spring referendum for construction of a new library. Total cost has not yet been set.

Federal construction grants, administered by the state, are available for up to 25 per cent of the building cost.

Saturday, the board voted on the Federal aid proposal, after year long preparation that entailed gathering facts on the subject from

February 27, 1968

a variety of sources; meeting with the representative of the state librarian's office who helps administer the grants; and pinpointing the timetable for filing for aid.

"It won't put a cent in the pockets of Streamwood taxpayers, and it won't change things a bit in Washington, but I'm opposed to federal financial aid for our new library," said Sid Cato, president.

His vote against federal aid created a three-to-three tie, thereby defeating the move.

By the same three-to-three vote, a subsequent motion calling for "lowering the total cost of the new-building project by the amount of a Federal grant."

Joining Cato in the anti-federal aid vote were directors Warren Dahl, board treasurer, who sparked opposition to such aid, and Richard Isenberger.

Directors voting for federal aid were Mrs. Peter Deuel, Mrs. Donald Martin and Mrs. Steven Papp.

The board also voted five to one to decline to file for library equalization aid. This year, such aid will come from federal funds, since the Illinois legislature did not appropriate funds for this purpose.

Equalization aid enables local libraries to raise their standards to established minimum levels.

Mrs. Martin was the lone director voting for an equalization grant.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

Adopted by the Young Republican Club of Arlington, Virginia February 14, 1968.

Attest:

CLAUDE H. SMITH, Jr.,
President.
CAROLYN PERSIMMER,
Recording Secretary.

Address by Commissioner Francis Wheat, of the SEC

HON. JOHN V. TUNNEY

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 27, 1968

Mr. TUNNEY. Mr. Speaker, I have known Francis Wheat, Commissioner, Securities Exchange Commission, for several years now. He is a very capable, conscientious, and dedicated public servant and a credit to the Securities and Exchange Commission. In addition Commissioner Wheat is a polished public speaker. I would like to place in the RECORD his address before Town Hall, a southern California forum "dedicated to civic education and to the discussion of public questions." I believe that Commissioner Wheat's address, which follows, is a lucid explanation of the policies and goals of the SEC:

WHAT THE SEC WANTS

(Address by Francis M. Wheat, Commissioner, Securities and Exchange Commission, before Town Hall of California, Los Angeles, Calif., November 14, 1967)

Thank you Frank. Ladies and gentlemen, and old friends—fellow members of Town Hall—it's a privilege to speak to you—and a delightful pleasure to see so many old friends. I still enjoy your weekly newsletter and can't help noticing that those who address you seem to be affected by an intangible influence which one lover of the west called "the geography of hope." It is an influence I cannot expect to escape in discussing with you some of the aims of the S.E.C. For there is hope in each of these aims: to strive for free securities markets, for higher corporate standards, for an efficient securities industry, and for fair procedures in the administration of the federal securities laws.

Each year, amid academic pomp and circumstance, the President of Harvard addresses the graduates of the Law School and declare them—I quote his words—"ready to aid in the shaping and application of those wise restraints which made men free." The thought is an arresting one. It has a special relevance to the first of the four aims I mentioned a moment ago: to seek attainment of conditions under which the securities markets can be genuinely "free."

Two of these conditions, stated in the abstract, are by now familiar and accepted. They are, first, that adequate and timely information be made available to public investors, and, second, that the pricing function of the securities markets be as little as possible affected by artificial stimulation.

Full disclosure to investors is the cornerstone of the earliest of the Federal securities laws. It is also a concept which constantly takes on new dimensions. For example, the recent wave of corporate "tender offers" has focused wide attention on the question whether enough information is provided to public shareholders who are the object of such offers. A shareholder must decide whether to accept a tender offer or to reject it and remain a shareholder of his company. Yet he may not know the true identity of

those who would take control of his company, the nature of their plans (possibly including the company's liquidation), or their sources of financing, which might have an important bearing on what they could be expected to do if the offer is successful. Even apart from the interest of particular shareholders, there is a question whether public confidence in our business-oriented society requires that such information be disclosed and not be held secret.

A bill which would remedy this disclosure gap, and which is co-sponsored by California's Senator Kuchel, has recently passed the Senate. Similar legislation is pending in the House. We assisted in shaping this legislation in an effort to insure that the restraints it provided did not exceed those essential to the task, and we hope the Congress will adopt it.

A more complex problem of disclosure deals with the quality of the financial data contained in prospectuses, in proxy statements, and in reports to shareholders. We have long felt that this quality could be improved if the range of choice between alternative accounting principles could be narrowed. To this end, we have sought the cooperation and, indeed, the leadership of the American Institute of CPA's and its Accounting Principles Board. Our own powers over the presentation of financial information we have largely held in reserve. I might illustrate our relationship with the American Institute with a brief story. It's about the response made by Mary Garden when a friend had the temerity to wonder out loud about her new strapless gown. "It's held up by your self restraint, Mr. Depew."

How confident can you be in the latest reported earnings per share of your company? Are you aware, without painstaking analysis, of the probable diluting effect on this earnings figure of outstanding options and convertible securities? If there are important subsidiaries in the picture, do the financial statements reflect the results of their operations, either in consolidation or otherwise? Are you fully advised of the impact on the company's earnings of extraordinary items not expected to recur in normal operations? Is the long term cost of pension benefits fairly reflected in each year's results. In these and other areas, most investors are better informed today than they were three years ago, thanks to a series of opinions published by the Accounting Principles Board. Based on this record, I think we can expect financial statements to be increasingly useful to the ordinary investor as well as to the professional analyst. The nation's stockholders owe a real debt of gratitude to the leaders of the American Institute for their able and constructive efforts.

Sometimes the information publicly available on a company's affairs may be grossly misleading in the light of knowledge we have acquired. It may even be entirely nonexistent. Such situations are inconsistent with the concept of a free market.

One of our most important disclosure powers is the authority temporarily to suspend all trading under such circumstances. We are trying to develop better techniques for obtaining, and publicizing as rapidly as possible, accurate information about a company whose securities are subject to a trading suspension. An incident occurred here in Los Angeles last spring which may have set a record in this respect. A tender offer for the stock of J. J. Newberry Co. was advertised in the Los Angeles Times. The market immediately rose in response. Information came to us indicating strong doubt that the tenderer had funds to back up his offer. Unbelievable as it may seem, our investigation showed that the author of the tender offer had apparently conjured up the offer during a casual conversation on the golf course with two friends. We acted promptly to suspend trading. Our staff then went to work around the clock to prepare an injunctive complaint

Resolution of Arlington Young Republican Club

HON. SILVIO O. CONTE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 27, 1968

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Speaker, the Young Republican Club of Arlington, Va., has requested me to insert into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a resolution concerning Lithuania adopted by them February 14, 1968.

I have often been requested by various groups in the past to introduce resolutions expressing their views on various matters and have been happy to do so. I am similarly pleased to introduce the resolution of the Arlington Young Republican Club at this point in the RECORD:

RESOLUTION

Be it resolved by the Young Republican Club of Arlington, Virginia:

Whereas the year 1968 marks the fiftieth anniversary of the proclamation of independence of the three Baltic States—Latvia, Lithuania, and Estonia; and

Whereas there exist historical, cultural, and family ties between the people of the Baltic States and the people of the United States; and

Whereas the occupation and subsequent annexation of the Baltic States by the Soviet Union is violative of both fundamental human rights and international law and has never been officially recognized by the United States and other nations of the free world; and

Whereas the Congress of the United States has overwhelmingly expressed its deep concern for the plight of the Baltic States, therefore

The Young Republican Club of Arlington, Virginia requests the United States Post Office Department to issue a commemorative stamp to call the attention of the free world to the fiftieth anniversary of the proclamation of independence of Latvia, Lithuania, and Estonia.

which would disclose to the world what we then knew to be true. Within twenty-four hours the complaint was on file, the principal defendant had consented to a decree, and trading was permitted to resume, unfettered by erroneous information.

These examples are only illustrative, but they show that the facets of a full disclosure policy are infinitely varied. One aspect that needs attention consists of the various ways in which publicly held companies report periodically to the Commission and to investors. Another has to do with traditional prospectus requirements—when these are applicable and when an exemption may be available, particularly in so-called “private offerings” and some types of business combinations. This is not always a simple matter to determine, and brings to mind Justice Holmes’ wise counsel that “the tendency of the law must always be to narrow the field of uncertainty.” We are about to begin a study aimed at better coordination of these disclosure rules. While seeking faster dissemination of information where this is needed, we will try to reduce the burden of paperwork where we can. As an earnest of our intent, we expect very soon to announce a new and greatly condensed registration form for certain publicly held companies. These are companies whose stability and reporting history provide assurance that investors will have the essential information on which to base their private decisions.

A free market is not possible without well informed buyers and sellers. Neither can it be achieved if artificial factors influence the movement of prices. In recognition of this elementary truth, the Federal securities laws enjoin the Commission, in broadest language, to pursue and prevent fraud and manipulation.

We still contend occasionally with the crude manipulative schemes of an earlier era: pooling operations, “painting the tape”, and other devices, accompanied by the spreading of false rumors. Such operations always make good headlines. Problems of far greater subtlety have arisen in recent years. The potential effect of short-term trading by powerful institutions is a matter of immediate concern and careful study. Another interesting and complex problem arises when a publicly-held corporation purchases significant quantities of its own shares. In 1966 we estimate that corporations with securities listed on the New York Stock Exchange spent over 2 billion dollars for this purpose, contrasted with just over 400 million dollars ten years earlier.

Last year the Commission filed an unprecedented action against a well-known corporation. We charged that purchases of its stock by its own employees’ stock bonus trust, under the direction of its principal officers, had been deliberately made to inflate the market price of its stock. The alleged purpose of the manipulation was to reduce the number of shares the company had to issue in corporate acquisitions, which depended upon a formula related to market price—the higher the price during a selected period, the fewer the number of shares that had to be given to the sellers. The evidence showed that the trust acquired in a single 30-day formula period, over half the stock it purchased in an entire year. Buying was often concentrated in the last half hour of trading on the New York Stock Exchange, when it could be expected to have maximum impact on the published “last sale” price of the stock.

The company consented to a permanent injunction. Its terms specified the conditions under which further purchases would take place. These included a restriction against “leading” the market, or purchasing shares either at the opening or within one hour of the close; a prohibition against the use of more than one broker at a time; and a limitation of total purchases to a specified percentage of both daily and weekly exchange volume, unless such purchases were both unsolicited and privately negotiated.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

Is it practicable to adopt somewhat similar restrictions for all publicly held corporations? A definite set of rules would remove the uncertainty which breeds lax standards and, in a sense, penalizes those who practice caution. Rules of such breadth of application are not easily drawn. It is particularly hard to develop a workable quantity limitation for purchases by companies whose shares are not listed on a stock exchange, since information on trading volume in the over-the-counter market is unfortunately unavailable. The patient efforts of our staff, however, have brought us close to the day when a rule can be proposed, and I believe, a significant protection afforded to the public securities markets.

In seeking the goal of free markets there is much to be gained by what has been called “cooperative regulation”. The potential has always existed for such cooperation between the Federal government and the states, and in some cases it is realized to a much greater degree than in others. Protection of investors has long been a vital function of state government in California, more so, I believe, than in any other state. Men of the highest professional ability and standing have occupied and now occupy the office of Commissioner of Corporations. That such men should recognize the possibility of improving existing law is hardly surprising. It is a pleasure to note that your present Commissioner of Corporations, assisted by a distinguished group of men whom he has appointed to advise him, has just finished drafting a completely new corporate securities law for California which is certain to create nationwide interest.

This is no time to try to describe the features of the proposed new law, but it skillfully avoids unnecessary duplication of the S.E.C.’s regulatory effort, while preserving traditional standards of protection for investors. It exemplifies creative federalism at its best.

More and more Americans are becoming investors in securities—over 21 million at the latest count, including over 2 million in California alone. A second objective of the S.E.C. concerns the standards of conduct of those who manage the resources these investors have provided. Fortunately, improvements in disclosure, and development of better weapons against manipulation and fraud, both serve indirectly to encourage higher corporate standards. For example, when a corporation’s assets exceed a million dollars, and its shareholders number over five hundred, it must register with us. It must disclose for public gaze—and bring that disclosure up-to-date at intervals thereafter—all material loans, leases, sales, and other dealings between it and its officers and directors. These are the sorts of transactions most likely to involve over-reaching. Fortunately, they have a “shrinking” quality when brought to light. It is not unusual for a company’s initial registration statement to disclose as it must a series of past transactions of this kind, and then voluntarily to state that the directors have changed its policy, so that loans to management, or other specified types of dealings involving a conflict of interest, will no longer be authorized.

Two years ago we brought suit against a large, publicly-held corporation and certain of its officers, directors, and key employees. It was alleged in the complaint that the individual defendants had violated federal law when they purchased the company’s stock on the New York Stock Exchange, and acquired calls on that stock, at a time when they possessed secret knowledge of the discovery of an ore body of great potential. The final outcome of this case—still on appeal—remains in doubt. It has, however, resulted in much productive thought regarding the obligations of so-called corporate “insiders” when they purchase and sell the securities of their companies in the public market. Written policies have been adopted by a number of corporations designed to inhibit the kinds of deal-

ings in their shares which gave rise to our lawsuit. An especially valuable contribution to the evolution of higher corporate standards was made by the New York Stock Exchange in a thoughtful bulletin, published late in 1965, entitled “The Corporate Director and the Investing Public.” In the words of the Exchange:

“Corporate officials should wait until after the release of earnings, dividends, or other important developments, has appeared in the press before making a purchase or sale. This permits the news to be widely disseminated and negates the inference that officials had an inside advantage . . . The same considerations apply to the families or close associates of officers and directors, who are often presumed to have preferential access to information. As far as the public is concerned, these also are insiders.”

This sort of statement, coming from a non-government source, is good—and much needed—and there should be more like it.

In one specialized area, the standards of management are by statute a matter of direct concern to the Commission. Since 1940, the Investment Company Act has expressly forbidden any transaction in the nature of a purchase, sale, rental of property or the like, between an investment company and any of its affiliated persons—such as its separate investment advisory organization—unless on application the Commission finds the transaction fair and reasonable and free from overreaching. However, the fees charged to the investment company for services rendered by affiliated persons—the advisory fee, for example—are immune from such review. In 1940, these fees were very small. Today they amount, in the aggregate, to something in the neighborhood of \$140,000,000.

We recently recommended a change in the statute to establish a standard for management fees. The reason for this recommendation lies in the existence of a basic conflict of interest between the typical advisory firm and the investment company which it serves—a conflict built into the traditional investment company structure. Representatives of the advisory firm usually act as the officers of the investment company. They also sit on its Board of Directors.

The other directors, although unaffiliated with the adviser in a statutory sense, are selected by the adviser. Such an operating structure contrasts to that of the typical business operation whose affairs are managed by its own salaried officers and employees. In light of this structure and the fiduciary position of the external adviser, we believe it is the adviser’s duty to charge the fund no more than reasonable fees for its services.

We have asked, first, that this duty be recognized in the statute, and, second, that a meaningful avenue of enforcement be provided. We did not suggest that the Commission be given power to determine what fees meet the test of reasonableness. Instead, it was felt proper to leave this function to the courts where questions pertaining to the obligations of fiduciaries have been settled since the early days of the common law. Strong opposition to our recommendation has been voiced by the fund managers and others, and the decision on whether or not to change the pattern of law rests with the Congress.

A third Commission objective, made urgent by the needs of the rapidly growing investor population, is to foster greater efficiency on the part of the securities industry—the firms and their employees who merchandise securities to the public and who handle trading. Efficiency in today’s financial world centers largely on automation, which furnishes perhaps the best hope for holding down costs to investors. Efficient and sophisticated internal procedures for securities firms are important to us for another reason: they make possible closer surveillance by the firm’s own officers of its salesmen and

February 27, 1968

branch officers to try to prevent fraud and manipulation.

Seven years ago the stock of The United States Automatic Merchandising Company, a new corporate venture, was heavily sold by the salesmen of a large brokerage firm in Los Angeles. After increasing nineteen-fold in six-months time, the price of the shares suddenly collapsed and many investors were hurt. After extensive hearings, the Commission levied sanctions not only on the personnel of the local branch office but also on certain of the top partners in New York. We observed that the latter "bore a heavy responsibility" for failure to provide the degree of careful, long-distance supervision which could have prevented the fraud. There is an encouraging sequel to this episode. Last summer, an article appeared in a national business magazine bearing the title "Wall Street's Own Watchdog". It featured the work now being done by the Compliance Department of the same brokerage firm, and praised that firm for having "one of the strongest surveillance departments on Wall Street."

Nowhere in the industry is there greater room for improved efficiency than in the functioning of the over-the-counter market. Communication in this market is almost entirely by telephone or teletype. Although a marvelous oral shorthand has developed among the professional traders, the mechanisms they use are still those of the 19th century. We have encouraged the National Association of Securities Dealers to develop workable automation techniques for this vast and diffuse market place. The technology is ready and waiting.

At the outset, and very soon it is hoped, computers will be used to collect and disseminate market-making bids and offers which can be made to appear at the touch of a button on electronic screens in the offices of subscribing brokers. A second step would be to provide the mechanics for the execution of trades through the system, thus making possible automatic clearing, preparation of confirmations and public reporting of volume and price information on the transactions of all who use the system. Without these developments, investors will continue to be poorly informed about what is going on in this market. Moreover, the much needed surveillance of unusual market changes, which may be the fruit of manipulation, will continue to be an awkward and troublesome problem.

There is a fourth, and final objective of the Commission which deserves mention. That objective is to handle our own affairs in such a way that those on whom the Federal securities laws impinge will feel that they have been fairly treated. We seek mutual respect between the regulators and the regulated even though our task might sometimes appear like that of a minister: to comfort the afflicted and to afflict the comforted. Each Commissioner is involved almost daily in an effort to be helpful to those who must deal with us. In a sense, each of us regards himself as an ombudsman, charged with making certain that what may appear an impenetrable maze of law to the inexperienced does in fact have a key.

We are not always entirely successful. Let me illustrate the problem by reading excerpts from the correspondence we had with one lawyer in a small town:

The first letter (with names altered) was dated in January, and was addressed to our Chicago Regional Office:

DEAR SIRS: Mr. John Smith, president of Lake City Auto Auctions, has handed me your letter of January 12, to which please refer.

"I set up the corporation for these fellows. They have bought themselves a lot and are aiming to put up a place where used cars are auctioned off.

"The boys' intentions were to sell stock only to used car dealers. I know this for a

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

fact, because I set in on several of their meetings when they started the corporation last September. Of course, I suppose they could sell stock to the public if they took a mind to. There is nothing in their charter forbidding it.

"Now I frankly tell you that I am a country lawyer. There are a dozen lawyers in this town, and I would not give two cents for what all of us put together know about Federal law. The reason is that each one of the regulatory or administrative agencies of the govt. has got its own books of rules and regulations and if a lawyer here had them, he would be needing a barn to put them in, and he would be bankrupt from buying them. So, most of us gave up on Federal law long ago. All I've got is a \$3 book on bankruptcy. If some poor fellow comes in with a Federal problem, I tell him to write his Congressman. There may be a copy of the Securities Act of 1933 in this town, but I don't know who would have it, and I sure don't.

"So, if the Auto Auction boys are doing something you don't like, you just let me know what it is and I will tell them to quit it.

"I can't figure how you ever even heard of this outfit. I think their competitors must have written to you. Maybe you could also check on their competitors.

"Yours very truly,

"M. J. P."

The second letter is dated a month and a half later—

DEAR SIRS: I thank you for your letter of January 29.

"It does appear that the stock offering might not have been entirely intrastate, and that therefore registration is required. I have wended my way through all the material you sent me, and I think I fairly comprehend the substance of Release Nos. 4434, 4554, 4450, 4470, and the Securities Act of 1933. However, I must confess that the "General Rules and Regulations" is the most incomprehensible document that has ever come to my hand. When I graduated from law school, I got the highest grade on the state bar exam. I have an I.Q. of 137, and I still can't read this doggone thing and make any sense out of it. Couldn't you just send me some blank forms to fill out? Then we could do business.

"Yours very truly,

"M. J. P."

There is, of course, a germ of truth in our correspondent's disarming comment. Our rules reflect the complexity and variety of available methods of financing. We cannot hope to convert them into pleasant reading. But an effort to explain them is only a telephone call away.

These, in a word, are some of the S.E.C.'s goals: to narrow the information gap between "insiders" and public investors, to restrain artificial influence on the movement of prices in the markets, to encourage higher corporate standards, to assist the development of a more efficient securities industry, and to conduct our own affairs so that those who deal with us, whether large and powerful corporations or owners of insignificant amounts of stock, will have reason to feel that their problems and legitimate interests have been understood.

Each of these goals is bound to the others by a common thread of policy. That policy is to foster conditions under which the rapidly increasing public participation in the ownership of American business makes sense. We are limited by the boundaries of the laws we administer and properly so. The Congress deliberately left ample room for significant contributions on the part of others. Such contributions have been made—I have described a few of them—and more will come. The genius of our country lies in the fact that so many of its citizens find a challenge worthy of their best efforts in helping to shape and apply "those wise restraints, which make men free."

Thank you very much.

House Doorkeeper Colorful as His Name

HON. THOMAS P. O'NEILL, JR.

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 27, 1968

Mr. O'NEILL of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, everyone loves "Fishbait." He greets you with an effervescent smile, a cheery hello, and a warm handshake. "Fishbait" makes gloomy days bright and bright days brighter. He is a truly loved, helping friend of so many Members of Congress who particularly remember when they first arrived on the scene and "Fishbait" was there to help them to get settled.

I am happy to place in the RECORD for all to see, the following article on "Fishbait" written by Aldo Bechman of the Chicago Tribune:

HOUSE DOORKEEPER COLORFUL AS HIS NAME
(By Aldo Bechman)

WASHINGTON, February 24.—"Fish Bait" Miller has devoted most of his life to helping other people. And that practice has paid off handsomely for him.

In the 20 years since Miller first was elected doorkeeper of the House of Representatives, the man with the personality almost as colorful as his nickname has become known throughout the world as a kind of shepherd for the world's leaders.

Most of his day-to-day work is spent routinely supervising the operation of five capitol barbershops, two snack bars, two cloakrooms, a dozen restrooms, an army of pages, doormen, and janitors.

But moments of glory come during joint sessions of Congress.

LEADS HONORED GUEST

For it's Fish Bait who leads the honored guest, whether it be the President about to deliver a state of the Union address or a world leader visiting the United States, to the front of the jammed chambers of the House.

His booming introduction, "Mistuh Speaker, the President of the United States," has become legendary, and television technicians have learned to turn down their audio mikes just a little prior to the introduction.

Altho only 58, Miller has truly become a legend in his own time. Stories of his folksy approach to high-collar situations are never ending.

SERVICE TO MRS. LUCE

There was the time Mrs. Clare Booth Luce was about to enter the chamber to be sworn in as a member of Congress. Miller walked up and whispered to her, "Mrs. Luce, I'm sure you wouldn't want to be sworn in with your slip showing. The lady's room is right over here."

In an instant, Fish Bait had made another lifelong friend.

Perhaps the most discussed colloquy ever engaged in by Miller occurred when Britain's Princess Elizabeth, prior to becoming queen, and her husband visited Washington in the early 1950s.

GUIDES ROYAL COUPLE

Congress wasn't in session at the time, so there was no joint session, but Fish Bait was given the job of showing the House chamber to the royal couple.

"Howdy, Ma'am. Nice to see you," he said upon being introduced.

Then, with state department protocol officers cringing, the doorkeeper took the princess by the arm and helped her mount the speaker's rostrum. As he stood beside the future queen, he said to the congregated officials, "Pass me up the prince."

Philip then joined his wife and Fish Bait on the rostrum and asked what every button was for before finally descending.

GETS PROTOCOL NOTE

The next time a royal couple was scheduled to visit the House, Miller received a terse note from the state department.

"The correct way to address a royal couple is 'your highness or your majesty,'" the note said. Then, in large letters at the bottom, was written, "Do not touch royalty."

Miller today denies the oft-repeated story that on at least one occasion, he addressed Elizabeth as "Queenie."

He has escorted every President to the rostrum since Truman, a close friend with whom he shared a common bond. When Miller was first elected minority doorkeeper in 1947, he won by 108 votes, the same margin that Truman enjoyed in the electoral college after the hotly-contested 1948 election.

RECALLS DE GAULLE

Among dignitaries, who have addressed joint sessions after being led down the aisle by Miller, are Gen. Douglas MacArthur, upon his return from Korea; Winston Churchill; Charles de Gaulle; and, more recently, Gen. William Westmoreland.

Of his experience with the French president, Miller recalled: "At the time, he was a pretty good guy. He even acted like a human being."

Miller came to the nation's capital in 1933, as a clerk in the House post office. He was the first patronage appointment by Rep. William Colmer [D., Miss.], now the chairman of the powerful House rules committee.

Colmer, for whom Miller had served as a driver during his campaign for Congress, told the young junior college student that he would have to help out in his office, after working in the post office.

COMES FROM MISSISSIPPI

Both were from Pascagoula, Miss., a small community in the southeast corner of the state.

Miller picked up his nickname there, while working as a soda jerk in a corner drug store. The principal bait for fishermen in the area was shrimp and, and since Miller weighed only 75 pounds at the age of 15, his customers called him "Alligator Bait," or Fish Bait, since he was such a "shrimp."

Fish Bait stuck. Many of his closest friends don't realize his real name is William.

Waller Batson, Colmer's administrative aide, who came to Washington with the congressman 35 years ago, remembers Miller as a young man. "He's always been a real hustler," he said. "His stock in trade is knowing how to help people. He enjoys doing things for people and people enjoy him."

ALL OVER THE PLACE

"During that first campaign, Fish Bait was all over the place," reminisced Batson. "He was picking up posters, or shaking hands, or doing whatever needed to be done."

Miller recalls that during that campaign, he drove Colmer 24,000 miles over the 17-county district. "We had 19 flat tires because the roads, where there were any, were awful," he said.

After working in the post office for 6½ years, Miller got a job as a messenger to the doorkeeper. And, then, making more friends with each job, he became an assistant to the sergeant at arms for the House. Finally, in 1947, he ran for minority doorkeeper and was elected.

RISES WITH DEMOCRATS

When the Democrats gained control of Congress, he became doorkeeper and has served there ever since, except during the Republican-controlled 83d Congress, when he was minority doorkeeper.

His present office is down the hall just two doors from the post office, where he started his Capitol hill career.

Altho his pay has jumped from \$145 a month, which he drew when he first came

here in 1933, to nearly \$29,000 a year, Fish Bait hasn't changed much. He still has that Mississippi accent.

He and his wife, the former Mable Breenland, a nurse whom he met when he returned home in 1936 for some minor surgery, live in a modest home in suburban Arlington, and he drives a 1947 Dodge sedan.

Altho Miller enjoys talking about his experiences on Capitol hill, the real gleam in his eye appears while discussing his daughter, Sarah Patsy, who teaches high school near Atlanta.

Altho supervising a payroll of about 2 million dollars a year, Fish Bait's main job, even today, remains one of service.

He's there every noon to brush the dandruff off the shoulders of Speaker John McCormack [D., Mass.] before he convenes the House, and he is on call to offer his services to any congressman.

ENJOYS THE APPLAUSE

To know Fish Bait is to enjoy him. When asked what he thinks about while leading the leaders of the world down the center aisle of the House chamber, he said, "I make out like all the applause is for me."

Perhaps Rep. Carl Albert [D., Okla.], House majority leader, summed it up best, when he signed a picture for Miller.

"To the one and only Fish Bait," the picture reads, "a tireless worker, a devoted servant of the House, a man of rare talents, a friend of man."

Oregon's Long-Range Planning Program

HON. AL ULLMAN

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 27, 1968

MR. ULLMAN. Mr. Speaker, in recent years the importance of long-range planning has become a national topic. The need for it has been recognized at every level of government. In my own State of Oregon a program of long-range planning is being conducted which is a great source of personal pride to me. The Oregon Cooperative Extension Service is sponsoring this resource planning program for each of Oregon's 36 counties. Ten counties have already completed long-range planning programs which will provide the basis for the many decisions that will determine their economic and social future. Half of these counties—Marion, Deschutes, Union, Jefferson, and Linn—are in the Second Congressional District. By 1970 all counties in Oregon will have completed plans.

I would like to briefly summarize the Linn County program to demonstrate the scope of the planning that is now taking place in Oregon. Linn County's long-range planning program contains sections on the present county situation, family life, youth, community development, natural resources, industrial development, agricultural production, and agricultural marketing. Under these major headings, 74 specific topics which require attention and direction in the future growth of Linn County are discussed. The plan has already been accepted and the steering committee has been authorized to immediately initiate action to implement the recommendations. I am hopeful that the county will shortly realize the benefits of this program, and I know that Linn County's progress will be an example to all Oregon counties.

February 27, 1968

It is the interest and support of the citizens of each county that have made these long-range planning programs so successful. For instance, in Linn County over 200 people participated in the planning groups. Special recognition is due Mr. Ted Sidor, a resource development specialist at Oregon State University, who has spearheaded this progressive program in Oregon. Through his efforts, and the cooperation of thousands of interested citizens, this program will serve as a grassroots guideline for years to come.

Survival of OEO

HON. CHARLES C. DIGGS, JR.

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 27, 1968

MR. DIGGS. Mr. Speaker, during the current period of U.S. budgetary imbalance, the Federal Office of Economic Opportunity is having to wage its war on poverty on two separate fronts. While continuing to bear the standard of the economically and socially disadvantaged—of the otherwise voiceless and powerless poor—this unprecedented program must continue its own struggle for survival.

I wish, today, Mr. Speaker, to say a few words in behalf of the survival of OEO; in fact, in behalf of the full appropriation of the \$2.18 billion which the Congress has authorized for fiscal year 1969.

Coming often under particularly heavy attack is the OEO organization known as the Job Corps, and the weapon used, or rather misused, has been the national concern and shock over the crisis of our cities and the general mood of urban unrest.

The Job Corps of today is a new program. It is a program of human renewal, with the purpose of providing the opportunity of constructive, contributive citizenship to the out-of-school young men and women who lack the education, the skills, and the attitude necessary to obtain and hold a job. One can add with little fear of exaggeration, that the young people whom the Job Corps is geared and toolled to help are those otherwise destined to a negative and disruptive role in their own society. They are those who can look forward only to wasted bodies, wasted minds, and wasted lives. They are those whose brothers in life are now being judged for their destructiveness and irresponsibility—those whose faces many of us now see for the first time, aided ironically by the light from the fires of our summer riots.

Who are they, and where did they come from?

They are well described in the first annual report of the Children's Aid Society of New York. In part it reads:

There are no greater dangers to our society than those created by the existence of large groups of vagabond, ignorant and ungoverned children.

They have not begun to show themselves as they will in eight to ten years when they are matured. Those of us who were too negligent or too selfish to notice them as children will be fully aware of them as men.

Then let the society beware, when the out-

cast, vicious, reckless multitude of New York boys, swarming now in every foul alley, come to know their power and use it.

This children's aid society report was dated 1854, Mr. Speaker. That is 114 years ago; that is where our rioters came from; that is who they are, and no one can say that we were not warned in plenty of time.

But the question is no longer one of forewarning. The problem is here and it is real.

No matter what the instigation or provocation of our recent riots however—whether it be man or condition—the ultimate fuel, without which there could be no conflagration is the poverty, the ignorance, the depression, and the degradation of life in the urban ghetto. This fuel, Mr. Speaker, should be the target of our wrath. Let us remove this fuel, and no matter how great the spark, there will be no fire.

**Lincoln College Preparatory School
Commencement, February 22, 1968**

HON. JOSHUA EILBERG

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 27, 1968

Mr. EILBERG. Mr. Speaker, on Thursday evening, February 22, 1968, it was my pleasure to address 207 graduates of the Lincoln College Preparatory School at its 56th annual February commencement, which took place at the Irvine Auditorium, University of Pennsylvania, 34th and Spruce Streets, Philadelphia. Dr. Manfred E. Lapayowker is the distinguished president and founder of this fine preparatory school.

This institution is one of the oldest and largest of its kind in the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, and does outstanding work in providing a high school education for its students. It specializes in accelerated courses and does an excellent job in particular for individuals who have been previous high school dropouts. Approximately 60 percent of the current graduating class are college-bound.

On the occasion of these exercises, it was my pleasure to present the following remarks:

I wish to discuss with you the impact of Federal activity on higher education in the States—as seen by one Member of Congress.

I have divided my brief remarks into three parts.

First, I shall discuss the purposes of Federal legislation, as I perceive them, to assist higher education. I then would like to comment on some of the current attitudes of Congress toward the Federal role for higher education. Finally, I shall enumerate some of the issues raised in the government-campus relationship.

In discussing the purposes—or rationale—of Federal legislation in support of higher education, I do not think it necessary to document in detail the extent of the involvement of the Federal government.

We all know that the Federal government has for a long time been involved in one way or another with education in this country, from some of the ordinances of the post-revolutionary era to the Land Grant College Act of a century ago.

It has been chiefly since World War II, however, that there has been a really sub-

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

stantial expansion of Federal support for education, an expansion that has been particularly significant during the last few years under the Presidencies of John F. Kennedy and Lyndon B. Johnson.

Let me give you several measures of the new Federal role in education.

About 1800 institutions of higher education—of a total of almost 2300—participate in one or more Federally-supported or sponsored programs. In fact, the Federal government in 1966 spent more money on higher education than did the 50 state governments combined. The \$5 billion spent by the Federal government on higher education represents no less than one-quarter of higher education's total budget.

One college student of every four in this country received some kind of Federal aid to pay his educational expenses during the 1965-66 academic year; three years before that the figure was one in fifteen. One of every two Americans working towards a doctor's degree is now studying at a university that is receiving Federal funds to build graduate facilities. One of every four American colleges has received a Federal loan or grant to build undergraduate facilities.

Now let me here comment on some of the reasons for this increased support of the Federal government of education. First and obviously, education, like most other things, has come to cost a great deal more. Consider for example, the cost of faculty, equipment and structures.

Second, we have seen an enormous increase in the campus population in this country. In 1955 there were 2.4 million college students; in 1965, 5.4 million; and you had better get ready for the fact that in 1973 there are going to be approximately 8 million students on our college campuses. The question you will face is where to get the money for facilities and equipment and first-class faculty.

Clearly, increased Federal support has been premised on the fact that we cannot get enough support for higher education purely from state and local public funds or from private resources. All three are terribly important but simply insufficient to do the job.

Another reason for the increase in Federal support is that the government itself has had pressing needs for scientific and technological knowledge and expertise. The National Science Foundation, the National Aeronautics and Space Administration, the Department of Defense, the Atomic Energy Commission, the National Institutes of Health, the Department of Agriculture and the Agency for International Development have all had to contract out to the universities a good deal of their research work. Federal support has therefore become a major factor in the budgets of many universities and the sums involved are substantial.

Beyond these major reasons for the enlarged aid from Uncle Sam to higher education, I must cite another. In the post-war period Americans generally have come to have a somewhat different attitude toward education. We no longer look at spending on education as welfare expenditures, as it were. Rather, we have begun to regard education as an investment in human resources. Sparked in large measure by the writings of Professor Theodore W. Schultz of the University of Chicago, a new school of economists has grown up who analyze education as human capital, as distinguished from investment in plant and equipment.

In addition to this new attitude towards education, we have also come to realize that lack of education has enormously impeded the opportunity to participate in American life of many of the minority groups in the United States, of Negroes, of Spanish-Americans, of many other disadvantaged groups, of poor people generally.

A year or so ago, before he left his position as Assistant Secretary of Health, Education and Welfare for Education, Francis Keppler, who had also served as U.S. Commissioner of Education, in an address at

Atlantic City, described what he termed "a new partnership" in American education. The partners he discussed were the Federal government, on the one hand, and state, local and private authorities on the other. Mr. Keppler listed the terms and the objectives of this new partnership.

It must be obvious that the new education Acts which we have been passing generally reflect these new terms and these new objectives. Let me list them: (1) Assuring an equal educational opportunity for the disadvantaged in American life; (2) Stimulating quality in education by supporting research and experimentation and innovation; (3) Strengthening the capacity of State departments of education to make decisions on local proposals for using Federal funds; (4) Expanding facilities and faculty for higher education and providing a range of student financial aid; (5) Recording the results of all these programs in order to help Congress and the Administration evaluate their effectiveness; (6) Insisting that Federal funds should be over and above and not in place of present expenditures on education.

Let me now cite only a couple of examples of the ways in which the national government has been seeking to make its contribution to achieving the objectives of this new partnership.

I shall illustrate the Federal contribution by referring to two particularly important recent acts of Congress: The Higher Education Facilities Act of 1963 and the Higher Education Act of 1965.

Since World War II the number of colleges and universities has increased 250 percent—from 886 to about 2,300. Enrollments in these institutions, which were 2.4 million in 1954 are expected, as I have said, to reach over 8 million by 1973. Reflecting the concern of the nation over this problem, Congress enacted the Higher Education Facilities Act of 1963. This Act was designed to alleviate pressing needs for academic facilities to accommodate the "baby boom" which had already hit our higher education institutions.

The Higher Education Facilities Act provides matching grants and loans for the construction of classrooms, laboratories, libraries and other undergraduate and graduate academic facilities. Of particular interest in this age of burgeoning community college and technical institute development, is the inclusion of such institutions under the provisions of the Act. In fact, 2 percent of the funds appropriated under Title I (undergraduate facilities) was allotted to the states to be used by public community colleges and technical institutes.

The Act requires each state to designate a State Commission for Higher Education Facilities. This Commission determines the priorities and the Federal share, within the state allotment, for each project submitted. Federal assistance for higher education did not end, however, with this facilities construction legislation. Congressional concern turned to other pressing problems facing higher education.

In 1965, Congress enacted the Higher Education Act—a "package" of assistance to our colleges and universities and their students. Its several titles, of which I will discuss two, provide a variety of student assistance programs—scholarships, work-study arrangements, guaranteed student loans, and a variety of other programs—to strengthen less developed colleges, to improve college library resources, to develop teacher-training programs, and to support university involvement in community problems.

Title I of the Act deals with community service and continuing education programs. It was designed to give colleges and universities a stronger role in helping solve community problems, especially urban problems. Under Title I, the States have the opportunity to select institutions to administer education programs, activities and services

through plans submitted to the U.S. Office of Education. The goal is to make the universities active and important participants in such projects as:

Seminars for community leaders on problems of poverty, transportation and pollution.

Seminars for architects, engineers, city planners, policemen.

Training programs in providing educational services for the elderly.

Training in consultative services to local, State and Federal governments.

I am heartened to learn that the Southern States have an excellent record of response to Federal assistance under Title I; the first plan approved, as a matter of fact, was for North Carolina. The University of Georgia, with a long history of interest in community development and continuing education, is this State's agency appointed by the Governor to administer Title I programs.

You have probably been concerned with the condition of "developing institutions." Congress shares this concern to the degree that it authorized Title III of the Higher Education Act to provide assistance to institutions struggling to survive. About 90 percent of the institutions of higher education are classified as small colleges—those having fewer than 5,000 students enrolled. Many are poorly equipped, under-financed, lacking in accreditation, and offering little diversity in course offerings. Title III provides such institutions making reasonable efforts to improve themselves with assistance for activities such as: Faculty or student exchanges, faculty improvement programs, introduction of new curricular and teaching methods.

I have given you some illustrations of the present Federal support of higher education. We would now do well to ask whether a well-developed philosophy or ideology underlies this Federal commitment.

In the first place, it should be emphasized that no clearly defined ideologies have emerged—or are likely to. Federal support for higher education has largely grown for highly pragmatic reasons.

Next, we must recognize that the Federal government's approach to assisting higher education has been quite uncompromising in its support of the pluralistic pattern of higher education in America. This obviously does not mean complete laissez faire. Congress, for example, has moved to end racial discrimination in higher education. But, on balance, the most salient feature of the role of the Federal government has been its endorsement of one highly diverse partnership in higher education—a partnership consisting of Federal, state and local governments and some 2300 public and private institutions of higher education.

In this setting of pragmatism and pluralism, a strong bipartisan support has developed for Federal aid to higher education—especially in the areas of construction, research and development, and student assistance.

I will conclude by simply enumerating several rhetorical questions with which I hope you will be concerned, all questions that have to do with the relationships among the Federal government and higher education and the States.

One of the problems I have frequently encountered is that of providing adequate information to local authorities both in and outside education about these new Federal programs. I spend a great deal of time on these matters and I myself have a hard time keeping up with everything that's going on. My point is that we have to do a better job of educating the educators—about the education legislation.

A second issue: Will our institutions of higher education come to look upon these federal programs as a kind of gigantic pork barrel and simply say, "Let's get ours," without carefully thinking through the impact of these programs on the enterprise of edu-

cation at your institutions? For example, will you seek money available for scientific equipment when perhaps you really don't need to strengthen your capacity to teach science as much as you do the humanities?

A third issue I would raise in this: Will Federal support be concentrated in a few colleges and universities, especially those that are already of the first order, thus widening the gap between them and the less well off institutions? Or will we fall into the opposite trap and dilute the quality of the first class institutions simply in order to maximize the distribution of the support?

Another issue concerns the fate of the smaller four-year liberal arts colleges, those beyond the junior colleges or the developing institutions, but which neither approach nor necessarily wish to emulate the larger universities. Will they be driven out of business? Will they be able to continue financially?

We do pay a price, you know, for the amazing diversity of education in this nation—especially at the level of higher education. A good many of the institutions of higher learning in this country are quite marginal—not only in terms of their financial capacity to persist, but also in terms of the consequent quality of education they are able to offer. At some point in the future—I know not when—it seems likely that the contribution of these institutions to the national welfare will be reassessed.

Will we eventually move in this country in the direction of free public higher education, that is to say, of opportunity for every able high school graduate to obtain a tuition-free college education?

Or will the states be asking for larger tuition fees from students desiring to attend public institutions? (California)

Related issue: role of states in student financial aid programs. E.g., state's part in operation of government loan program.

Another issue: With President and Congress seeking to lower a direct drain on the Treasury and moving toward increasing reliance on financing through the private sector, what will this mean to the colleges and universities who need to build facilities? i.e., Can loan programs do the job?

Is the desire of more and more institutions to award advanced degrees something the Federal Government should encourage via aid, thus perhaps changing healthy colleges into weak universities?

Role of states in helping its institutions of higher education assess what commitments of faculty and facilities they can make to helping society solve problems, to providing service, e.g., adult education, VISTA, Peace Corps, etc.

The final point I would make is that Federal education policy has certainly not been determined for all time. We are authorizing money. We are spending money. We are increasing our national investment in education. We must at the same time, however, engage in the most rigorous and searching and critical self-examination we can of all these programs. We should be asking ourselves if, in terms of financing education, improving the quality of education, insuring access to education—if in terms of all these questions of which I have been speaking—we are adequately fulfilling our responsibility to the young men and women of our country—which is to say, to the future of the American society.

I should like to emphasize at this point that the future role of the Federal government in this area—as in so many other areas—is very closely related to the question of leadership and capacity within the individual states.

I have told you that State and local public funds coupled with private resources have not been sufficient to provide the money necessary for college faculty, classrooms and laboratories. And a large number of students are in college today through a Federal loan, scholarship or fellowship.

February 27, 1968

I nonetheless believe that the future of higher education in the United States depends in large measure on our maintaining a mixture of financial support from private, state and local and Federal resources. If we are to maintain the diverse pattern which is the genius of American higher education, we must not depend on one source of support alone.

But, in order to make the most effective use of the education dollar, we must do a much better job of planning for education, especially at the state level.

State governments can play an important leadership role in forging closer links between the universities and the industrial community within a state for the purpose of encouraging the state's economic development.

State education agencies can also do much more than at present to stimulate cooperation between colleges and universities and elementary and secondary schools. For instance, a university can strengthen its own program for training teachers of the disadvantaged by working closely with a hard-pressed school system and at the same time help supply much needed teaching assistance.

I look for the decade ahead to bring a new era of cooperation in American education between public and private institutions and among Federal, state and local education authorities.

Model Cities

HON. RICHARD FULTON

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 26, 1968

Mr. FULTON of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, gentlemen, an historic moment of decision is at hand. The President of the United States has just recommended to us a most significant piece of housing and urban development legislation.

Let us examine just one portion of that legislation: the request for \$1 billion in model cities aid. Who will get the money? A look at the record thus far tells us a great deal.

Last November, 63 cities were selected for model cities planning grants. Others will be chosen in a few months. The 63 cities represent almost every kind of urban condition. They come in all sizes, from Pikesville, Ky., population 5,000, to New York City, with its teeming 8 million. They encompass problems of depressed Appalachia; the changing agricultural centers of the South; the old, wornout sections of cities in the East and North; the outmoded, obsolete portions of midwestern industrial centers; and the booming cities of the West and Southwest.

Each has its own peculiar problems, but one thing they have in common: slum and blighted areas inhabited by people beset with the heaviest burdens of slum living, substandard housing, poor schools, ill health, unemployment, crime, and delinquency. Each area reeks with apathy, frustration, and hopelessness. Each is a breeding ground for anger and rioting.

Now we have given these people hope. That through the model cities program they can begin to attack these evils through coordinated programs of Federal, State, and local aid, created and executed by themselves.

Let us not dim that hope; let us positively commit ourselves to building that hope by supporting the model cities and all other provisions of the President's message on cities.

The School-to-School Program

HON. ROBERT McCLORY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 27, 1968

Mr. McCLORY. Mr. Speaker, it has come to my attention that the 500th schoolhouse, fostered under the school-to-school program, soon will be constructed in Llachshu, Peru. This activity, now named the school partnership program, has enabled American students to participate in the development of much-needed schools in underdeveloped countries, and has contributed substantially to understanding and harmony between American citizens and many friends in other lands.

The school partnership program was initiated under the leadership of Gene Bradley when he served as president of the Parent-Teacher Association of Rosendale School in a suburb of Schenectady, N.Y. Gene Bradley felt that the PTA should do something useful with its money, rather than just search for more "extras" for a school that was already well equipped. He investigated the possibility of helping the poor in impoverished countries to build schoolhouses with the aid of contributions from American schoolchildren.

With the approval of his PTA board members and the principal, Mr. Bradley solicited the advice of the Peace Corps. The first school built was that in Casablanca, Colombia, in South America. So successful was this first venture that the then Peace Corps Director, Sargent Shriver, asked General Electric to grant a leave of absence to Mr. Bradley—who was then editor of GE's public affairs magazine forum. The local initiative of parents and teachers as well as members of various civic, fraternal and religious groups under the inspired supervision of Gene Bradley, enabled a major program of self-help to be launched in many underdeveloped countries. The people of our Nation have much to appreciate in the character of such a man as Gene Bradley. He is a good example for others to emulate.

The following editorial appeared in the February 7, 1968, issue of the Christian Science Monitor. It is a deserved tribute to the success of the school-to-school program and to Gene Bradley, the man who launched the program on its way. It is fitting testimony to the energy and contributions, both at home and abroad of those whose efforts have resulted in the success of this worthy activity for better education and for promoting good will and peace among the people of the world.

The editorial referred to follows:

PENCE FOR PERU

The 500th overseas schoolhouse built with funds raised by American school children will soon go up in Llachshu, Peru. More

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

than half a million youngsters have donated \$623,535 to the Peace Corps for this school-building program. The money for this Peruvian school was raised by the children of the Newport, Pennsylvania, high school.

There is something deeply touching about this steady, generous and brotherly effort on the part of boys and girls in the United States. Although given almost no publicity, this school-gift program strikes us as particularly noteworthy when set against the recent, skinflinty attitude of Congress toward foreign aid.

While it would be stretching things a bit to compare the action of school children in well-off America to that of the poor widow in the Bible who threw two mites into the temple treasury, yet these school collections also call forth a certain selfless generosity worthy of the deepest respect. Indeed, we hazard the opinion that no more worthwhile lesson has been learned in these contributing schools than the enlargement of outlook which came with dipping into one's pocket money to help a far-off someone to a better life.

Speech by the Honorable Robert L. F. Sikes at the Dedication of the ROA Building, Washington, D.C., February 22, 1968

HON. GEORGE P. MILLER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 27, 1968

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, I am happy to insert in the RECORD for the information of my colleagues the inspired speech delivered by Congressman ROBERT SIKES at the dedication of the "Minuteman" building, the new national headquarters of the Reserve Officers Association:

Mr. President, Honored Guests, Members of the Reserve Officers Association, Ladies and Gentleman:

George Washington, in his letters to Alexander Hamilton during the days when the unique American system free government was being formed, wrote:

"It may be laid down, as a primary position, and the basis of our system, that every citizen who enjoys the protection of a free government, owes not only a proportion of his property, but even of his personal services to defense of it."

This was in 1775, a year before the Declaration of Independence. A year after our freedom as a nation was declared, in 1777, Thomas Paine said:

"Those who expect to reap the blessings of freedom, must like men, undergo the fatigue of supporting it."

And then, after our freedom was secured by valor and arms, Thomas Jefferson wrote, in 1806, before the years in which he was to serve as our President:

"Whencever hostile aggressions . . . require a resort to war, we must meet our duty and convince the world that we are just friends and brave enemies."

Daniel Webster, in an address on June 3, 1834, stated this basic American principle with even more firmness and clarity.

"God grants liberty," he said, "Only to those who love it and are always ready to guard and defend it."

So throughout the history of our free nation, there have been those who understand and appreciate our Freedoms—those who perceive that Freedom is not Free—those who fully realize that we must invest our labors, our devotion, and exhibit to the world the fact that we are willing to sacrifice life

if necessary. Without such patriots we stand ever in danger of becoming enslaved.

This is no hard-to-understand formula but it is one which freedom loving people must live by. This is no mystique. This is not even an intellectual challenge. This is a rule that free men must live by, and die by, and through which they find the ultimate of satisfaction and happiness in the world, particularly in this small part of the world which today is free of aggression, whose institutions are historic models, and whose people enjoy both a material and spiritual abundance.

When we look around it is easy to see in the enormity of today's problems only a picture of darkness. This isn't the situation at all. We have problems, and they are serious, but we have had problems before and we have overcome them. America has strength and resources that have barely been tapped. All around you there are wonderful things which make this nation the greatest one on earth, which give us so many reasons for being proud that we are Americans.

So I wonder if it isn't time to start thinking of the opportunities which are ours to render a greater service to our own country. I wonder if it isn't time to encourage the great overwhelming majority of the people who believe in America, to speak up for it instead of listening to criticism about it. And isn't it time, particularly, to lend strength and encouragement to those whose loved ones are in uniform, for they, most of all, are rendering an important and necessary service which will insure a safe and happier future for everyone in the years ahead.

Then look around you at the things which are being done by responsible citizens to calm unrest, to put an end to riots and crime, and give recognition to them instead of the hate mongers, the demonstrators—and the no good crowd who would burn America down. How many opportunities there are for each of us to make this a better country each day! Real faith in our country is a living, vital force and a constant source of strength and effort. The very faith that freedom will survive will in itself help freedom to survive, but we must never stop working at it if we are to maintain the true spirit of America.

Those of us here today understand what I am talking about.

I am proud that it is the ROA which is establishing a perpetual—a tangible—perhaps to some, an embarrassing reminder, that every man, woman, and child in these United States is in debt for their freedom . . . and that the bank of freedom may indeed call in their notes.

As a member of Congress, as well as of ROA, I am proud that this fine building is located on famous Capitol Hill in the midst of America's co-equal law-making branches of government. Here ROA has chosen to erect this modest temple to the great principles which are America's heritage and to which all free men are devoted.

In this which may be ROA's finest hour, let us all dedicate ourselves fully to ROA's mission . . . and together take the vow that we will keep alive the spirit of those who gave us our freedoms—for in that spirit the United States of America can and will survive for the years ahead with courage and strength to meet its responsibilities.

The "Pueblo": How Long?

HON. WILLIAM J. SCHERLE

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 27, 1968

Mr. SCHERLE. Mr. Speaker, this is the 36th day the U.S.S. *Pueblo* and her crew have been in North Korean hands.

**President Johnson's Proposal To Involve
Private Enterprise in Meeting Our
Urban Goals**

HON. THOMAS L. ASHLEY

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 27, 1968

Mr. ASHLEY. Mr. Speaker, the rebuilding of our American cities—including achievement of the Nation's housing goals—cannot be accomplished without the full use of private industry's resources and talents.

The theme of President Johnson's message on the cities, as well as numerous proposals of the past several years, pays tribute to this fact.

This message recognizes that private efforts are not only essential but central to success in solving urban problems. It acknowledges that the problems are too vast for either Government or private enterprise to solve alone. And it proposes a coalition of Government and private enterprise if we are to develop and carry out the programs needed for a healthy America.

We are fortunate that the business community has given strong indication of its desire to participate in the rebuilding of our cities and the provision of housing for the low-income market—where it is most urgently needed.

The concern of the business world with housing and urban problems is shown in many ways. Here are some contributions that industry is making:

Mr. Edgar Kaiser of Kaiser Industries is heading up the President's Committee on Urban Housing which has undertaken to find ways to stimulate and extend private enterprise's involvement in meeting the housing needs of America's ill-housed families. This Committee recommended a program to bring private firms into the management of public housing.

The life insurance companies of the country have pledged a special effort to work toward the alleviation of the problems of the central cities. They have established a \$1 billion pool for investment in improved housing and in job-creating enterprises. When he announced this plan, Mr. Gilbert Fitzhugh, chairman of the board of the Metropolitan Life Insurance Co., emphasized the determination of the insurance companies to find ways to improve the quality of life in the cities. He said:

Other elements in the private sector of the country are also seeking ways to work for a solution . . . through cooperative effort we may achieve gains of real significance for the people of our cities and for all Americans.

General Electric is exploring research and engineering developments in the building process. Mr. Gerald L. Phillippe, board chairman of General Electric—only one of many companies with plans for creating entire new cities—reports that General Electric is concentrating on studies of the building process aimed at both better performance and lower costs; and, using a systems planning approach to develop new prototype communities which have a balance of commerce, industry, and housing and which

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

are large enough to support a full complement of municipal services.

The Allegheny Housing Rehabilitation Corp. organized by ACTION-Housing, Inc., has undertaken a broad-scale program to rehabilitate housing and neighborhoods in the Pittsburgh, Pa., area by using Federal, State, and local programs of assistance in housing and neighborhood facilities, and social and educational services. The corporation, with ACTION-Housing as consultant, plans to rehabilitate 500 dwelling units in the first phase of its program. Among the business firms involved are United States Steel, Westinghouse Electric, Pittsburgh Plate Glass, Aluminum Co. of America, Koppers Co., and many others of equal stature in the world of business and industry, who are also turning their energies to the task of housing rehabilitation.

Business is involved in the two new planned communities of Reston, Va., and Columbia, Md.

Westinghouse Air Brake Co. is conducting basic research in transportation systems: How people can be moved economically and efficiently within urban areas. The problem of traffic congestion in and around cities can be resolved by a balanced transportation system that combines high-speed transit, outlying parking, feeder buses, and automobiles—each used to complement the others. In addition to Westinghouse, other corporations are working to find the best solutions to the urban transportation problem.

We in Congress can take a fair share of the credit for this new business commitment to join with public resources to achieve what neither can conceivably do alone. We have provided many of the tools that have enabled business to apply its talents, its technologies and its managerial and financial resources to solving the problems of our cities.

But we cannot rest with this record. The task ahead is massive and it will require new efforts, both public and private. Over the next decade this Nation will need a minimum of 20 million new housing units and another 2 million will require rehabilitation. At least 6 million federally assisted units must be built for low- and moderate-income families.

Today, President Johnson has requested that we expand the opportunities for private industry's involvement in meeting these needs. In the message on the cities he recommended that Congress charter "privately funded partnerships that will join private capital with business skills to help close the low-income gap."

Such corporations could provide dynamic inputs for low-income housing that is now lacking—mobilization of private investments and the application of business skills. National in scope, they could assemble a top-flight staff with the expertise required to promote and develop a large volume of low-income housing. Also, these corporations can begin to apply new methods of construction, new technologies to this task.

Mr. Speaker, I commend President Johnson for acknowledging the necessity of involving private enterprise in rebuilding our cities and for offering a reasonable plan to insure their participation.

February 27, 1968

It is worthy of our consideration and I urge my colleagues to join with me in supporting this proposal.

Anniversary of Lithuanian Independence

HON. DANIEL E. BUTTON

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 27, 1968

Mr. BUTTON. Mr. Speaker, on February 16, over a million Americans of Lithuanian descent observed the 50th anniversary of the establishment of the Republic of Lithuania. For over two decades after independence, in 1918, the Lithuanians made tremendous strides toward improving their nation; but, their freedom was short lived. Since 1940, 3 million Lithuanians have lived under the oppressive rule of communism and while those people cannot celebrate their own day of independence it is for us to remember and commemorate their cherished day of freedom.

Mr. Speaker, it is an honor to share with my colleagues an editorial and a letter from the *Schenectady Gazette* which were published on this February 16. These public statements demonstrate that we in America and free men everywhere will never forget and never cease to work for the renewed independence of the gallant people of Lithuania.

The editorial and letter follows:

A REMINDER

Lithuanians throughout the world today are observing the 50th anniversary of Lithuania's independence. But it does not denote 50 years of freedom and progress. The people of Lithuania live in fear and oppression.

In the days of the czars the Lithuanians resisted the Russians but their revolts were mercilessly crushed. Then, in the shambles of World War I they gained their opportunity for freedom and declared their independence Feb. 16, 1918. For a while their nation began to make strides but then came World War II. First the country was occupied by the Soviet army, then the Germans, then the Russian armies again in 1945. In the first few years of Soviet occupation there was bitter guerrilla fighting against occupation troops, suppressed by massive imprisonments and deportations to Siberia. Since then the Lithuanians have lived under the heavy hand of the Soviets, denied the freedom of expression and other rights that people in the free world cherish.

On this day, Lithuanians in every part of the free world wish to remind the rest of us that freedom is priceless. What the Lithuanians have endured down through the ages at the hands of first one foreign power and then another can be a lesson to anyone who has freedom but does not appreciate it.

EVERYBODY'S COLUMN: A SAD DAY FOR LITHUANIANS

EDITOR, GAZETTE: Following the end of the Arab-Israeli war last June, many diplomats declared that, as a basis for a lasting peace in the Middle East, the rights of small nations to exist, and to live in peace with their neighbors, must be respected.

President Johnson recently stated that we are fighting in Vietnam to safeguard and guarantee the freedom and independence of the people of South Vietnam.

While world leaders seek justice for the people in those areas, there is one part of the

world where justice has been denied. I speak of the Baltic area, and one nation in particular, Lithuania. Along with her sister Baltic States of Latvia and Estonia, Lithuania fell victim to Soviet expansion during World War II.

This year, on Feb. 16, the people of Lithuania will be remembering an event that brought them joy, and the fulfillment of a goal that finally became a reality after more than a hundred years of struggle and sacrifice. It was on that day in 1918, that the Lithuanian people declared their independence from the Russian Empire, an empire that crumbled following the end of World War I.

For a nation to celebrate 50 years of independence and freedom would be a time of joy and gaiety, as it was in Finland, on their anniversary date, last Dec. 6; however, in Lithuania today, this anniversary date of Feb. 16 will be observed in silence and in fear for they are once again a part of a Russian Empire, through no choice of theirs.

As we thumb through the pages of history, we realize that man has been struggling for freedom and justice ever since time began. Let us look at Europe, briefly, during the hectic days of 1918. President Wilson's declaration that every nation must be given the right to self-determination, brought on a wave of nationalism that swept over the subjugated minorities of Europe. With the defeat of the Central Powers, Czechoslovakia and Yugoslavia emerged as independent nations. With the collapse of Czarist Russia, the people of Poland, Finland, Lithuania, Latvia, Estonia, the Ukraine, the Caucasus, and Siberia demanded independence or autonomy.

In Russia, the internal upheaval produced a struggle for power, which was won by the Bolsheviks. Lenin, their new leader, was not about to become the master of a new Russia, one that would consist of only Russians. The newly formed Red Army was on the move against the lands that wanted independence from Russia. After crushing the republics of the Ukraine and the Caucasus, the Red Army turned westward.

The struggle to maintain Lithuania's newly won independence was about to begin. This struggle for freedom was nothing new to the Lithuanians. Between 1812 and 1863, there were three revolts against the Czar, and each one ended in failure. This time, however, things would be different.

With the help and support obtained chiefly from the United States, Lithuania was able to raise an army, and by the end of 1919, this army succeeded in driving the Red Army out of Lithuania. The Reds were out to crush Poland, also, and had reached the gates of Warsaw before they were driven back by a fierce counter-attack. The Poles saved their nation, too, and peace finally came to Eastern Europe.

On July 12, 1920, the Soviet Union signed a peace treaty with Lithuania, and recognized her independence and integrity.

Peace, and freedom from Russia, finally came to the Lithuanian people. Or did it? With war breaking out in Europe in the fall of 1939, this peace and freedom was not to last much longer. On June 15, 1940, as the German armies marched on Paris, Russia struck. The Red Army, still licking its wounds from the unsuccessful attempt to crush Finland the previous winter, invaded Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia and quickly overcame what little resistance these small nations were able to offer.

And so the struggle for peace, justice, freedom, or whatever words one chooses to use goes on in the world today, and will probably go on until the sands of time run out.

To those of us in the United States, who take freedom so much for granted, we casually accept it as a normal part of our every day lives. We give little thought on what freedom means to people in other parts of the world. Freedom is one of the most cher-

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

ished gifts that anyone can have. To obtain it, it does not come easy, for it involves much sacrifice and blood. Once obtained, the price to keep that freedom runs high, and to those who want it and keep it, it is worth every bit of that price.

For once having freedom, and then losing it, the catastrophe is unmeasurable. The people of Lithuania will attest to that.

EDWARD W. BARANAUSKAS.

Vietcong Strategy: Use Peace Talk Time To Launch Offensive

HON. ROMAN C. PUCINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 27, 1968

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, the official Roman Catholic publication in Chicago—the New World—carried a most enlightening article in its recent edition which is based on captured documents in South Vietnam and which clearly indicates that the Communists want to exploit any period of negotiations in Vietnam to their own advantage.

The article, written by Patrick J. Burke, S.S.C., is datelined Saigon and should be of extreme interest to all of us who have been watching developments in Vietnam with great concern.

I believe the New World has performed a notable public service by bringing this very revealing article to our attention.

I am also inserting an editorial which appeared in the same issue of the New World written by J. M. Kelly.

Mr. Speaker, I consider these two articles of profound importance in better understanding President Johnson's firm determination that there must be some guarantee of early negotiations before we stop the bombing in North Vietnam.

These two articles clearly explain why the President in his state of the Union message said that if we do start negotiations the first order of business must be a total cessation of hostilities in South Vietnam.

These two articles clearly demonstrate the profound wisdom in President Johnson's determination to protect our American boys during any period of prolonged cessation of the bombing in North Vietnam.

I believe that every publication in this country ought to reprint the New World editorial entitled "Cong Stategy: Fight During Negotiations," with special emphasis on the last paragraph of this penetrating editorial which calls our attention to the fact that two-thirds of all our Korean war casualties were inflicted while we were at the conference table with the North Korean Reds.

Mr. Speaker, I am at a loss as to what methods to use to bring this very important message to the attention of all the American people for, indeed, these two articles have put more precisely into proper perspective President Johnson's determination to protect our American troops during any possible negotiations and bombing halt than anything I have seen or heard in the current dialogue on

ending the bombing as a way toward resolving this conflict.

The above-mentioned very timely and penetrating articles follow:

REVEALED IN CAPTURED DOCUMENT—VIETCONG STRATEGY; USE PEACE TALK TIME TO LAUNCH OFFENSIVE

(By Patrick J. Burke, S.S.C.)

SAIGON.—Fight while negotiating—this is the stated policy of the National Liberation front (NLF) of South Vietnam.

Passages from a captured document confirm the policy, stated in previously captured secret Viet Cong documents, of fighting while negotiating.

The confirmation is contained in an English translation of a notebook of an unidentified Communist party cadre. The notebook is one of a number of documents captured by the U.S. 199th Light Infantry brigade in July 1967, in military operations in Hau Nghia province, west of Saigon.

Peace negotiations will only be started from a position of strength in the military field and will "serve mainly to provide us the groundwork from which to launch our general offensive." A second reason for entering into negotiations "is to expose the enemy's political attack upon us and to show that our is the just cause and his the unjust.

The conclusion drawn by the leaders of the Workers' party (Communist party) of North Vietnam for their cadre and members is: "This means that the war will be settled only on the battlefield, not in the conference room." The Communist party of North Vietnam exercises complete control of the Viet Cong and its political arm, the National Liberation Front.

These thoughts, listed under the heading "definition of strategy," continue with: "To have negotiations we must fight more fiercely. Only in such a situation can we authorize negotiations to take place.

"Thus, when hearing that negotiations are about to take place, we must attack the enemy more strongly all over the country. Negotiations will follow when we are really strong. We must take precautions against the illusion of peace at all costs."

The "we" of the statement are leaders of the Communist party in North Vietnam. The notes are a record of guidance lectures given in a 1967 reorganization course to party personnel of Viet Cong Military Region IV which includes Saigon.

CONG STRATEGY: FIGHT DURING NEGOTIATIONS

There are those who feel sincerely that the U.S. should stop the bombing of North Vietnam with no reciprocal cessation of hostilities on the part of the communist forces. It is their feeling that the Viet Cong will think we're being pretty nice about it and will respond favorably. Captured secret documents of the Viet Cong reveal that their stated policy is to fight while negotiating.

According to one of the captured communist documents, peace negotiations will be started only from a position of strength in the military field and will "serve mainly to provide us the groundwork from which to launch our general offensive." A second reason for negotiating is presented: "to expose the enemy's political attack upon us and to show that ours is the just cause and his the unjust."

These thoughts are continued under the heading of definition of strategy: "To have negotiations we must fight more fiercely. Only in such a situation can we authorize negotiations to take place. Then, when we hear that negotiations are about to take place, we must attack the enemy all over the country."

These conditions are already being fulfilled. A great Red troop build-up has taken place at the De-militarized Zone. They are ready for this type of negotiation as soon as our nation weakens to their demands.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

Meanwhile, we have their Red comrades in North Korea coming to their aid by their diversionary tactics in pirating an American vessel 25 miles off the North Korean coast in open water. Other North Koreans, guerrillas, have recently infiltrated the south and are perpetrating raids. Their admitted purpose is to kill the South Korean president.

Does any of this point to any sincerity on the part of Hanoi and the Viet Cong or any of their friends? If we want to get our boys shot down in a hurry, tell them to lay down their arms, stop the bombing unilaterally, and walk forward slowly with hands extended in friendship. Our enemies will not misfire. Remember, two-thirds of all our Korean war casualties were inflicted while we were at the conference table with the North Korean Reds.

J. M. KELLY.

Loss of Lung a Serious Disability

HON. WILLIAM C. WAMPLER

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 27, 1968

Mr. WAMPLER. Mr. Speaker, none of us can deny that the loss of a hand, foot, or sight of an eye severely limits the productive capabilities of an individual. We currently have legislation in effect which awards statutory disability compensation to veterans who suffer such anatomical losses in service-connected circumstances.

However, in recent months I have become increasingly aware that the loss, or loss of use, of a lung can be a serious disability. I have received a great amount of mail on this matter from my constituents.

In checking with medical authorities, I find that they are of the opinion that such loss of use of a lung is very serious indeed, and bears out the contention of my constituents that hard labor would be out of the question, and any activity involving physical effort is automatically eliminated. This, of course, has a direct impact on the earning power of the veteran, who, in many cases, earned his living through manual labor.

The following report, from the Library of Congress, Legislative Reference Service, was prepared by a leading lung specialist:

A person with one lung is definitely disadvantaged. The degree of incapacitation and general limits for employment of such an individual are dependent on his age and overall physical condition. Under normal conditions a man with one lung should be able to work at a sedentary occupation with little difficulty. However, a job which requires physical exertion would be beyond the capabilities of the individual.

If the patient is a young man at the time of the removal of the lung he can expect 10 to 20 years of freedom from complications. After this time he is generally more predisposed to lung disease. Of course, the older the individual is at the time of lung removal, the greater the risk is for complications to arise during any subsequent period.

In an effort to make our veterans' benefits laws more equitable in this respect, I have today introduced a bill which would allow the same statutory disability compensation for loss, or loss of use, of

a lung as for the loss of a hand, foot, or sight of one eye.

I feel that this legislation is urgently needed, and I am hopeful my bill will receive prompt and favorable action.

Trustbusters Passe in Modern-Day World

HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 27, 1968

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, the international consulting economist of the Chicago Tribune, Eliot Janeway, presented a very thoughtful review of the relationship of domestic antitrust laws and international economics, in the February 27 edition of that newspaper. His commentary follows:

POINT OF VIEW—JANEWAY: TRUSTBUSTERS PASSE IN MODERN DAY WORLD

(By Eliot Janeway)

NEW YORK, February 26.—Once upon a time, the American economy was insulated from the rest of the world, and American industry was small and had all it could do to supply the needs of America's home market. In that long-since-outgrown era, conservatives agitated for protective tariffs to foster domestic industrial expansion; while liberals argued that free trade, by opening the domestic market to import competition, would protect the consumer from price gouging by industry.

On balance, the advocates of industrial expansion had the better of the argument. The country grew and industry grew with it. But between the end of the Civil war and America's entry into World War I, the pattern of growth was violent and erratic. As a consequence, free traders—inevitably Democratic party spokesmen—were effectively righteous despite the irresistible march of prosperity; while protectionists—just as predictably Republican spokesmen—were understandably defensive because of the stubborn prevalence of exploitation.

OFFSET ECONOMIC PROCESS

Between the era of industrialization that followed the end of the Civil war and the era of industrial combination that preceded America's entry into World War I, the political process provided an offset to the working of the economic process. As the Republicans and their protectionist credo got the better of the economic argument, the very fact of their success put the Democrats in position to exact a concession for what today is called "consumerism."

The Republicans cheerfully offered it. Our first anti-trust law was put on the statute books by the party of business. It was passed when Benjamin Harrison was President. It remains the basic economic law of the land today, nearly 78 years later. But the present team of trustbusters in Washington is stretching both the spirit and the letter of the antitrust laws to hit a target entirely different from the one at which the men who wrote them in the first place were aiming.

TAYLOR ANSWERS QUESTIONS

In an interview with this column Feb. 22, Hobart Taylor, Jr., the respected director of the Export-Import bank just retired, gave the following answer to the twin questions of whether our present anti-trust laws are relevant to present economic realities and whether our anti-trust laws, as administered, tend to disqualify us from competing effectively with other industrial countries.

The Congresses which drafted the present

February 27, 1968

laws, Taylor said, were primarily concerned about domestic combinations of suppliers to fix domestic prices, particularly at retail . . . the major thrust for change [thanks to the application of these primarily domestic statutes to the international area] has been to make our antitrust laws more restrictive, whereas the tendency abroad has been . . . to serve the national interest externally, rather than to insure a free market at home."

HAS LIBERAL CREDENTIALS

Mr. Taylor approaches the problem with impeccable liberal credentials, having served on President Johnson's personal staff before his appointment to the Export-Import bank. His experience on the board of the bank—whose primary mission it is to finance American industrial exports—has made him thoroughly familiar with what the competition is doing in the industrial countries formerly allied with and dependent upon us.

In a special report to the Wall Street Journal from London, Frank Linge provides irrefutable detailed confirmation for this judgment of Mr. Taylor. "Government officials in most European nations," Linge concluded, "are busily proclaiming that corporate consolidation is nothing less than the business executive's patriotic duty."

LOWER TRUST BOOM

Against this background, the empire-builders in the justice department now have lowered the boom against the Gillette company for committing to buy a controlling interest in Germany's famed Braun electric shaver and appliance combine, notwithstanding the fact that Gillette itself is not in the electric shaver business. The justice department apparently is hanging its hat on the peg that, if Gillette takes Braun, Braun will be eliminated as a potential competitor in the American shaving market.

But razor peddling in America already is a cutthroat business [no pun intended]. More important than the merits of the shave the anti-trust hatchet-gang is giving Gillette in this particular case is the game of overkill that the trustbusters have set out to play in the international arena. Just when the dollar earning power of American business needs to be reinforced internationally, the justice department is sending us down the road to dollar disarmament—without the advice or consent of Congress.

Model Cities Program

HON. ROBERT L. LEGGETT

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 26, 1968

Mr. LEGGETT. Mr. Speaker, I would hope that the Congress moves ahead with legislation in support of the President's special message proposing programs to deal with major urban problems of poverty and slum blight.

This includes the full amount of \$2.18 million which the Congress has already authorized, which can be used to meet the massive national need of building 26 million new homes and apartments over the next 10 years, six million of which will replace present substandard housing.

Special grants amounting to \$2.5 billion are needed over the next 3 years for the model cities program for reclaiming blighted neighborhoods. This is in addition to the \$750 million already appropriated for fiscal 1969 and the \$1.4 billion the President recommended today for fiscal 1970.

There is a great need for modernization and expansion of urban mass transportation systems and a new method of financing private developers of new communities of tomorrow, on the outskirts of present cities.

The need is present, the call is clear, the 20 million Americans who still live in the shadows of poverty and substandard housing are appealing to their court of last resort, the Congress of the United States. Gentlemen, it is urgent that we act in their behalf.

Need for a Joint Select Committee To Study Proposals To Provide Evaluations of Government Programs

HON. CLARENCE J. BROWN, JR.

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 27, 1968

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, last session of Congress, I and some of my colleagues sponsored a bill to establish a National Commission on Public Management. Section 1 of H.R. 20 stated:

In order to study and recommend the manner in which modern systems analysis and management techniques may be utilized to resolve national and community problems in the non-defense sector there is hereby established a National Commission on Public Management.

The duties of this Commission are set forth in section 8 which requires the Commission to, first, develop information on the methodology of systems analysis; second, analyze the possible application of systems analysis to public programs; third, determine the national and community problems to which the application of such techniques offers the greatest promise of solution; fourth, assess the proper relationship between governmental and private investment to obtain the most effective application of the techniques involved; fifth, make recommendations regarding the use of management techniques in the formulation of legislation; sixth, conduct studies into specific problem areas and make recommendations; seventh, expand public knowledge of management technologies; and eighth, analyze methods to encourage the application of modern management technology to public problems through the use of various contracting procedures, grants, loans, cost allowances, and tax incentives.

The Commission would consist of 13 members. Nine would be appointed by the President, two would be appointed by the Speaker of the House and two by the President of the Senate.

The Commission would cease to exist 32 months after its first meeting.

We introduced this legislation because of the increasing evidence that the old approaches of government are no longer working. The technological revolution and the increase in man's knowledge have brought the Government phenomenal new problems covering a very broad spectrum. But at this time, this technological revolution has provided us with the capacity to solve these problems. The

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

real challenge is to us in the Congress—can our political creativity keep pace with the march of science and in this fashion keep pace with the mounting complexity of our urban, 20th-century society? Can the Congress effectively make use of the new technology to solve the problems largely created by that new technology?

I believe we can meet this challenge. The legislation I am cosponsoring is one step toward meeting this challenge. Other Congressmen, also concerned about our growing inability to keep pace with today's problems, have introduced legislation with a similar objective, but different means. I am happy to support this joint resolution as a good first step toward eventual resolution of what program should be instituted to insure that the Government keeps up with the mounting problems. This Joint Select Committee does not preclude any of the individual proposals to deal with our dilemma, but will in the long run, I feel, save us time in implementing a wise solution to the problem by studying the many alternative solutions and making recommendations about the best approach.

Postal Employee Protection

HON. LEE H. HAMILTON

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 27, 1968

Mr. HAMILTON. Mr. Speaker, we all know that crime has increased alarmingly recently. One aspect of this general increase is a sharp explosion of violent incidents involving mail carriers, clerks, and other postal employees. The number of incidents is now over 200 per year and rising.

The bill I introduce today will provide these reliable and important employees with both the statutory and administrative protection they deserve. Other Federal employees are protected by laws making it a Federal offense to assault, intimidate, interfere with, or kill them while engaged in carrying out their official duties. It is time to extend this same protection to those postal employees, who, because of the very nature of their work, are exposed all day, every day to hazards of life and limb. This bill provides such statutory protection.

The bill also provides greater administrative power to the Postmaster General to discipline any official or postal worker who assaults a fellow employee. This administrative protection is in addition to the statutory provisions of the bill. It provides a method, other than being charged and tried for a Federal offense, of disciplining postal workers involved in violent conduct toward fellow workers.

The assault, robbery, and threatening of postal employees has reached the point where these violent incidents often do not reach the newspapers. It is now commonplace for the mailman to get mugged and have his mail stolen.

The time is now to make unmistakably clear to those criminals who violate the

mails and threaten and injure its protectors that they will be dealt with severely in Federal court.

President Acts To Increase Travel to United States

HON. SAMUEL N. FRIEDEL

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 27, 1968

Mr. FRIEDEL. Mr. Speaker, President Johnson's Advisory Commission on Travel has recommended a number of imaginative steps to help cut America's travel gap—by increasing foreign travel to the United States.

The Commission has proposed steps to reduce travel costs to America—costs which discourage many from visiting our vast country. Transportation fares and accommodation rates of major hotel and motel chains will be drastically reduced for foreign travelers. In addition, simplification of visa and customs regulations and the creation of additional foreign tourist services will make America a more appealing place to visit.

The steps outlined to the President will help reduce our travel deficit by one-half billion dollars this year alone—with a growing impact in years to come.

As the President noted, however, increased travel to America will do more than ease our serious balance-of-payments problems. It will increase international understanding. It will give foreigners a balanced view of our country—and our people. And it will give Americans—in the President's words—the chance to open their hearts and their homes to travelers from foreign lands.

The Advisory Commission on Travel—responding to the President's New Year's plea to step up its schedule in view of our payments deficit—has submitted their excellent report one-half year ahead of time. They have done a difficult job rapidly and thoroughly—and deserve the thanks of all our citizens.

It is gratifying to note that a record 1,485,499 business and pleasure visitors from overseas came to the United States last year and I am confident that this number will greatly increase if the recommendations of the Industry-Government Advisory Commission on Travel are implemented promptly.

It is my sincere hope that increased travel to the United States, the closing of some tax loopholes and the use of American ships by industry and private citizens will make it unnecessary to enact legislation to impose a tax on Americans traveling abroad.

Under unanimous consent I include the President's remarks upon receipt of the Commission's report in the RECORD:

PRESIDENT ACTS TO INCREASE TRAVEL TO UNITED STATES

The President today received the report of the Industry-Government Advisory Commission on Travel.

The Commission was appointed by the President on November 16, 1967, to make specific recommendations on means of increasing foreign travel to the United States.

Robert M. McKinney, former U.S. Ambassador to Switzerland, acted as Chairman.

The original target date for the report was mid-summer of 1968. In his message to the Nation on January 1, however, the President asked the Commission to step up its schedule in view of the urgency of the Nation's balance of payments problem. He asked the group to submit immediate recommendations within 45 days, and to make long-term proposals within 90 days. The two are combined in the present report—completed ahead of schedule.

The Commission concentrated its first efforts on reducing the cost of travel to the United States. For example, subject in certain cases to approval by the appropriate regulatory agency, the following cost reductions for travel in the United States will be offered foreign tourists:

—50 percent reduction in regular domestic airline fares, effective April 28, making these fares the lowest available anywhere in the world.

—25 percent discounts in railroad fares.

—10 percent discounts on charter coach rates on trips involving 400 miles per day, effective May.

—10 percent discounts in rates by the three largest United States car rental companies, effective immediately.

—Up to 40 percent reductions in regular rates in seven major hotel-motel chains, effective immediately.

In addition, the following reductions in international travel fares to the United States have been proposed and are under consideration in international regulatory bodies:

—25 percent discounts on round trip fares to the United States on tickets purchased in Europe.

—Reduced steamship fares to the United States.

The Commission also recommended a substantial increase in the budget of the U.S. Travel Service of the Department of Commerce, the simplification of visa and customs regulations, and the creation of a National Tourist Office to coordinate the promotion of foreign travel to the U.S.

The President commended the Commission for "doing a difficult job fast and thoroughly."

"The steps recommended", he said, "will help achieve our goal of reducing our travel deficit by \$500 million this year. They will have a growing impact in future years."

"But promoting travel to the United States will do more than ease our balance of payments problem. It will encourage international understanding. It will give Americans the chance to open their hearts and their homes to travelers from foreign lands."

The President said these recommendations "will receive prompt attention. The actions and recommendations to increase travel to the United States are an essential part of our program to reduce the Nation's travel deficit."

The National School Lunch Act

HON. JOSEPH Y. RESNICK

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 27, 1968

Mr. RESNICK. Mr. Speaker, one of the most significant pieces of legislation to be passed by the Congress in recent years was the National School Lunch Act, a measure designed to feed hungry children in our schools so that they could forget the gnawing pain in their bellies and turn their attention toward learning how to read and write. At pres-

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

ent this program feeds 18 million children who attend 71,000 participating schools.

But the School Lunch Act, as it is presently drawn, does not do the whole job. For example, it does not feed those hungry children who attend day-care centers, or settlement houses, or summer camps, or recreation centers. And so children participating in these programs generally go hungry—unless frugal administrators are able to scrape together funds out of scarce resources and hard-pressed budgets to buy food.

Mr. Speaker, I and several of my colleagues have introduced legislation to amend the National School Lunch Act so that inexpensive food supplies will be made available to deprived children from poor economic areas who do not, for one reason or another, attend schools, but instead attend day-care centers, settlement houses, summer camps, and recreation centers.

I strongly urge my colleagues to join in support of this vital legislation, so that we can take further steps to make sure that in this land of plenty there are no children who are going hungry.

Hearings on this bill are now being held by the House Education and Labor Committee, and I urge all of my colleagues to submit statements of support for this important bill.

The "Pueblo"

HON. WILLIAM J. SCHERLE

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 27, 1968

Mr. SCHERLE. Mr. Speaker, following are two of the letters we have received in response to our daily reminder in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of the Pueblo's captivity:

NORTHERN RAILROAD & TELEVISION CORP.,
Green Bay, Wis.
Congressman WILLIAM J. SCHERLE,
Longworth Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: I am happy to see that you are following up on the Pueblo affair.

And while you're at it, go after the damned fool admiral that left that ship out there without a destroyer nearby.

We must get the men back from the Pueblo, quickly.

BYRON DEADMAN.

SAN PEDRO, CALIF.,
February 23, 1968.

The Honorable Mr. SCHERLE,
Republican Representative for the State of
Iowa, House of Representatives, Wash-
ington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: Today's Wall Street Journal says, "Republican Rep. Scherle of Iowa promises to address the House daily on North Korea's seizure of the Pueblo until the U.S. does something more about it."

I have been a Navy wife for 13 years, and if my husband were in their spot right now, I'd feel somewhat better to know that a voice keeps speaking for them.

Thank you very much for your efforts in behalf of the crewmen and their families.

Sincerely,

MARY BINKLEY.

February 27, 1968

Search for Scapegoats in Wake of Red Drive

HON. CHET HOLIFIELD

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 27, 1968

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Speaker, last month I returned from Vietnam. While there I saw firsthand the tremendously complex and difficult situation that the United States finds itself in today. President Johnson, I know, more than anything, wants to find an honorable, peaceful solution to the war. However, his efforts on all fronts have been met with intransigence and rejection by the North Vietnamese. I know that he will continue to search for peace and keep the door for negotiation open, while at the same time maintaining a secure military position.

Those who oppose our presence in Vietnam are using various arguments to persuade the United States to "cut and run." One of the most persistent comments heard is that the South Vietnamese either do not want to fight or will not fight and are not carrying a burden in this war. I do not believe that the statistics on wounded and dead South Vietnamese soldiers bear this out.

In this connection I place in the RECORD at this point an excellent article by Carl T. Rowan, which appeared in the Washington Evening Star, February 16, 1968:

[From the Washington (D.C.) Evening Star, Feb. 16, 1968]

SEARCH FOR SCAPEGOATS IN WAKE OF RED DRIVE

(By Carl T. Rowan)

A lot of scapegoating has featured the post-mortems of the recent Viet Cong offensive in the population centers of South Vietnam.

But none has been less informed, or in some cases more irresponsible, than efforts to belittle the contributions to the war effort of the South Vietnamese.

Even U.S. officials got into the act when they complained that the Saigon government was really the culprit responsible for VC penetration of the American Embassy compound.

"Security of an embassy is the responsibility of the host government," said one top American. You would have thought he was discussing protocol at a social bash in Old Vienna. When we have 500,000 soldiers in a war zone and leave protection of our embassy to some technical protocol arrangement, the real culprit is the U.S. official in charge.

But the scapegoating goes on—and perhaps the most effective argument against U.S. involvement in Vietnam is that "the South Vietnamese won't fight for their own freedom, so why should we?"

Believing this, many Americans find it especially galling that South Vietnamese President Nguyen Van Thieu is asking for more U.S. troops.

Granting many shortcomings on the part of Saigon, it is just not fair to generalize that "American boys are doing all the fighting for a bunch of crooks."

During the heavy enemy offensive that began during the Tet holidays, the U.S. lost 1,102 dead and 5,144 wounded (serious and minor). The South Vietnamese lost 2,105 dead, 7,848 seriously wounded and over 7,000 slightly wounded. Since Jan. 1, 1961, the

U.S. has lost 17,296 dead compared with 54,875 dead South Vietnamese.

Considering the differences in population, South Vietnam lost 30 times as much of its young manhood as did the U.S. during the recent offensive. It has suffered deaths at a ratio 50 times that of the U.S. since major U.S. involvement began in 1961.

"But it's their country. Why shouldn't they?" the war critic asks.

That question evades the fact that the war long ago ceased to be a struggle to decide the future of South Vietnam. It is really a war over the future of Southeast Asia and the United States role in it.

So it is sophistry to put the onus for every setback on Saigon. But Americans do it in part because our government has too often let "security" get in the way of making available to the public adequate information about the war.

An example is a recent telegram about the performance of South Vietnamese military leaders who foiled a Viet Cong plan to kidnap them and make defection of their units the "ransom."

A Viet Cong group went to the home of the Kien Hoa province chief at 2:30 a.m. The day the great enemy assault began they expected to find the chief whooping it up in holiday revelry and kidnap him. But unlike the American military brass at Pearl Harbor, Province Chief Du was at his headquarters in Bien Tre City.

The disappointed Viet Cong group murdered Du's entire family. But even after learning of this, he carried on his duties. A report to Washington said that he "displayed real leadership and organizational ability in the face of ruthless VC terrorism in Bien Tre in which thousands of homes were destroyed."

Then there was General Tri, commander of the 9th ARVN Division, who was at this operations center at Sa Dec at 2 a.m. on Jan. 31 when the Viet Cong entered his home. But even Tri's family was not at home. Learning of the VC raid, Tri sent a platoon to destroy the insurgents: This platoon captured one prisoner who said the group's mission was to capture the general and his family and force him to call his chief of staff and deputy who would also be kidnapped. With these hostages, the Viet Cong was to give the general the choice of turning over his division or seeing all the hostages executed.

General Than, commander of the 7th ARVN Division, was also a kidnap target for the same purposes as General Tri. But the Viet Cong were foiled here, too, for Than turned out to be at his headquarters instead of home celebrating.

Not exactly a picture of corrupt indifference, is it?

Estonian Independence

HON. WILLIAM V. ROTH, JR.
OF DELAWARE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 21, 1968

Mr. ROTH. Mr. Speaker, 50 years ago last Saturday, the people of Estonia threw off the chains that bound them under czarist Russian domination and laid claim to their birthright as men—liberty and independence.

Following the consolidation of power by the Communists in Soviet Russia, the Kremlin attempted to recapture Estonia, but was repulsed by a united and courageous people. Stalin, in 1940, with the help and cooperation of Hitler Germany,

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

finally succeeded in conquering Estonia in one of the most infamous deals in history.

Today, nearly three decades after their betrayal, the Estonian people's desire for freedom remains firm. Despite harsh treatment at the hands of the Soviets, the destruction of religious freedom and rights that free men everywhere prize, and the exploitation of Estonia's wealth, the Soviets have not—and cannot—crush out that courageous nation's desire for liberty.

Mr. Speaker, we who are free can never forget those living oppressed, and I share the Estonian people's hope that they will soon again enjoy the blessings of independence and freedom.

Dayton, Ohio, Presented Trigg Trophy

HON. CHARLES W. WHALEN, JR.
OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 27, 1968

Mr. WHALEN. Mr. Speaker, the principal city in my district, Dayton, Ohio, last week won the Nation's Cleanest City Award in ceremonies attended by Mrs. Lyndon B. Johnson.

Dayton is immensely proud of this honor, Mr. Speaker, and I, too, am proud to represent her in this House of Representatives.

The accomplishment came with deliberate hard work on the part of many citizens of the community. The effort included the city government, civic groups, neighborhood associations, and the residents.

Perhaps the most noteworthy aspect of this victory is the reaction it had in Dayton. From what I can gather, the city is far from content to rest on its laurels and is intent on winning the award again next year.

Editorials in the two daily newspapers reflected this feeling, Mr. Speaker, and I would like to include them at this point in the RECORD for the edification of my colleagues:

[From the Dayton (Ohio) Journal Herald, Feb. 22, 1968]

THE CITY CLEAN

We naturally share the elation of all directly involved in efforts which led to Dayton's being named the city that tried the hardest of all to keep itself clean and beautiful.

This is not the same thing as saying Dayton is the cleanest, most attractive city in the United States.

It is saying, however, that the neighborhood block clubs and area councils, the city administration and, especially, the City Beautiful council under Robert Bush made the very best effort found in any major city to keep their city fresh and inviting. In this regard we believe Mr. Bush himself has made a real and substantial contribution through his tremendous investment of time, energy and thought.

As made plain in the Washington ceremonies at which the Trigg trophy was awarded to our city, Dayton's civic and political leadership considers the award an incentive to press even harder. This is surely a healthy attitude. It reflects the kind of determination which not only insured a first-place award but, win or lose, means no let-down in

efforts to keep Dayton a clean, decent and altogether beautiful place in which to live.

[From the Dayton (Ohio) Daily News, Feb. 20, 1968]

PROUD DAYTON TOPS NATION IN BEAUTIFICATION EFFORTS

Dayton officials and citizenry who pitched in last year to paint-up, fix-up and clean-up the community probably never heard of the Trigg trophy. But today it's one of the prettiest things in this prettier city.

Dayton was proud enough to be among 30 communities selected by national judges for outstanding civic improvement work. But the button-popper came when Mrs. Lyndon Johnson presented Dayton the Trigg trophy, the national award of excellence.

Hard work last year has paid off in a cleaner community and national recognition. The community has earned a right to get ecstatic over esthetics, to pass congratulations all down the line.

Consider work done in 1967. A block of homes painted on Mound St. Special trash collections. A UD fraternity going after abandoned cars. Junior Beautification council registering for work. Camp Fire girls adopting parks. Dayton Boys club shining everything in sight. People volunteering time and material, as the Painting and Decorating Institute did. Dayton commissioners and City Beautiful members pushing and promoting. Trees planted here. Flower boxes installed there.

Dayton has found that a little paint, water and repairs can go a long way down beautification's road. People are becoming more aware of the need for handsome buildings and landscaping. City Beautiful has turned from soothsaying slogan to genuine goal.

Wouldn't that Trigg trophy be nice to keep?

Occupational Safety and Health Act of 1968

HON. ELMER J. HOLLAND

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 27, 1968

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. Speaker, the Select Subcommittee on Labor, of which I am chairman, has been holding, and is continuing to hold extensive hearings on H.R. 14816, the Occupational Safety and Health Act of 1968. This administration proposal seeks to establish a safe and healthful working environment for every American working man or woman employed by a business engaged in commerce. In my opinion, the legislation is urgent and seriously needed; 14,500 Americans annually die of industrial accidents, and others die of diseases which stem from the working environment.

The Executive Committee of the AFL-CIO, in its recent meeting, has issued a strong endorsement of this bill, and of the drive, in which labor, management, and the public alike have a deep interest, to prevent men and women from dying, or being disabled because of preventable industrial accidents and disease.

This is, Mr. Speaker, my last year of service in the House. I pray that I can look back in years to come, to the passage of this vital legislation this year.

Under unanimous consent I place the statement of the AFL-CIO Executive Council at this point in the RECORD:

OCCUPATIONAL SAFETY AND HEALTH ACT OF 1968

(Statement by the AFL-CIO Executive Council, Bal Harbour, Fla., February 1968)

Organized labor has for many years called attention to the urgent need for a strong, broad-based federal attack to control or eliminate any factor on the job damaging to workers' health and safety. We have stressed both the problem and the far overdue need for action in policy statements adopted by both the 1965 and 1967 conventions of the AFL-CIO.

The active concern and leadership of organized labor has been a major factor in the formulation of President Johnson's proposal set forth in his manpower message of January 23, "to establish the nation's first occupational health and safety program."

We strongly endorse the President's goal of protecting "every one of America's 75 million workers while they are on the job" by attacking the "source of evil which causes hazards and invites accidents."

America's workers comprise 40% of the population. They pay 60% of the nation's taxes. But 80% of these workers are employed where there is little conventional safety and no occupational health protection whatsoever.

The annual death and accident rate is a grisly reminder of national neglect. Each year 14,500 workers are killed at their jobs; 2.2 million are injured; 250 million man-days of work, \$1.5 billion in wages and more than \$5 billion in production are lost.

The administration's proposed Occupational Safety and Health Act of 1968 has been introduced in the Senate by Senator Yarborough (S. 2864) and in the House of Representatives by Rep. O'Hara (H.R. 14816). These are identical bills.

This legislation is most welcome and should obtain the strongest support from all elements of organized labor. It will constitute, with a few strengthening amendments and with adequate appropriations for needed research, planning and manpower, the first historic breakthrough toward the long neglected goal of a safe, healthy work environment for every American holding a job. It agrees with the program proposals set forth by organized labor for the past three years. And it will hopefully end an almost unbroken era of inadequate federal and weak, archaic and poorly financed state laws and programs.

The Occupational Safety and Health Act of 1968 will cover 50 million workers in interstate commerce and provide for federal grants-in-aid to qualifying states for planning, demonstration, improved administration and enforcement to meet the Act's objectives.

The Secretary of Labor is directed to conform standards developed under this Act to those of other laws he administers and to coordinate programs of other agencies with those created by this legislation.

Under the proposed Act, the Secretary of Labor will:

1. Establish mandatory safety and health standards affecting interstate and intrastate commerce.

2. Inspect and enforce for violations, assess civil penalties, including closing down of unsafe plants and cancellation of federal contracts, or seek criminal penalties.

3. Encourage and assist states to develop effective occupational health and safety programs, including short-term manpower training programs.

The Secretary of HEW will:

1. Expand research and investigations into occupational hazards.

2. By grant or contract, conduct educational programs to increase supply of manpower in the occupational health field.

3. Establish management-labor educational

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

programs for prevention and control of occupational hazards.

4. Gather data on occupational diseases for research, standards setting and compliance programs.

5. Assist states in establishing and/or improving occupational health and safety programs.

We urge the following amendments which we believe will strengthen this legislation and ensure a more effective pursuit of its broad aims:

1. Establishing a statutory Center for Occupational Health within the Department of HEW, standing equally with the Center for Air Pollution Control and absorbing the responsibilities of other elements within the U.S. Public Health Department which deal with occupational hazards. Presently, the Division of Occupational Health, which never in history has had statutory existence, is merged with a number of other health related agencies and physically located in Cincinnati, Ohio. This unfortunate situation should be remedied immediately if the responsibilities of the Secretary of HEW set forth in this legislation are to be carried out effectively.

2. Giving the Secretary of Labor the power to pull back any delegation of authority to any state to conduct an occupational health and safety program, if such state fails to live up to the conditions imposed by the Secretary.

Science: Workhorse, Not Hobbyhorse

HON. JOHN D. DINGELL

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 27, 1968

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, the current issue of the Tennessee Alumnus includes excerpts from an address delivered at the recent dedication of the University of Tennessee Memorial Research Center at Knoxville by our esteemed colleague, Representative Joe L. EVINS, of Tennessee, chairman of the Appropriations Subcommittee on Independent Offices and Department of Housing and Urban Development and also the distinguished chairman of the House Small Business Committee.

During the course of his remarks, Chairman EVINS commented upon the increased importance of scientific research but explained that during this period of the Vietnam conflict, Congress must review research budget requests more closely.

He reminded them also that the American people cannot afford to finance science as a hobbyhorse—science for the fun of it—for they envision practical science as a workhorse for the people.

Under unanimous consent, I insert excerpts of Representative EVINS' address in the RECORD as follows:

SCIENCE: WORKHORSE, NOT HOBBYHORSE

The University of Tennessee is known as, and is indeed, one of the great centers of excellence in education. Here at this Research Center is being performed the basic research into the essential functions of life—into the essential composition of cells, into the causes of cancer and other diseases—and through this research is developed knowledge that is used in the care and treatment of patients here at the Hospital and Center.

Here, too, we have the classic partnership between this Center and Hospital and all

levels of government: local, state, and federal; between the University and its Medical School and the Atomic Energy Commission, the National Institutes of Health, the Public Health Service, the National Science Foundation, and private industry and individuals who have contributed to the building and success of this Center.

One of our contemporary philosophers, Prof. Will Durant, a prolific and profound scholar, once said:

"The health of nations is more significant than the wealth of nations."

I might add a sequel to his observation.

The wealth of a nation makes possible the improved health of a nation.

Ours is the greatest, the wealthiest, the strongest, the most productive nation in all history. It is certainly within our grasp and capability to advance the frontiers of medical science to the full extent of our potential, which is virtually unlimited.

The importance of the relationship between the federal government and our universities and colleges is brought home to me with great impact each year during our annual budget justification hearings on appropriations for the various agencies of government. These agencies include the Atomic Energy Commission, the National Science Foundation, the National Aeronautics and Space Administration, and the National Institutes of Health.

One of my responsibilities and honors in the Congress is to serve as chairman of the Subcommittee on Appropriations for Independent Agencies. This includes some 23 agencies of government, including those I have listed, and Dr. Donald Hornig, the President's science adviser, and Dr. Edward Welsh, science adviser to the Vice President.

In an overall way, Congress for the past several years has been appropriating in the neighborhood of \$18 billion for all phases of science and research and development. This is broken down into the work of various agencies.

Our committee has heard testimony through the years concerning the great progress in medical research being made by the AEC in cooperation with institutions such as The University of Tennessee. We know of the great strides made in the use of radioisotopes in the diagnosis and treatment of diseases. Certainly, we all support and appreciate the role of the Human Atom—the Atom of Life—the Atom sometimes called "the Good Guy Atom."

Those of you who are participating in this great adventure of atomic and biomedical research are sharing in the most potent force of our time—a force which has been called the most beneficial force of the twentieth century.

TRADITIONAL FEDERAL ROLE IN RESEARCH

Our nation, from its very founding, has accepted its responsibilities to promote and develop scientific study. In his first annual address to the Congress, President George Washington called on Congress to promote science and literature.

Historically, the federal government's role in science received its greatest thrust from the development of technology during World War II. The dramatic advancements in medicine, the spectacular application of science and engineering to the development of nuclear energy, electronics, radar, aircraft and military communications—all of these achievements paved the way for the postwar emergence of research and development by the federal government in cooperation with our universities.

The Congress has followed closely the development of this great alliance between government and the academic world, and has sought to encourage it, with ever-increasing appropriations for both basic and applied research.

February 27, 1968

Serving on the Appropriations Committee, and hearing as we do the annual requests of the AEC and the National Science Foundation, is an education in itself. During our hearings this year, we discussed matters such as:

Research bearing on the history and nature of the universe.

The latest evidence regarding the observation of the cool stars.

The quasars and radio galaxies.

The discovery of the genetic code of life, which many scientists believe to be the intellectual feat of our time.

The development of the fantastic laser beams.

The development of the computer and its application to sciences, industry, and education.

The several committees of Congress are constantly reviewing and surveying research costs and achievements. Congressman Daddario's Committee on Science Research and Development recently cited progress and shortcomings in the federal programs of assistance to research.

RESEARCH COSTS MOUNTING

This report points up that research costs are mounting, and that appropriations are not unlimited. In the last eight years, for example, expenditures for biomedical research have more than tripled.

In 1960, Congress appropriated just over \$300 million for health research. In fiscal year 1968, this total will reach almost \$1.5 billion.

Between 1960 and 1968, the total national expenditures, public and private, for biomedical research increased by 150 per cent. Overall federal expenditures for all phases of research in the current fiscal year is expected to be more than \$17 billion.

While the Congress has supported research over the years with generous appropriations, many feel that the time has arrived for the "Practical Application Approach"—whether the benefits will justify the cost.

President Johnson said recently, "I think the time has come to zero in on the targets by trying to get our knowledge fully applied—to achieve practical results."

During this period of the Vietnam conflict, faced as we are with an unbalanced budget, Congress is reviewing research budget requests more closely.

However, we cannot—and must not—shortchange future generations and our nation by cutting back on research and development too sharply, especially in the field of medical research.

Our committee, over the years, has made studies and surveys which have shown that a high degree of concentration of federal research funds has centered in our large universities, principally Harvard, Yale, MIT—the Ivy League colleges. One recent study showed that these and similar institutions, which comprise 16 per cent of all universities and colleges, received 96 per cent of the federal funds for research. This survey showed that 40 per cent of our universities and colleges received only one per cent of the federal funds.

It is the feeling of the majority of the members of our committee that research should not be confined to these few colleges. We believe the base of support should be broadened, and we have plugged away at this theme during our hearings for the past several years.

I note that The University of Tennessee Memorial Research Center has received a number of grants for research projects, indicating that the base is being broadened and our universities and colleges are being funded with research appropriations on an increasing scale. Some 21 federal grants currently are being provided this Center.

This broader base of research assistance is strengthening higher education and help-

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

ing remove weak spots in our educational system.

Another of our concerns is that research facilities, built and supported with federal funds, should be made adaptable to change—flexible enough so that our research facilities can be used for more than one research project. These facilities, thus, should provide an opportunity for research scientists to utilize their talents in varied fields to meet national goals and national objectives.

TEACHERS MUST NOT BE DEPLETED BY RESEARCH

The National Science Foundation has suggested eliminating the fellowship program for elementary and secondary level teachers. Our committee has opposed this proposal, which would deny refresher training and briefing for teachers in summer special training.

In this era of change, our teachers must know what is happening. They must be able to relate the changes of today with the history of yesterday and the anticipation of tomorrow.

Our committee is also concerned over the loss of teachers to the research field. A report of the Special Subcommittee on Research said flatly that federal research and development programs have served to divert needed teaching manpower into research by over-emphasizing research.

Our committee has insisted that this trend be modified and more emphasis placed on instruction as it relates to research. The blend of instruction and research here at this Center is a good mixture of teaching and research.

GOALS AND PRIORITIES

It is most important for scientists to face up to the necessity of fixing priorities and objectives in line with our national goals and objectives, in view of limited resources available at this time. The President's science advisers and Secretary Gardner of HEW, among others, recently have urged scientists and researchers to set realistic objectives.

While it is important for our great research centers to have clearly defined goals and objectives, it is important for our people to understand these objectives.

One of our national goals today is that technology will solve or help to solve the problems it has created. Examples are air and water pollution, depletion of natural resources, impact of automation on employment, and the problems created by our concentrated Urban America and the problems of depleted small town and rural life.

RESEARCH: WORKHORSE, NOT HOBBYHORSE

Many in policy-making positions in our federal government feel that the American people cannot afford to finance science as a hobbyhorse—science for the fun of it. They envision practical science as a workhorse for the people—research that produces a better quality of life for our people—research like that conducted at this Center, which contributes to the health and well-being of our people.

Congress wants scientific research that gets results.

In biomedical research, we want the payoff in terms of healthier lives for our people.

We must make sure that no life-giving discovery is locked up in the laboratory.

It is important for scientists to tell their story. Many feel that researchers must learn to explain their work to non-scientists—the American taxpayers who pay the bill.

This relationship with the people must be strengthened so that they will understand what science is accomplishing and what science is attempting to accomplish.

Progress in the first half of the twentieth century depended greatly upon development of our natural resources. Progress in the last half of this century may well depend upon the quality and development of our intellectual resources. We must marshal our brainpower and resources to combat disease,

ignorance, poverty, crime—the problems of our people.

And so I am pleased to join with you in dedicating this great University of Tennessee Memorial Research Center—to better health and to longer life for our people.

May the research of the dedicated scientists who work here open the door to the solution of ageless diseases that torment mankind.

May your scientific discoveries open up new frontiers of progress for the betterment of all mankind; and may your work promote, preserve, and perpetuate our cherished American way of life.

American Baptists Troubled About War's Suffering

HON. GEORGE E. BROWN, JR.

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 27, 1968

Mr. BROWN of California. Mr. Speaker, the American Baptist Convention this past year issued a resolution on peacemaking and peacekeeping, which deals with their concern about Vietnam. The suffering in the war has become for these churchmen a grave moral issue. Their concern is giving rise to many dilemmas facing Christians who want sincerely to follow the path that is consistent with their religious teaching. The love of God compels them to seek peace and pursue those things that make for peace, but their government is engaged in an unpeaceful war that is causing great suffering.

They declare that it is impossible to remain silent in this "crisis of conscience which confronts every Christian." They are calling all their members to study the facts and to bring their Christian witness to bear on the moral issues involved.

I place in the RECORD part II of this resolution, which is the section dealing with Vietnam:

PEACEKEEPING AND PEACEMAKING—PART II

An immediate problem in peacekeeping and peacemaking exists in Southeast Asia where conflict has continued for the past 25 years. The French rule in Indo-China challenged by the Japanese was defeated by the Vietnamese under the leadership of Ho Chi Minh in 1954. The conference of great powers meeting in Geneva granted independence to Vietnam and temporarily divided the country into the North and the South. A situation has been created by recent developments involving the United States and some Asian countries which is considered to be a threat to world peace.

The love of God compels us to seek peace and pursue those things that make for peace. It concerns us as Christians that the situation in which we are involved in Vietnam brings suffering and many human problems to all involved such as: the suffering of South Vietnamese whose homes and families suffer from invasion from the north; the suffering of those who wish to revolt against foreign leadership and to establish their own national identity; the suffering of people of North Vietnam whose homes come under destructive forces from bombing and conflict; the suffering of families who members are called to military service and who are experiencing broken relationships because of conflict; the suffering of those who are actual participants in the arenas of combat; the suffering of those who, because of their moral beliefs, are convinced that neither

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

they, nor their country should be involved in this war; and the suffering of those who feel that all war is wrong. While it is easy to say we seek peace, we need to define the kind of peace we seek. We seek the kind of peace that is not only the absence of open conflict between or among the big powers of the world but a recognition of the legitimate and natural desires of all men to be free of domination by others, whether foreign or domestic. We seek conditions for the Vietnamese that will make it possible to be free not only politically but economically so that each person may live in dignity according to the political pattern chosen by the majority, equipped to help build an independent nation and to live in peace within the family of nations. All men, regardless of nationality, politics or ideology are equal objects of God's judgment and loving kindness in Jesus Christ and this must be recognized in our efforts to seek a just solution. Christians face many dilemmas in seeking such a peace which include:

1. Whether the use of military means to seek political objectives is justified;
2. Whether the attainment of legitimate goals through destruction and human suffering is defensible; and
3. Whether the assumption of authority to direct the government and military forces of another country in order to establish a situation which fits its own national security or way of living is acceptable.

We commend the President for his ready acceptance of U Thant's March 18, 1967, proposals to seek a settlement, and urge that he continue to explore all possible avenues for negotiations with all concerned in the conflict, making full use of regional agreements and the facilities of the United Nations. Recognizing the risk involved in escalation and possible expansion of the conflict, as well as the risk involved in immediate withdrawal by either side, we urge the governments of the United States of America and the Democratic Republic of Vietnam to take positive steps to decrease mutually the level of the fighting. Specifically, we call upon the United States to stop the bombing of the Democratic Republic of Vietnam and to stop the build-up of troops in Southeast Asia; and we call upon the Democratic Republic of Vietnam to stop sending troops to fight south of the 17th parallel.

We support the President's proposal for a billion dollar Mekong River development to create power for all Southeast Asia, believing in the basic responsibility of our great economic power to share constructively with the nations of this area as they seek to create the means to minister to the basic physical needs of their people. Recognizing the complexity of the situation being faced and the impossibility of remaining silent in this crisis of conscience which confronts every Christian, we confess our need to act and speak in the spirit of humility. We call upon the people of our American Baptist churches to pray God's wisdom upon leaders of our government.

We further urge that each church—

1. Share in a special offering for the relief of human suffering in Vietnam as an act of reconciliation to be channeled through the World Relief Committee of the American Baptist Convention;
2. Recommend qualified persons to the American Baptist Foreign Mission Societies for specialized ministries of reconciliation to meet human need in Vietnam;
3. Engage in study in order to learn the facts and to bring their Christian witness to bear on the moral issues involved;
4. Call upon our national leaders not to construe dissent as disloyalty on this issue;
5. Uphold the right of citizens to a free and open examination of all matters pertinent to world peace in general and to Vietnam in particular;
6. Stand in compassion and understanding

beside those to whom the conduct of national policy is entrusted, to pray for them and to support them, though not uncritically, in efforts to solve the dilemmas facing this country; and

7. Express its love and concern for our young men and women who are serving in our Armed Forces around the world. We pray that their lives may be a continuing witness for Christ within the Armed Forces and the countries where they serve.

Renewal of Justice Needed

HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 27, 1968

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, the views of students receive consistent coverage these days and I have noted the spirited editorial commentary that has developed in numerous school publications. One such publication is the Marian Megaphone, which is published monthly by the senior journalism class of Marian Catholic High School, Chicago Heights, Ill. Their February issue carried a spirited commentary on the present Supreme Court by Jeff Schenck, a staff member of the publication.

The article follows:

RENEWAL OF JUSTICE NEEDED

In the past twenty years the Supreme Court of the United States has caused a change in the face of our society. Today this previously eminent institution is receiving a heavy barrage of abuse in all quarters of the country. This widespread criticism seems to stem from the Court's ultra-liberal approach to cases requiring a final decision.

The Supreme Court headed by Chief Justice Earl Warren, is composed of nine members. Justice Warren had no previous judicial experience except for a term as a district attorney. He received his present position as a political favor.

The Court's rulings on subversion and internal security are questionable but consistent with its normal approach. Communists are not required to register with the proper authorities. Communist card holders cannot be denied a job in a defense plant. Senator James O. Eastland, head of the powerful Senate Judiciary Committee, charged that the Court has upheld the position advocated by the Communist party in 46 of 70 decisions or at a .657 average.

The Supreme Court's ruling on prayer has met with widespread opposition. Its decision has been called a "disintegration of a sacred American heritage."

Crime is on the rise, and the Supreme Court has taken its usually liberal and left wing approach to the issue. Individual rights are being exaggerated, helping to make the streets of our country unsafe for the average American. For instance, in *Escobedo vs. Illinois* the Supreme Court freed a confessed killer on the grounds that he admitted his crime before seeing a lawyer. The average cop must be a "judge and jury" before he can make an arrest or question a witness. Evidently the handcuffs are being placed on the wrong party.

The Supreme Court is no longer interpreting the law. It is usurping Congressional power and undermining our country. The people are becoming dissatisfied. Billboards stating "Impeach Earl Warren" are seen in numerous localities. As Senator Robert C. Byrd remarked, "Somebody is tampering with America's soul. I leave it to you who that is."

February 27, 1968

Crackdown on Drugs Timely

HON. WILLIAM L. SPRINGER

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 26, 1968

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Speaker, the Subcommittee on Health of the House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce had hearings a week ago on LSD, its component parts and possible injury to the general public who made use of LSD.

Some undercover work in the last 6 months resulted in charges placed against 10 persons in the Champaign-Urbana, Ill., area for violation of narcotic laws, either State or Federal.

The testimony of Dr. Cecil B. Jacobson, of the George Washington University Medical School, was most revealing. Dr. Jacobson is an internationally known researcher and geneticist and has done an excellent job on the particular drug, LSD.

The testimony which he gave revealed that there are breakdowns in the chromosome structure in future generations as the result of the use of LSD by either the father or the mother. Breakdown of cells also showed much similarity to that in leukemia. Not all is known about the possible effects of LSD on future generations but certainly enough is known at this time for us to come up with a Federal law for possession of LSD. Our committee is now considering the matter of making it a misdemeanor to handle LSD. Marijuana, a very less dangerous drug, is a felony. It appears to me that we would be fully justified in making possession of LSD equally a felony.

The attached editorial from the Champaign News-Gazette of February 22, 1968, comments more fully on the dangers of LSD:

CRACKDOWN ON DRUGS TIMELY

We commend the moves of state authorities, working in cooperation with local police, in acting to stem the illicit traffic in narcotics and use of drugs by local young people.

The responsible citizenry share the hope, we're sure, that the raids on those peddling and selling illegal dope—as well as those engaged in use of the drugs—is not a one-shot or sporadic effort.

Continued vigilance and detection will be required on the part of narcotics agents and police if this week's law enforcement actions are to mean much.

It is also imperative that prosecutions on the charges placed against at least 10 persons in Champaign-Urbana in the narcotics arrest cases be followed through quickly and not allowed to drag out in the courts, ad infinitum.

The apparent spreading use of illegal drugs by young people is not confined to any one community, but seems to be a national symptom of the times.

Many blame breakdown of home discipline as the root cause. Others cite the prosperous, affluent age and ease with which young people can "get by" with little work and always appear to have easy money for curiosity-satisfying forays.

While the number of local boys and girls of high school age, or college age, reported participating in the illicit drug traffic—through sales, distribution and/or use of narcotics—may be comparatively small, the

report publicized this week that as many as 500 may be involved, is more than a little alarming.

We hope the present investigations and arrests provide a needed deterrent.

Like traffic or any other law violation practices, law enforcement officers will have to follow up effectively and intensively to curb the illegal practices.

The Plight of Jews in the Soviet Union and Prospects for Their Future

HON. ROMAN C. PUCINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 27, 1968

MR. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, recently it was my privilege to address a citywide conference on Soviet Jewry held in the Sherman House in Chicago.

This very worthwhile conference was sponsored by a committee of interested citizens in Chicago and their respective organizations who are becoming increasingly alarmed over the menacing growth of persecution of the Jewish people in the Soviet Union.

The chairman of this worthwhile conference was Dean Jerald C. Brauer of the University of Chicago.

I had pointed out in my remarks that one way we can relieve the pressure now being asserted by the Soviet Union against its Jewish citizens is for the United States to lead the way to admit Israel into NATO.

It occurs to me that as the stature of Israel increases as a major world power, nations that find it within their ease to persecute Jewish citizens will have to take cognizance of the fact that their own relations with the world will suffer if such persecution continues.

I should like to include in the RECORD today the remarks that I delivered in this citywide conference.

I am also including at the conclusion of my own remarks a petition being circulated by the steering committee of the Chicago Conference on Soviet Jewry.

I sincerely believe, Mr. Speaker, the conscience of the world cannot rest so long as we are witnessing in the Soviet Union today the same kind of persecution that we witnessed 30 years ago in Nazi Germany.

This world can no longer remain aloof to the plight of the Jews in Russia.

I invite all those Americans who value freedom to join in their respective communities in calling the attention of all Americans to this ugly specter of persecution which we are now witnessing in the Soviet Union, but more important, I invite all of my fellow Americans to recognize the fact that persecution of the Jews in the Soviet Union is not a problem of concern only to the Jewish people; it is a problem which presses heavily on the conscience of all freedom-loving people in this world.

I hope each community will undertake an effort to have as many of these statements addressed to the Council of Ministers of the Soviet Union, protesting the persecution of Jews, as is possible.

The two statements follow:

THE PLIGHT OF JEWS IN THE SOVIET UNION AND PROSPECTS FOR THEIR FUTURE

(Remarks of the Honorable ROMAN C. PUCINSKI, Democrat, of Illinois, delivered at the Citywide Conference on Soviet Jewry, Sherman House, Chicago, Ill.)

The year 1967 was a great year for the Soviet people; it was the 50th Anniversary of the Bolshevik Revolution.

The news media in this country covered all the major celebrations in great detail—the parade on November 7, the commemorative speeches by the Soviet leaders, the laudatory remarks of visiting communist dignitaries, and all the rest.

For the Soviets this was a great event; for them it was a time to review the great accomplishments of their country; it was a time for accountability; it was a time for taking stock of a half century of life under communism.

There can be no doubt that the Soviets have achieved significant progress. Still, they surely must know that they have paid a very high price for the material gains they have made.

You will observe that I used the word "material" progress—and I give special emphasis to the word "material"—for, when one goes beyond the material realm of Soviet life to the spiritual realm, to the realm that deals with the great human values of man's existence, then we see the obverse side of this Soviet experience.

We see very quickly that progress in this sector of human activity is sadly lacking; we see that progress in preserving and enhancing human values contrasts sharply with progress in creating the hard, materialistic values of a modern industrial society.

This spiritual poverty is evident everywhere one turns; it is seen in the suppression of the Russian writers; it is seen in the imprisonment of Daniel and Sinyavsky; it is seen in the barren wasteland they have created out of the lush tradition of Russian culture.

But nowhere is this spiritual poverty more evident in Soviet society than in the continued persecution of its Jewish people.

Soviet anti-semitism is a reality of Russian life that has been encouraged in devious ways by Soviet authorities: it makes a mockery of all those formal declarations by the Soviet leaders and those spiritually uplifting formulations insuring freedom that are integrated into the law and constitution of the Soviet state.

Jews in the Soviet Union are officially regarded both as a nationality and as a religious group.

This duality complicates their status in an officially atheistic country where any attack on the Jewish religion becomes inseparable from an attack on the Jewish nationality as a whole.

Their vulnerability is increased by the fact that they are widely scattered throughout the Soviet Union, unlike most other nationalities which have their own territorial homelands.

Neither as a nationality nor as a religious group do Jews receive the rights granted other such groups in the U.S.S.R.

In the last Soviet census, 2,268,000 people specified their nationality as Jewish.

This is about one percent of the total Soviet population and ranks the Jews twelfth in number among the more than 100 nationalities in the Soviet Union.

Nevertheless, it is the only nationality which does not have school taught in its national language.

There are no newspapers published in Yiddish although the Maris—a tiny primitive Asian group of about 205,000—have 17 newspapers and the Yakuts—a similar small Asian group of about 236,000—have 28 newspapers.

A literary magazine which began publica-

tion in 1961 as a bimonthly, and is now a monthly is the only regular Yiddish publication. Its contents are carefully conformist, lacking any flavor of a national culture, and it is printed in only 25,000 copies.

A handful of amateur theatrical groups made up of Jews who band together after working hours exists on a marginal basis giving occasional concerts and readings in Yiddish.

There is no state-supported Jewish theater, although Government subsidies are given to other national theaters.

All religions in the Soviet Union exist under difficulties, but Judaism is subject to special discrimination.

Jewish congregations have not been allowed to establish any central organization, and have nothing comparable to the Holy Synod of the Russian Orthodox Church or the Moslem Board for Central Asia and Kazakhstan.

Bibles, hymnals and prayerbooks for the other "recognized" religions are printed fairly regularly.

There have been repeated promises by regime spokesmen that a new edition of the Jewish prayerbook would be allowed, but none has been produced since a small edition (3,000) copies in 1958.

The other major ecclesiastical bodies are authorized to produce a variety of religious articles such as church vessels, vestments, or crucifixes.

The production of prayer shawls and phylacteries is prohibited to Jews, for the estimated 40,000,000 Russian Orthodox there are about 20,000 churches (a ratio of 1 to 2,000).

For the 3,000,000 Baptists there are roughly 6,000 parishes (or 1 to 500).

For the estimated 1,000,000 Jewish believers, however, there are only between 60 and 70 synagogues (or 1 for each 14,000 believers).

Most religious groups maintain educational institutions for the priesthood.

The Russian Orthodox have two academies and 5 seminaries; the Moslems have a Madrassa.

A Yeshiva was established in Moscow in 1957, but fewer than five Rabbis were ever graduated.

A recent visitor was told that no Rabbis are now being trained there, due to difficulties encountered by would-be students in obtaining permission to live in Moscow.

When a Rabbi dies, the synagogue is closed.

For those Jews who wish to make their way as assimilated Soviet citizens, however, the prospects are not all black. While they have lost the strong position at top levels of the communist party which they held after the Revolution and are virtually excluded from "sensitive" areas of the bureaucracy and the army, they are well represented in artistic and professional circles.

Jews probably have a higher income than other groups, although it is something of a disadvantage in career terms to be Jewish.

Many liberal Soviet intellectuals have reacted against the long history of anti-semitism in the Soviet Union by emphasizing their sympathy with the victims of discrimination.

In recent years many young Jews have crowded into the remaining synagogues and massed in the streets outside for celebrations of Torah or Rosh Hashanah.

They are longing for color and animation amidst the drabness of Soviet life and to a youthful search for identity as to formal religious beliefs.

Our intelligence reports indicate that many Jews privately expressed pride in and identification with Israel at the time of the Arab-Israeli war last June.

An official Soviet position of support for the Arabs during and since the war lent indirect support to the latent popular anti-semitism in the Soviet Union and resulted

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

in more open expressions of prejudice in private conversations.

Isolated anti-semitic incidents were reported to have occurred during June but there is no evidence that the regime sponsored actions against Soviet Jews.

In the light of continued persecution of the Jews, we have a right to ask: Does this great giant of a nation, the Soviet Union, feel so insecure that it is compelled to take 2.2 million of its citizens and relegate them to an inferior status of life?

If it is not fear that motivates this poisonous anti-semitism, why then the refusal to give the Jew the opportunity to develop his Jewish cultural traditions unimpeded?

Why the refusal to permit the believing Jew to attend his religious beliefs as should be the right of every man according to his own preferences whatever they may be?

Why the refusal to give the Jews unrestricted admission to the institutions of higher learning: the universities, the institutes, the academies?

Why the refusal to permit the Jews who are separated from their loved ones abroad to join their families?

My friends, there is a gross contradiction in this reality of Soviet power and Soviet anti-semitism. If it were not so tragic, as indeed, in so many ways it is, it would be comical, for there is here an absurdity that betrays all rationality.

Imagine this for a moment:

Here we have one of the most powerful states of all history—statesman and nations tremble before it—and yet this state, with its staggering might, with its ICBMs, ABMs, “orbital rockets”, and all-powerful military establishment, yet this state feels so insecure within itself that it must persecute one of its most gifted people—and here is the contradiction—a people who ask only for no more in this life than the opportunity to exercise their God-given talents which in the end is for the power and glory of the Soviet Union.

What an absurdity!

And yet the Soviets do not see anti-semitism in this light. They do not see it for what it is, a sickness of the soul, an evil-inducing paranoia that divides a nation, saps its human resources, diverts its energies, and in the end weakens its spiritual center.

Given the direction, the depth, and emphasis of this new manifestation of historic Russian anti-semitism, it is often very hard to feel optimistic about the future of Russia's Jews.

Certainly, the Soviet response to the recent success of Israel in its defensive war against the Arabs has given a strong indication of what Soviet Jews can expect for the future.

For the Russians, the Israeli victory provided an occasion for regenerating their internal anti-semitic campaign.

The old stereotypes, the ugly, overt anti-semitic stereotypes, depicted in anti-Israeli cartoons, were spread throughout the Soviet Union in the Soviet press.

Soviet newspapers revived, updated and refurbished the classic anti-semitic doctrine of an international Jewish conspiracy to control the world.

For many generations in Russia, the Jews had been regarded with suspicion and hostility as strangers, aliens, and enemies, actual or potential.

Now this situation has been magnified to a new and more ominous dimension.

Since the end of the June war, the Soviets have strengthened their position in the Middle East: They have largely restored the military equipment they had given to the Arabs and which was destroyed by the Israelis; they have extended their political and military position in the entire area, for example, by enlarging their Mediterranean fleet and by sending military supplies, including trained fighter pilots, to the revolt-torn Yemen.

The Soviet Union is in the Middle East to stay; its hold is firm; its control is expanding, and for Israel its threat is ominous.

For at the root of Russian policy in the Middle East is their calculated intention of exploiting the Arab-Israeli conflict as a means of getting larger political control over the Arab states.

To achieve this end, they have with only a minimal qualification supported wholeheartedly the Arab cause against Israel; but, what is more important, they continue to supply the Arabs with the military means to destroy Israel.

In a word, the whole thrust of Soviet Middle East policy is directed against the interests, indeed, even survival, of Israel, and in a manner consistent with Soviet behavioral patterns, they have sought a unity of foreign and domestic policies.

Accordingly, they have generated an anti-semitic policy internally that has enlarged still further the threat to Soviet Jews that existed during the days of Khrushchev.

What the future holds for Soviet Jewry, neither I, nor anyone else, can really say. Certainly, the enlargement of the Soviet presence in the Middle East, coupled with the dissolution of Britain's old imperial position in the area, has created a new and dangerous situation. A situation similar to others that have occurred during the post World War II period.

It would seem that much will depend on the extent to which Soviet power is balanced in the Middle East, mainly by resources endemic in the area, and by the extent to which Israel can achieve a permanent peace with her Arab neighbors; for if a permanent relationship can be established between Israeli and Arab, this may have the positive effect of undoing Moscow's anti-Israel policy and in turn lessen discriminatory pressures on Soviet Jews.

This is only conjecture, only a hope. And as all of you know, my hopes have always been that not only Soviet Jews but Jews everywhere will be able to live a life free from all forms of discrimination that have plagued them for centuries.

Perhaps a permanent peace along the Arab-Israeli borders will bring us closer to that expected goal.

Peace in the Middle East, of course, is a desire of top priority.

But looking at the Soviet Union's increasing influence both in the Middle East and the Mediterranean, one can't help but conclude that resumption of any normalcy between Israel and the Arab states continues to be in the realm of the most elusive speculation.

Perhaps, however, we might explore other possibilities which give us an insight into the future plight of Jews in Russia which could, conceivably, produce even a flicker of hope.

There are growing signs that the Soviets are becoming increasingly concerned about world opinion. These signs are minuscule at the present, but they indicate that the Soviet Union is not disinterested in world opinion.

The first counter-propaganda that the Soviets have launched in recent months against charges of persecution of the Jews in that country leads many “Soviet-watchers” in Washington to believe that the Soviets do place a high value on world opinion.

I hope you will not interpret this as negativism, but a seemingly simple move by the Soviet Union to lift the ban on production of Matzos for Passover offers a flicker of hope.

In recent months the Soviets have substantially slowed down the extent of false “show-trials” against Jewish merchants who have been charged with economic crimes against the state. This change in pace against the Jews is being interpreted not only as a gesture toward easing world opinion against the Soviets, but reflects a growing belief that as the failures of communism as

February 27, 1968

an economic doctrine continue to accelerate, there are those in the Soviet Union who believe Russia will need the Jewish genius of Commerce to help her survive.

It occurs to me that America can do much to help the Jews in Russia.

First of all, I strongly urge the United States to give serious consideration toward leading the way for gaining admission for Israel to the North Atlantic Treaty Organization. There is ample justification for this proposal.

There now are three Mediterranean nations in NATO—Italy, Greece and Turkey.

The whole situation in recent years has undergone a huge change in the Mediterranean. The Soviet Union, obviously mindful of the strength of NATO on the European continent, has now transferred its campaign of expansion into the Mediterranean, the Middle East, and the African continent itself.

The Soviet Union is now boldly and arrogantly striking out for domination of the Mediterranean. It is becoming a common occurrence for Soviet ships to play “chicken” with American naval vessels in an effort to launch provocations against the United States.

Our Intelligence has clearly established—beyond any doubt—that the Soviet Union has replaced virtually all of Arab military weapons destroyed by the Israeli in the six-day war.

There can be no question that the Soviet Union is in no way abating its drive to gain the dominant role through the Arab states of the Middle East. Nor can there be any doubt that the Soviet Union is intent on ultimately destroying the State of Israel because it is Israel that today stands in the way of the Soviet Union's drive for the grand prize: control of the whole continent of Africa.

I submit to you that the time is long past due when the European powers must recognize that Israel can no longer alone be required to guard the Middle East, the Mediterranean, and Africa itself against Soviet expansion.

I submit to you that Israel today is as much a key to peace in Europe and the world as any of the present members of the NATO alliance.

It would be my hope that Israel could become the fourth Mediterranean member of NATO, for indeed we can no longer isolate the Middle East from stability in Europe. The presence of the Soviet fleet in the Mediterranean has closed that kind of separation forever.

I am mindful that an invitation from NATO to Israel to join the European defense community would undoubtedly bring strong pressures from the Soviet Union on the Arab States to join the Warsaw Pact Treaty. This is all right as far as I am concerned, for it will force the Arab States to fish or cut bait.

If they choose to formally plunge themselves into the Communist orbit—and there is overwhelming evidence that they are already controlled by the Soviet Union—the rest of the world should clearly know this.

The Middle East may very well hold the key to containment of Soviet expansion, and Israel itself is the keystone in the free world's perimeter against such Communist growth. I believe it is in the interest of the free world to provide Israel with the full backing of NATO. Too long has Israel been asked to carry the costly burden of protecting our interests in the Middle East.

There is no question in my mind that placing Israel in NATO would give the Jews in the Soviet Union a new dimension of meaning and significance, which the Soviet would have to recognize and respect. I am sure the persecution of Jews in Russia today would be substantially abated as the influence of Israel grew in the NATO community.

I sincerely hope the United States will seriously consider at least exploring this prospect with your fellow members of NATO, and with the Israelis themselves.

STATEMENT

To the members of the Council of Ministers of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics.

From citizens of the City of Chicago meeting in conference on the oppression suffered by the Jewish citizenry of the Soviet Union.

We call upon you . . . the leadership of the Soviet Government, to recognize the flagrant violations of human rights perpetrated upon your Jewish citizens by some of your regimes' policies and practices—direct and indirect. We call upon you, the leaders of the Soviet Government, to enforce and defend the constitutional rights of your Jewish citizens to the same extent you have done so in the case of other national and religious groups in the U.S.S.R. We call upon you to recognize and to honor your pledge to support the international rights of man, as you have subscribed to them publicly many times in the past.

To prevent your Jewish citizens from a free exercise of Judaism, their age old faith—the maintenance of religious seminaries, the publication and distribution of prayer books, the production and distribution of religious articles—violates your own solemn guarantees. To prevent your Jewish citizens from freely pursuing their national culture, and to deny the rights of Jewish intellectuals to fully express themselves in their national language—Yiddish—through books, nation-wide newspapers, schools and the theatre, will serve as a continual reminder of the violation of your own constitutional guarantees. To discriminate against your Jewish citizens in public life, to promote and nurture propaganda campaigns using anti-Semitic stereotypes, to encourage discriminatory application of maximum penalties, only brings the inequitable administration of your constitution into sharper focus.

We respectfully and urgently request that you take proper cognizance of our statement and take appropriate steps to reinstate with all speed the constitutional guarantees for the benefit of your Jewish citizens. This will undoubtedly help eliminate the seeds of racism and discrimination which still last, and enhance the progress of all of the peoples of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics.

Respectfully,

Homeownership

HON. JOHN A. BLATNIK

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 26, 1968

Mr. BLATNIK. Mr. Speaker, the President's message, entitled "The Crisis of the Cities," outlines in broad terms the dimensions of our urban problems. The challenge we face is enormous—and one means of meeting it is by acting on the President's homeownership proposals. Unless Congress does act, many families who might well prove to be successful homeowners will find the financing of new homes still out of reach.

Homeownership offers advantages and benefits not only to the families involved but to the communities in which they live.

Homeownership for those who desire it offers a sense of self-accomplishment that should be extended to more families.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

This Nation has the resources to assist those seeking to own their own homes. In the past, homeownership was out of reach for many middle-income families and individuals.

Congress recognized this and, because of congressional action, even modest-income families today know the pride of owning their home.

The need for more extensive action is apparent. The President has recommended that we help to place homeownership in the grasp of more families, and especially those of lower incomes.

By so doing, we will help make it possible for those families so long excluded from the mainstream of American society to share in America's abundance and to join in constructive contribution to it.

By making it possible to own a home, we will go a long way toward making it possible for them to belong to the American community—rather than reject it.

I support these proposals and I urge my colleagues to join me in that support.

Private Enterprise

HON. CHARLES W. WHALEN, JR.

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 26, 1968

Mr. WHALEN. Mr. Speaker, in his message yesterday, President Johnson requested \$1 billion for the model cities program. He asked for authorization to build 6 million federally assisted housing units over the next decade, and called for the start of 300,000 federally aided housing units for fiscal 1969. These are substantial increases over this and past fiscal years.

Since 1960, more than 9 million jobs have been added to the American economy. The assets held by American families have grown by \$325 billion during this period.

Since its inception in 1934, the Federal Housing Administration has insured more than \$112 billion in mortgages and loans. FHA has helped more than 8½ million families to become homeowners, and has helped builders finance about 1,200,000 rental apartment units. It has also insured more than 28 million home improvement loans.

The public housing program has produced some 662,000 dwelling units occupied by nearly 2,500,000 persons since it was launched in 1939. As of last December, public housing had provided decent accommodations for some 9,700,000 persons.

These are impressive performance figures. But it is obvious that the Federal Government cannot do the increasingly complex job alone. Despite what the Federal Government has done in the last 30 years, much, much more remains to be done.

The commitment of the talent, resources, and flexibility of private enterprise must be obtained. Preliminary indications of interest are encouraging. But we have yet to see a widely based, wholehearted commitment of private enterprise to our cities.

The business community has a vital stake in the stability of our urban system and its orderly development. It is in the long-range interest of the business community to assist in the rebuilding of our cities—to preserve those basic conditions on which the growth—and profits—of business depend.

A New Approach to the Problem of Gold and World Liquidity

HON. JONATHAN B. BINGHAM

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 27, 1968

Mr. BINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, last week a group of Members met at a luncheon with Mr. William Wasserman of New York City. Mr. Wasserman has had a long and successful career in international finance; in addition, he served as a delegate to the World Economic Conference in 1931, chief of the U.S. lend-lease mission to Australia in 1942, special adviser to the Chairman of the Smaller Warplants Corporation in 1944, and in various other posts.

At the luncheon, Mr. Wasserman outlined to the group his provocative and imaginative views on the problem of gold and world liquidity. These views are set forth in a memorandum by Mr. Wasserman and Mr. Walter Maynard, a distinguished New York economist, titled "A New Approach to the Problem of Gold and World Liquidity," and in a recent letter to me commenting on the article and related matters. I commend these papers to my colleagues and other readers of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

A NEW APPROACH TO THE PROBLEM OF GOLD AND WORLD LIQUIDITY

(By William Wasserman and Walter Maynard)

The recent British devaluation and the subsequent speculation in gold, which continues as this is written, once more points emphatically to the importance of early and decisive action looking toward improvement in the world's arrangements for settling international balances.

The inadequacy of gold itself, or any arrangement based upon gold, has become progressively more apparent in recent years, during which world trade has been rising strongly while gold available for monetary purposes has, if anything, diminished. Since these trends can be expected to continue, it is merely a question of time until arrangements, alternative to gold, will have to be arrived at. The Special Drawing Rights on the International Monetary Fund agreed at the recent Rio Conference are linked to gold and will only begin to be available in 1969. Events are marching fast, and decisive action may need to be taken at an early date.

This paper advances a concept that goes considerably further than anything yet proposed in that it offers a scheme for the creation of a new currency, available, like gold today in the U.S., only to central banks, that would be in a practical sense superior to gold in that its purchasing power would be inherently stable.

That improvement in the world financial arrangements is needed is readily apparent from the fact that the world's richest and most productive nation, with over \$87 billion of investments abroad and a favorable

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

trade balance in excess of \$5 billion a year, now has to restrict its foreign lending, talk of curtailing its tourist expenditures, urge its industry to repatriate foreign balances, and has begun to tighten its internal credit conditions. Moreover, the fact that Great Britain, which, because of the importance to it of its world trade, banking arrangements, and political connections with the Commonwealth, has every incentive to maintain a stable currency, has twice, in the past nineteen years, been forced to devalue, is evidence of the fact that the present system is not working well. If difficulties of this nature affect strong, developed nations, how much more severe must the difficulties be which the weaknesses in the system today place in the way of newly created nations obtaining desperately needed development capital?

There seems, however, to be a way in which some of the defects of the present system can be remedied. The means of doing this is to set up a mechanism by which the true wealth of a nation, namely its capacity to produce, can be recognized and included in the calculation upon which its creditworthiness is based, thus adding a new unit of value to be used for settling international balances, relating gold to a position as simply a metal useful in art and industry, or as a medium for small savings in inflation-ridden countries.

The international monetary system under which we operate today—the key currency system—is one in which the unfavorable overall international balances of the United States and the United Kingdom provide the liquidity needed for financing international commerce. The situation is one in which sentiment can, and does, oscillate between extremes; if the United States has a favorable overall balance, the rest of the world talks of a "dollar gap" and a liquidity crisis, and if the United States has a large deficit resulting in a gold outflow, then doubts begin to be expressed concerning the ultimate value of the dollar in terms of gold. The myth of gold persists despite the fact that for more than thirty years its holders have experienced a sad loss of purchasing power, and despite the self-evident circumstance that the distribution and availability of gold is in no way related to the need for it, but rather depends upon geological accident, and the shifting needs of hoarding and fashion.

There are multiple examples of the fact that a nation's wealth is in reality based not on a gold hoard but upon its productivity. An example of staggering force within our own lifetimes is that of Hitler's Germany, where a maniac, prompted by the economic genius of Dr. Schact, was able without any gold holdings, not only to build a highly effective war machine, but also maintain his people's standard of living at a high level while he was doing it. Conversely, in our own country we have the example of the depression of the early 30s, when the existence of a tremendous gold hoard did not influence the fact that there were twelve million persons seeking work and unable to find it.

The problem of improving upon the present key currency system for financing world trade and international capital movements is basically that of creating a new means of international payment and exchange which will not suffer from the weaknesses of gold, but will have the virtues which holders of gold believe are possessed by that metal.

Among the virtues possessed by gold as a means of settling international balances is the fact that it is completely neutral in character—it is a substance or commodity, not a national currency. For this reason the discipline imposed by gold is impersonal and effective. The present system, in which the means of settling international balances is a national currency, lacks these qualities.

Among the further virtues that an ideal means of settling international balances should possess is *stability of purchasing power*. A simple way of bringing this about

is proposed below, and this mechanism is the basic feature of the plan offered here and is its chief merit.

This new basic medium of international exchange should be created with a recognition of the fact that each nation's currency is in the long run worth only what it will buy in terms of goods and services *within its own borders*. A nation's actual production of goods and services, and its ability to exercise fiscal and monetary self control, rather than gold holdings, in such a system should constitute the basis for its participation in the system.

If these premises are accepted, it would seem logical that a new international bank be formed with power to issue a new unit of currency (which could, following Lord Keynes' suggestion, be called "Bancor") which would be accepted as a legal reserve and as legal tender by member national central banks. Ideally, there would be as many subscribers to the new international bank as to the International Monetary Fund and in fact, the International Monetary Fund could be enlarged and converted into the new international bank. However, if full agreement on the part of the subscribers to the IMF could not be obtained, it would seem worthwhile to establish a new international bank, provided the participation of a sufficient number of powerful nations could be obtained.

Each nation desirous of World Central Bank membership would have the privilege initially of depositing in the World Central Bank an amount of its own currency equal in value to, say, 1% of the total value of its annual production of goods and services, based on an index computed by the staff of the World Central Bank. The percentage of the deposit could be greater or less than 1% and could be altered from time to time by the Bank's directorate. Each depositing nation would then receive a credit in world bank currency (Bancor) equal to 95% of the deposit. The balance of 5% would represent a subscription to the Bank's Capital. Voting rights in the World Central Bank would be based on the amount of each member nation's deposit.

The chief differences between this plan and other proposals would be:

(1) Each depositing nation would agree to increase its currency deposit from time to time in proportion to any deterioration in the internal purchasing power of its currency, as computed by the World Central Bank.

Thus, if in a given period, say three months, the general price level of one of the contributing member nations should advance, say 2%, that nation would be required to increase its deposit in the World Central Bank by an additional 2% of its own currency, without receiving therefor any compensatory credit in World Central Bank currency—or, failing such a deposit, its credit balance in World Central Bank currency would be partially cancelled by a corresponding amount. Thus, the new currency would remain fixed in its basic value in terms of the cost of goods and services within the borders of the participating countries. *For the first time the world would have a unit of value that at all times would remain constant in terms of actual purchasing power.* Heretofore would lie the superiority of the proposed unit of value over gold.

(2) In order to permit an increase in the supply of Bancor in response to the need for it, represented by increases in world trade and production of goods and services, each contributing nation would have the right to increase its deposits each year in proportion to its increase in national output as reflected by its index of production (as computed by the World Central Bank)—and receive in exchange therefor increased deposits of Bancor which it could use to settle its international balances with other member nations in the same way as gold. In other words,

February 27, 1968

a means is provided of monetizing real increases in production.

Under this system the international exchange rate of every nation's currency would be governed by its ability to maintain order in its domestic finances. Creditworthiness would be based upon a combination of fiscal responsibility on one hand and ability to produce goods and services on the other, rather than by the ebb and flow of liquid capital movements or the haphazard distribution of gold resources.

A major difference between this system and the present one would be that all currencies would fluctuate in terms of Bancor, instead of remaining stable in terms of gold and in relation to each other, as at present. Thus, each participant would be under continuous pressure to maintain a stable domestic price level and rising production. A nation that accomplished this would be able to have an unfavorable overall balance of payments with the rest of the world, financed by its ability to call on increasing quantities of Bancor as the result of growing production. This unfavorable balance could be maintained indefinitely—in the same way that under today's conditions nations with large gold mines can, if they wish, have unfavorable overall balances.

The requirement for continuous fiscal discipline in this plan virtually guarantees that it will meet opposition from the politicians and economists in all countries who find virtue in deficits and inflation. In Europe inflation is recognized as economic enemy #1, but in this hemisphere there is a more tolerant range of views in this area.

The powerful incentives for fiscal self-discipline that this plan would offer, should exert a favorable effect on the economies of the participants and greatly strengthen capitalist institutions. A stable price level encourages saving, makes low interest rates possible and permits long-range planning. The growing supply of Bancor, geared to growing production, would provide steadily increasing means of financing world trade and the international capital movements so important to developing countries.

There are many also who will claim that this plan is too simple and arbitrary—that it imposes unrealistically harsh standards, for example, on developing nations. Others, especially those influenced by the gold speculators, will claim that this plan is too complicated, and that a simple upward revision in the price of gold would solve the world's liquidity problem.

The suggested solution, in the case of the United States, would, in the long run, permit balance of payments problems to be confined to the private sector, where they would, in time, become self-rectifying. Presumably, capital movements between nations are dictated by economic considerations and, if carried out under private auspices, will be wise and productive both for the nation supplying the capital and the nation receiving it.

It is for this reason that the United States imbalance of payments, while it must in time be rectified, is not fundamentally serious in nature. Here, we enjoy a large export surplus and a rapidly growing investment income. Our basic situation is one of strength. Our adverse balance is brought about by the fact that we have been investing and lending huge sums abroad, giving economic and military aid to many foreign nations, and fighting a small but relatively expensive war. Our adverse balance has contributed greatly to the financial stability, growth and well being of many of the recipient nations. For us suddenly to withdraw this support, which thus far has benefitted all concerned, could create havoc and might even result in a new world depression. It is here that a new concept of a world currency and a World Central Bank can be helpful, even crucial.

As an added area of operation of the World Central Bank, we propose, in considering the functions of the proposed bank, that na-

tions be divided into two categories, developed, industrial nations on one hand and undeveloped—"developing"—nations on the other. By definition, a developed nation would be one in which the majority of the labor force was engaged in industrial production rather than in agriculture. As a means of encouraging the development of the so-called "developing" countries, the World Central Bank would offer a discount privilege to any industrial nation up to half of any loans or advances made to an undeveloped country—provided that at no time in a given year could such loans discounted exceed 10% of its permitted deposits.

This discount method would lessen the burden now carried to a great extent by the United States and Great Britain, who heretofore have led in making credit available to the developing nations of the world. Under these terms at least part of this burden would be shared by all the member nations of the World Bank, easing pressure on the leading industrial nations and providing greater liquidity and help to the underdeveloped nations.

In considering the whole proposal for a World Central Bank of this nature, it should be recognized that its members would be deliberately relinquishing some of their sovereignty, in that for the impersonal discipline of gold there would be in effect substituted the discipline of the statisticians of the World Central Bank. Nevertheless, just as the existence of the United Nations or the Common Market represent some abandonment of sovereignty for the common good, so would the present proposal provide for common benefits in the economic area.

The gold speculators, who for more than 30 years have been frustrated in their hopes of a new windfall as the result of devaluations of major currencies, can probably be relied upon to oppose vociferously any suggestion along the lines offered above. Moreover, since these proposals would bring about, as explained above, a situation in which greater self-discipline and restraint in fiscal and financial matters would be required of all participants, including the United States, the more extreme type of expansionist mentality would find it difficult to accept them. Also any change in the status quo is bound to meet opposition, and even among those who acknowledge the need for change, gradualism is preferred.

However, these suggestions would bring about a basic improvement in the world's monetary arrangements, they seem to be in tune with the times, the benefits of the proposals are clear enough, while the risks seem small enough to justify an early start on bringing into existence the proposed new international financial mechanism.

NEW YORK, N.Y.,
January 11, 1968.

Hon. JONATHAN BINGHAM,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR JONATHAN: Herewith the article on gold that Walter Maynard and I have written. I believe the thinking in it will be helpful in discussions of the international monetary problem. I hope Congress will take a more forward-looking attitude toward these matters than is now visible in the Executive Branch of our Government.

For my own part, I have always believed that a currency is worth exactly what it will buy in terms of goods and services—the dollar has maintained its value better than any currency in the world. Our fuel and food costs are still relatively the lowest in the world and our high labor costs are greatly compensated for by the fact that we have millions of low-cost laborers working for us in the form of horse power slaves, which actually gives us the lowest labor costs in the world in many industries. Last but not least, the value of a currency is roughly the result

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

of an equation between the total amount of credit outstanding in the nation's economy and the amount of goods and services that the economy produces annually. Our currency today is largely credit currency. Most of our transactions are done with bank checks. Our paper dollars are also credit currency. Gold plays no real part in maintaining the value of this credit currency. The value is created by the output of goods and services which the currency will buy.

What inflation we have today is not the result of an overabundance of credit currency, but the result of ability of labor unions to demand increases in wages in excess of productivity gains, and the ability of the manufacturing companies that pay these wages to pass the increases along to the consumer—which they must do if full employment is to be maintained. Even in times of stringent credit restrictions, this formula has not been disturbed, and since costs are largely inflexible due to the ability of labor to maintain high wages, the usual credit restrictions cannot result in lower prices.

In relation to the international position of the dollar, I think much of the talk now going around about budget problems is unrealistic. As long as we balance our budget to the extent that we maintain a reasonable inflow of taxes against current expenditures other than for capital goods, we are in a sound position. There is no reason why we can't reorganize our budget to include a capital expenditure budget just as a private manufacturing company would, or a utility.

The same reasoning is true of our balance of payments—can you imagine a business that is paying its way and earning a profit through its regular manufacturing operations, namely the sale of merchandise and services, having an annual profit of between \$4-5 billion on balance, worrying about an additional \$4-5 billion of debt when the creation of that debt through profitable investment brings in an annual return of 25%? One must not forget that American business owns assets throughout the world at costs of \$86 billion consisting of its huge and profitable investment in the oil, computer and automotive businesses of the free world, a business that earns an annual income of about \$8 billion per year, of which \$4 billion is annually returned to us as the owners of the business. Why, with a total of private and public assets abroad of \$125 billion should we worry, in view of the fact that our basic balance of payments is favorable, about going into debt for another \$4 billion, when that \$4 billion is being wisely invested by skilled businessmen in tangible assets that to date have been bringing in an overall return of about 25%?

That, my dear friend, is the position of the United States—and I would like to ask one other question—how in the world can our foreign debtors repay us unless we in turn run an adverse balance of payments which will enable them to return to us part of the money that they have already borrowed?

To sum up, we have traded our gold magnificently well because we traded a sterile asset that has constantly decreased in value for a live asset that has returned to us a magnificent income that is increasing year-by-year. Because we used our gold to establish a position of supremacy in the free world in three major industries—oil, computers and automobiles, the investment of these funds by American industries abroad, not only in these three industries but in countless others, has done more to make Europe and ourselves prosperous than any single action taken to date. To stop this flow is like depriving a man of the oxygen he needs to live, because without our investment abroad, Europe is likely to stagnate, and we would in fact precipitate a gigantic depression worldwide. To cut off this supply because we are fearful of the value of our currency or fearful of losing our gold supply

is akin to committing economic suicide. Certainly, there is no doubt that it would tend to limit the economic development of the free world and increase the possibility of violent revolution.

In the foregoing, I would like to distinguish clearly between private investment abroad and public expenditure abroad. Private investment is undertaken by skilled businessmen for economic reasons and must in the long run prove in the aggregate to be sound economically. On the other hand, investments abroad made by Government agencies or semi-public agencies having standards of credit-worthiness lower than those of the World Bank are made for political reasons and on the whole are likely to turn out badly in an economic sense. If, therefore, there is to be any limitation on investment abroad, common sense suggests that it be to the public and quasi public sector.

Both Walter Maynard and I who are in agreement on these matters are willing to do all we can for you and your committee at any time. Walter has had long experience with the practical economics of Wall Street. I have had more experience in the actual dealing with international currencies, but I do think that our combined experience might be helpful to you. Incidentally, I wrote a book in the early 1930s on the British economy in which I predicted England would be forced off gold long before anyone expected. I simply mention this as part of my credentials for making my voice heard in the present situation.

No discussion of this kind is at all complete without some reference to gold. The bold facts are that the monetary authorities of the world have been unable to add any gold to their reserves in the past two years, and no monetary reserves of gold are likely to be available in the future, since the supply tends to decrease while demand for ornament and industry and hoarding will increase. Sooner or later, therefore, the great nations of the world will be forced to abandon their present efforts at stretching the available supply, such as the special drawing rights recently agreed upon at Rio, and something new will have to be developed. In our view, the something new should be merely ascendancy of the United States dollar. If the United States were now to declare unilaterally, while we still have the world's largest gold reserves, that we will neither buy nor sell gold, there would, of course, be a flurry in the price. But the speculators, including the French and Swiss, would soon realize that they could only dispose of their gold through commercial channels and the price would then fall. Meantime, the dollar as the currency in the largest supply would become the standard medium for conducting international trade, and all other countries would find themselves required as a practical matter to maintain a fixed rate of parity with it. I believe this possibility is clearly recognized but never mentioned by Europe's financial authorities and bankers, and it is a prospect that they intensely dislike. Hence, the scramble to make the present obsolete system work.

With every good wish, I remain,
Sincerely,

WILLIAM WASSERMAN,

American Iron and Steel Institute

HON. JAMES G. FULTON

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 27, 1968

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I in-

clude the following letter from the American Iron and Steel Institute in the RECORD:

AMERICAN IRON AND STEEL INSTITUTE,
Washington, D.C., February 2, 1968.
Congressman JAMES G. FULTON,
U.S. House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN FULTON: On behalf of the domestic steel industry, I wish to express my deep appreciation for the action you took recently in sponsoring a bill to establish a quota limitation on steel imports.

In order that you may continue to be fully informed, we wish to advise you that steel imports rose to an all-time high in tonnage and in dollar value in 1967. Steel imports rose from 10.8 million tons in 1966 to 11.5 million tons in 1967, and the dollar value of such imports increased from approximately \$1.2 billion in 1966 to \$1.3 billion in 1967.

Moreover, the value of steel imports exceeded the value of steel exports by more than \$877 million. When the figure is adjusted to exclude government-financed exports and to include freight and insurance charges—normally included in the value of imports of most other nations—our steel trade deficit in 1967 amounted to \$1.1 billion.

The dangerous increase in steel imports, accounting for approximately 12.2% of our national consumption of steel in 1967, must not continue. Further increases from government-owned and government-supported foreign plants are inconsistent with our national security interests and our balance of payments objectives.

We hope we may count on your continued support.

With best wishes.

Sincerely,

JACK ROCHE, President.

State Department's Success

HON. DANTE B. FASCELL

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 27, 1968

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, the State Department is to be commended for the diligent efforts which it has made to secure the release of approximately 850 American citizens held in Communist Cuba against their will. All these Americans originally chose to stay in Cuba despite official warnings from the U.S. Government. Since then, however, they have changed their minds because of the tyrannical behavior of the Castro regime.

While it is to be hoped that a better arrangement will eventually be worked out, the State Department, through the good offices of Mexico, has reached an agreement which will allow one plane-load of Americans to be brought from Cuba to Mexico each month.

On February 12, the Miami Herald, in an editorial, commented on this recent and hopeful development:

AMERICANS OUT OF CUBA

At last, regular flights have started to bring out of Red Cuba some 850 United States citizens and their Cuban families.

A plane owned by the Mexican Ministry of Communications and Transportation went to Havana to ferry out the first 73 of them. The word from the Mexican Foreign Ministry is that the Cuban regime has agreed to permit one flight during the first week of each month to bring home the Americans, mostly of Cuban descent.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

The once-a-month schedule means it will take more than three years to airlift all of those wanting to leave.

The February flight was the fifth in a series which has been sporadic, to put it mildly. The Mexicans also arranged two such trips in December of 1966 and two more last December.

We have spoken sternly in the past of the plight of these 850 U.S. citizens, held in Communist Cuba against their will. They are entitled to the same rights, freedoms and immunities as other Americans, including the right to come home. We considered Washington remiss in ignoring them.

The new arrangement, although far from ideal, doubtless is due to effective diplomacy by the State Department. We commend those who got action. It shows what can be done when there's a will to enforce respect for American citizenship.

Homeownership

HON. JOHN D. DINGELL

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 26, 1968

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, homeownership is firmly established as a desirable goal toward which many newly formed families aspire.

It is virtually an American tradition.

There are a great many benefits in a family's owning its home that are widely recognized, and the appeal has no relationship to the level of the family's income.

There is the sense of becoming an established part of the community.

There is the accomplishment of being able to buy something of substantial value through accumulation of equity by monthly payments.

There is the reality of community involvement, of neighborliness, and of having earned a place in one's community.

I could go on enumerating additional alluring features in home buying, but I believe the point has been made. Homeownership benefits society by contributing to stability. It stimulates human as well as physical renewal.

We have taken a number of steps over the past three decades to make it easier for more families—especially those progressively further down the income scale—to buy their homes.

In my judgment, it is time that this process is carried further.

The President proposes a new homeownership program that I find to be of considerable interest. The Federal Government will provide variable interest payments directly to the mortgage lender on behalf of the qualified home buyer. This could reduce interest costs to as low as 1 percent and enable the buyer to make monthly payments equaling no more than 20 percent of his income. The amount of payment made will change with the buyer's varying income. This program would be a major breakthrough which would enhance the opportunities for homeownership for those in the lower income brackets.

I think it is up to us to bring this means into being.

February 27, 1968

Congressman Joe L. Evin Honored

HON. SAMUEL N. FRIEDEL

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 27, 1968

Mr. FRIEDEL. Mr. Speaker, it has come to my attention that one of our very distinguished and able colleagues has recently been honored by the National Association of Business and Educational Radio, and I know the other Members of this body will be as gratified and pleased as I was to hear the good news.

The January 1968 issue of the periodical Action, reported that the National Association of Business and Educational Radio presented its Award of Merit and a bronze plaque to Representative JOE L. EVINS, of Tennessee, in recognition of his outstanding contributions to the growth and development of the land mobile radio industry. This organization represents some 85,000 small businessmen as well as police and fire departments, licensed by the Federal Communications Commission to operate land mobile radio facilities.

As chairman of the House Select Committee on Small Business and also as the chairman of the Subcommittee on Independent Offices of the House Appropriations Committee, Congressman Evin's evidenced his deep concern about the problems the small businesses encountered because of the lack of sufficient frequencies to accommodate their needs by conducting hearings to determine the extent of the problem and try to find a solution.

In my own city of Baltimore, I have received many complaints from small businesses who lost customers because of the lack of adequate two-way mobile radio frequencies, which I brought to the attention of the Federal Communications Commission. However, I am sure it was largely through the efforts of Congressman Joe L. Evin's that the FCC has now made 110 new channels available for business and industrial uses and 36 channels available for public safety use.

Because this matter is of interest to businessmen all over the country, I include the article entitled "NABER Honors Tennessee Congressman Joe L. Evin's" in the pages of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

NABER HONORS TENNESSEE CONGRESSMAN JOE L. EVIN'S

On Tuesday, December 5, 1967, in very impressive ceremonies NABER's Executive Vice President and General Manager, Val J. Williams, presented the Association's Award of Merit to the Honorable Joe L. Evin, Congressman from the Fourth District of Tennessee. The plaque, containing a detailed outline of the state of Tennessee in bronze, cited Congressman Evin's for his outstanding leadership on behalf of all of the small businessmen throughout the nation.

In making the presentation to Congressman Evin's, Williams said,

Congressman Evin's, two years ago the board of directors of the National Association of Business and Educational Radio, Inc. (NABER) established an Award of Merit. This award honors those who have made outstanding contributions to the growth and development of the Land Mobile Radio Industry.

The most restrictive problem facing the thousands of businesses and organizations who must rely on mobile radio communications today is the lack of sufficient frequencies to accommodate their needs. The resultant jamming, crowding and confusion has reached the proportions of a major communications crisis.

Since the radio magnetic spectrum is a natural resource, its assignment and control falls under the direction of a federal government agency—the Federal Communications Commission. Repeated appeals by the small businessmen, police and fire departments, emergency agencies, hospitals, etc., over the past decade to the FCC for relief have produced no tangible long range results.

In May, 1966, NABER was granted a hearing before the House Small Business Subcommittee #6 which came under your direction as Chairman of the Select Committee on Small Business. When the report of Subcommittee #6 was presented to you, you, Congressman Evans, enthusiastically endorsed the recommendations of the subcommittee and incorporated them in your full committee report to the Congress.

Also, as a member of the Committee on Appropriations and Chairman of the Subcommittee on Independent Offices, you made clear to the Chairman of the FCC your grave concern for the conditions under which businesses are forced to operate two-way radio and your sincere wish that the FCC would initiate forthright actions to provide more radio frequencies to all land mobile radio users at the earliest possible date.

You and the members of your committee have continually followed up these proposals through speeches and letters urging all possible speed by the Federal Communications Commission to relieve the congestion and overcrowding in the land mobile radio frequencies to help the small businessmen throughout the nation, who must rely upon two-way radio to operate successful businesses.

Congressman Joe L. Evans, on behalf of the over 100,000 Business Radio Applicants throughout the United States, may I present to you, a truly outstanding public servant, this Award of Merit.

In accepting the award, Congressman Evans inserted the following remarks:

The National Association of Business and Educational Radio, Inc., is an organization which represents the best interests of some 85,000 small businessmen and organizations—including police and fire departments—licensed by the Federal Communications Commission to operate land mobile radio facilities under the Business Radio Services rules of the Commission.

As business has expanded and the necessity for immediate communications increased, this Association has endeavored to encourage the availability of additional radio frequencies to accommodate this increasing need for radio services.

As the matter of communications is important to many small businessmen, the House Small Business Committee has conducted hearings, studies and investigations in an effort to assist them and others interested in obtaining radio communications licenses.

The House Small Business Committee has urged the Federal Communications Commission to expand service and make additional radio frequencies available for this service.

Representatives of the National Association of Business and Educational Radio testified before our Committee and provided helpful and useful information on this effort to broaden mobile land radio services. As a result of our hearings, the Committee recommended that the FCC undertake action to allocate additional radio frequency spectrum to small business and other users of land mobile radio. A special Advisory Committee to the FCC has made recommendations substantially the same as the Committee.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

With the various studies, hearings and investigations of Congressional Committees it is hoped that the FCC will proceed to take favorable action on the matter for small businessmen who depend upon radio for quick and immediate communications.

The President of the National Association of Business and Educational Radio, Inc., Mr. John M. Hodgson, and Mr. Val J. Williams, and others who have worked diligently and faithfully to assist businessmen in this regard are to be congratulated.

Obnoxious Aquatic Plants

HON. EDWARD J. GURNEY

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 27, 1968

Mr. GURNEY. Mr. Speaker, today, with bipartisan cosponsors from Florida, Louisiana, Hawaii, New York, and Alabama, I introduced a bill to amend the River and Harbor Act of 1958 with respect to control and eradication of obnoxious aquatic plants.

The problems caused by these growths are becoming of such magnitude that the matter is creating an emergency situation in our waterways, lakes, and streams. Many of these bodies of water are becoming so polluted that water intakes are becoming clogged. Dangers of flooding are eminent because runoff water cannot escape. Boats cannot be used and recreational fishing grounds are being destroyed. This is particularly the case in Florida. The problems of other States are of a similar concern.

The bill will seek to supplement the very excellent comprehensive program now being conducted by the Department of the Army, Corps of Engineers, under the authority of the River and Harbor Act of 1958.

The bill will require closer coordination and reporting of both aquatic weed research activities and of field project operations, conducted by the very many Federal—12 Federal divisions and seven Federal agencies, under the authority of a number of Federal laws—and State organizations engaged in the associated work. The appropriate State agencies involved in the reporting procedure would be those coordinating the control efforts in each of the involved States. Thus, States would be encouraged to coordinate these activities within their own boundaries, as Florida is already doing. Unless the aquatic plant problem is attacked in a comprehensive manner, with coordination of efforts, there is no point in requesting added funding efforts.

The bill will, in addition, specifically expand weed eradication and control activities into the critical area of elodea growths. The 15- to 20-foot growth is rapidly spreading throughout the State of Florida. There is now no method known to kill the weed below the mud level of the water it pollutes. Thus, it is back in 3 months, even if destruction is attempted. Elodea is now established in most of Florida's drainage canals, many lakes, and rivers. A small amount of research is being done on this plant, but it is not enough.

The bill will further provide for, and encourage, the Department of Army, Corps of Engineers, to favorably consider allocating, where the need is apparent, research and development funds to the State agencies authorized to coordinate State aquatic weed programs. With a State agency responsible for coordinating aquatic plant activities within each State, there would be an excellent agent for deciding upon distribution of funds on the basis of effective efforts.

The bill, thus, would seek to obtain the most benefits out of the funding for the aquatic weed programs. It seeks to implement coordination of goals, funding, and programming under the central authority of one program, the most comprehensive effort. Coordination is badly needed. In that regard, more than five percent of the proposed legislation introduced in the 89th Congress was related to water resources. The measures were referred to no less than 13 of the 20 standing committees in the House of Representatives and 11 of the 16 in the Senate. In addition, the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy considered and reported at least one bill affecting water resources development.

Additional efforts in the field of obnoxious aquatic growths are essential. Public Law 89-298, the present law providing for a comprehensive aquatic weed program, authorizes up to \$5 million a year to be directed toward control and eradication of obnoxious aquatic weeds. Yet, in fiscal year 1968 only \$900,000 was appropriated. The amount to be requested for fiscal 1969 will remain at that same amount. Funds are being supplied through a variety of other sources, but the approaches are piecemeal. Thus, while in my own State of Florida, there are valuable projects focused on the solution of aquatic weed problems, the major ones are hampered by a grave lack of funds. For example, the U.S. Department of Agriculture crop research station in Fort Lauderdale operates on an annual budget that can support only three research scientists. Yet, it conducts the only significant aquatic weed control research for seven Southern States east of the Mississippi.

The comparatively small effort takes place against the background of the activities of the water hyacinth and other obnoxious weeds. The problems caused by the water hyacinth are many. It pollutes water supplies through growth and decomposition. It constitutes a grave health hazard. Mosquito larvae are provided an ideal breeding place. It kills fish by pollution and oxygen starvation. It obstructs drainage and waterflow. It interferes with navigation and recreation.

It is estimated that the oxygen-depleting factor caused by one acre of water hyacinth is equal to the sewage created by 40 people. Yet, in Florida alone, an estimated 90,000 acres of fresh water are still covered with water hyacinths, after decades of control operation.

The States of Alabama, California, Georgia, Hawaii, Illinois, Louisiana, Maryland, New Jersey, New York, Oregon, South Carolina, North Carolina, and many others are also engaged in the aquatic weed battle.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

February 27, 1968

The problems created by aquatic weeds continue to increase at overwhelming speed at a time when all attention is focused upon the grave hazards of the pollution of our air. The pollution and destruction of our waters is perhaps even more critical.

I urge prompt consideration of my requests.

The True Administration of Justice Is the Firmest Pillar of Good Government

HON. HERBERT TENZER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 27, 1968

Mr. TENZER. Mr. Speaker, on April 11, 1967, I sponsored legislation—H.R. 8376—in the House of Representatives to authorize and direct the U.S. District Court for the Eastern District of New York to sit in Mineola as well as Brooklyn. The enthusiastic response to this legislation from the members of the bar of our Federal district demonstrated that this enactment was long overdue.

The U.S. District Court for the Eastern District of New York serves Brooklyn, Queens, Richmond, Nassau, and Suffolk Counties, but the court held sessions only at the Federal courthouse in Brooklyn. The counties of Nassau and Suffolk, with a combined population in excess of 2.3 million persons, were long inconvenienced by the absence of Federal court facilities to serve their needs. These residents of Nassau and Suffolk were obliged to travel to Brooklyn—sometimes covering a distance of 129 miles—to serve as jurors, as witnesses, or as litigants in civil and criminal cases now tried only at the Federal courthouse in Brooklyn. This legislation recognizes the population growth of Long Island, the judicial needs of the area, and provides for the convenience of attorneys, litigants, and witnesses on Long Island.

Nassau and Suffolk Counties now generate 36 percent of the cases on the docket of the eastern district. The district ranks eighth of all the 91 districts in the United States in civil caseload and fourth in criminal caseload.

On September 22, 1967, the Judicial Conference of the United States specifically endorsed the Tenzer bill which called for the holding of sessions at Mineola. The Judicial Conference not only approved H.R. 8376, and sent its favorable report to the House Judiciary Committee, but it also specifically rejected other bills which called for holding sessions of the eastern district court at other locations.

On November 20, 1967, the House of Representatives passed the Tenzer bill. The House action came by voice vote only 7 months after I originally introduced the measure.

On December 11, 1967, the U.S. Senate, by unanimous approval, passed the Tenzer bill in the identical form as that passed by the House. The legislation was then sent to the President for signature.

The House and Senate—and the Judiciary Committees of both bodies—acted

with unprecedented speed in approving my bill.

It must be noted that passage of the legislation was accelerated and facilitated by a board of supervisors resolution which authorized the use and occupancy of space, to be allotted in the court buildings maintained by the county, for court facilities to enable the U.S. District Court for the Eastern District of New York to conduct its business in Mineola without cost to the U.S. Government.

On December 19, President Johnson signed the Tenzer bill into law—Public Law 90-217.

The first session of the U.S. district court at Mineola was held on January 12, 1968. The appropriate ceremonial session, held in the new Supreme Court building, marked a significant event in the history of the U.S. District Court for the Eastern District of New York and in the future development of Nassau and Suffolk Counties.

Present at this monumental first session were Chief Judge Joseph C. Zavatt, presiding, and Judge Jack Weinstein. The other judges of the eastern district court who participated are Judge John R. Bartels, Judge Jacob Mishler, Judge John F. Dooling, Jr., Judge Matthew T. Abruzzo, Judge Leo Rayfiel, and Judge Walter Bruchhausen. Judge George Rosling could not attend because he was presiding at the session of the district court in Brooklyn.

Others participating included Nassau County executive Eugene H. Nickerson, town of Hempstead presiding supervisor, Ralph G. Caso, and many other distinguished members of the bar.

At this session, the court heard applications of attorneys for admission to the bar of this court. Mr. Richard C. Cahn, chairman of the Federal Courts committee of the Suffolk County Bar Association, moved the admission of the Suffolk County members. Senator John R. Dunne, president of the Bar Association of Nassau County, moved the admission of the Nassau County members. Mr. Joseph F. Soviero, a former U.S. attorney, moved the admission of some 84 members of the Nassau Lawyers' Association of Long Island. A total of 388 attorneys were admitted to practice before the Federal courts of the eastern and southern districts of New York.

Mr. Speaker, the close of this first ceremonial session of the U.S. District Court for the Eastern District of New York marked the beginning of a new era for the Long Island judicial process. The lawyers and residents of Long Island who previously had to travel to Brooklyn to participate in Federal court proceedings will now enjoy needed relief from this inconvenience. Further, the authorization for the holding of a term of court at Mineola may result in a diminishing cost to the Government where the Government is a party to the litigation in the reduction of mileage fees for jurors and witnesses.

My bill directing the Eastern District Court of New York to sit in Mineola, as well as in Brooklyn, is a major first step to the development of a Federal complex in Nassau County. While this complex is now only a dream, I expect to see it blossom into reality in the near future. With

the rapidly expanding population in Nassau and Suffolk counties, we must plan now for future needs and the proposed Federal complex is one way to insure adequate Federal services to the more than 2.4 million residents of Nassau and Suffolk Counties on Long Island.

I insert in the Record at this point excerpts from the minutes of the first Federal court session at Mineola:

CEREMONIAL SESSION OF THE U.S. DISTRICT COURT FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK, HELD AT MINEOLA, N.Y., JANUARY 12, 1968

Honorable Joseph C. Zavatt, Chief United States District Judge, presiding, and Lewis Orcel, clerk, United States District Court for the Eastern District of New York.

Guest speakers: Honorable Eugene H. Nickerson, Honorable Ralph G. Caso, Honorable Frank A. Gulotta, Congressman Herbert Tenzer, Mr. Henry G. Wenzel III, Mr. Richard Cahn, Senator John R. Dunne, Mr. Nathan Zausmer, Mr. Joseph F. Soviero, Jr.

Mr. LEWIS ORCEL. All rise.

United States District Court for the Eastern District of New York is now in session. Please be seated.

Hon. JOSEPH C. ZAVATT. The judges constituting our Court (who are with us today), in the order of their seniority, and our senior judges who are with us today, in like order, are Judge John R. Bartels, on my extreme right; Judge Jacob Mishler; Judge John F. Dooling, Jr.

Then you notice a vacant chair. That should be occupied by Judge George Rosling; but he is in Brooklyn today minding the store. Therefore, he cannot be with us today.

Judge Jack B. Weinstein; Judge Matthew T. Abruzzo; Judge Leo Rayfiel; and Judge Walter Bruchhausen. We are still hoping that the two vacancies on our bench will be filled before next summer.

We are assembled here today to mark a significant event in the history of the United States District Court for the Eastern District of New York and in the development of Nassau and Suffolk Counties.

On December 19th, the President signed into law the Tenzer Bill—H.R. 8376, to be precise—which amends Section 112(c) of Title 28 of the United States Code so as to provide that our Court shall sit not only at Brooklyn but also at Mineola.

The enthusiastic response to this legislation from the members of the Bar of the two easternmost counties of our federal district demonstrates, over and above the impressive vital statistics, that this enactment was long overdue.

With no federal facility on Long Island presently available to enable this Court to comply with this legislative mandate, the holding of sessions of our Court in Mineola must depend for some limited time upon the hospitality and the cooperation of the executive, legislative and judicial branches of the Government of Nassau County.

Our ceremonial session today, for example, is possible only because we have been permitted the use of this commodious central jury room in your beautiful and functional new Supreme Court Building, which, fortunately, is available on a Friday afternoon.

The County Executive of this County has supported, from its inception, the move to bring the facilities of our Federal District Court to the people of Long Island. Fortunately, he is no stranger to the federal judicial system. He served as law secretary to Judge Augustus N. Hand of the Court of Appeals for our Circuit and later as law secretary to Chief Justice Harlan F. Stone of the Supreme Court of the United States.

The Court recognizes the Honorable Eugene H. Nickerson, County Executive of Nassau County, and Chairman of the Board of Supervisors.

Hon. EUGENE H. NICKERSON. Thank you, Judge.

May it please the Court, on behalf of the citizens of Nassau County, may I thank those who have been responsible for bringing the Federal Court here to our County; to Judge Zavatt for his interest and enthusiasm and practical effectiveness; to Congressman Tenzer for proposing and obtaining passage of the necessary legislation, the Tenzer Bill; to the members of the Bar who have supported the measure; to the members of the United States District Court for consenting to sit here; to the members of the Supreme and County Courts who have welcomed their federal brethren so graciously; particularly, Judge Young who so gladly relinquished one small room in his munificent and spacious chambers—two rooms, he tells me.

The people of our County express to all of these their sincere appreciation.

The Tenzer Bill passed the House without debate; it passed the Senate without debate; was sent to the President in December and became law on December 19th, 1967. That is less than a month ago.

I think that two activists outside the County government merit special mention today:

Richard Cahn, who planted the seed, and Congressman Tenzer, who made the delivery in much less than the normal period of legislative gestation.

Later in the program we will hear from Mr. Cahn, but the court now recognizes Congressman Herbert Tenzer of the Fifth Congressional District.

(Mr. Tenzer's remarks revised and condensed.)

Congressman HERBERT TENZER. May it please the court, judges of the Federal Court, distinguished judges of the State Supreme Court and other courts in Nassau County, distinguished Judge Beldock and others in the room, County Executive, Ralph Caso, Presiding Supervisor, and Judge Gulotta. On the day that this bill was debated in the House, I engaged in a colloquy with my good friend Congressman Wydler, whom I am glad to see here today, the Speaker called me up and said that this Bill broke some kind of a record for speed from the date of introduction to passage in the House. According to the records of the Judiciary Committee, I think it did break a record for a Judiciary Committee bill calling for holding a session of a District Court to be held in another part of the district. The Speaker gave me the gavel which he used on that day. I am not going to give it to you, Judge Zavatt, but I would like you to use it today, if you will, so that I may have that as an additional momento and remembrance.

The distinguished Chairman of the Judiciary Committee whom you mentioned sends his greetings to you and to all the other judges of the court and to all of my colleagues at the Bar who are gathered here today.

The President of the United States sends his greetings to all. Since there was no special signing ceremony for this bill, the President acceded to my request and is sending a limited number of pens to persons who participated in making this possible. I would like to symbolically present to you, Chief Judge Zavatt, a pen, one of the ten pens which were used in connection with the signing of H.R. 8376, enacted into law, on December 18th, when it was signed by the President. I will frame these pens appropriately with a copy of the Bill and see that all of those entitled to recognition in connection with this bill will receive one.

Due credit was given to Mr. Cahn, whom I never had the pleasure of meeting—and if he is here, I certainly would like to meet him. I would like to pay a tribute to him because of the very comprehensive and learned document which he prepared with respect to the growth of Nassau and Suffolk County—its geography, its history, its development, its

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

standing amongst the counties of the United States.

The very fact that the Eastern District Court of the United States, one of the 91 district courts of the United States, ranks eighth in the caseload of civil cases—I can assure Ralph Caso we do not have to worry about providing enough business for the court. We already have it. Though the court has the eighth highest caseload of all the district courts of the United States in civil cases, I am not proud of the fact that it also ranks fourth amongst all the districts of the United States in caseload of criminal cases; but that is true.

There is one other name I would like to mention here, with due respect to Mr. Cahn. The first one who wrote to me in 1964—during the time I was aspiring to become a member of the Congress of the United States—was Bill Rudin, Referee in Bankruptcy. Bill Rudin told me that there was a great need for this and asked my opinion about it. He also told me about the problems they were confronted with in respect to referee's chambers.

I went to see Judge Zavatt; personally telephoned and spoke to Judge Lombard; discussed the subject with Administrative Office personnel; followed through personally with the members and staff of the Judiciary Committee, and was also in contact with the Administrative Office of the Judicial Conference.

This proves to you, fellow brothers of the Bar, that when your case is well prepared, the Presiding Judge will receive it; when your homework has been done, half of the battle is won.

I claim no authorship of the idea. There are many who are entitled to the credit, but just like the patient who has had four doctors and each one prescribes a different medicine, if the patient gets well, they can all have the credit for the cure. Today, I would like to pay tribute to all who participated—all who ever had the dream—all who gave recognition to the fact that Nassau County was growing. Perhaps when this court proves that it was needed—it will be properly housed, because it is already evident that the facilities now assigned to it are inadequate before we start. I hope that we will remain united and unified in purpose, so that when the report which I have requested from the General Services Administration with respect to the possibilities of a federal building for Nassau county is rendered—we will work together to achieve it. On the last day of the session of the House, my colleagues, Congressman Wydler and Congressman Grover, introduced a bill for that purpose. I think we will have to do a little more homework before the bill will get to see the light of day.

Where there is a united and unified public need, we should not let politics enter into our activities in order to achieve our goals. Therefore, I pay special tribute to Judge Zavatt, who was constantly on the telephone, guiding and working with me in every step and at every turn in the road. He did not let me lose time by taking the wrong road and the wrong course.

I thank you for your kind comments today. I have only been the tool properly applied to give effect to this wonderful project that adds to the judicial history of Nassau County and to the great judicial history of the United States courts.

To my colleagues at the Bar who are seeking admission today, I would say to them, remember that respect for law and order starts with respect for the courts of our land. Those who come in contact with you and those you come in contact with the courts do not understand that very simple, simple statement. There are too many who would criticize the courts because they interpret the laws as they are. If the laws are not well-written, they require change. This is the orderly process which represents the great strength of our American democracy. I hope that you as officers of the court will go forth into your

respective communities, teach and preach that law and order will come from respect for the courts which administer the law.

Thank you.

Honorable JOSEPH C. ZAVATT. Our court can make only a modest beginning in Mineola. But, at least, it will be a first step in the right direction.

The scope of our activity will be governed by the facilities which the County makes available.

If, as appears likely, we will have the use of only one courtroom and one set of chambers, there will be no clerk's office, jury commissioner's office, central jury room, marshal's office, probation department, United States Attorney's office, detention cell, or conference rooms.

Every detail of our sessions in Mineola will have to be planned in and supervised from the judge's chambers, which must house the judge, his secretary, his law secretary, his court attendant, and must also serve as the headquarters of the courtroom deputy, the court reporter, a marshal and such other personnel as may be required from time to time.

Of necessity, greater demands will be made on our chambers than on those which are only one unit of a fully established court, with auxiliary facilities and supporting personnel.

We cannot announce today an assured date for the opening of our first regular session in Mineola. The first Monday in March is a tentative target date. But we must emphasize that, at present, that date can only be tentative.

We are in the process of formulating a policy pursuant to which cases will be assigned for trial in Mineola.

Under consideration is a procedure whereby attorneys will be able to file their initial pleadings and subsequent papers with the Clerk in Brooklyn, by mail, and, by the same means, arrange for the service of process by the Marshal.

Obviously, we will not be equipped to try criminal cases here. The trial of civil non-jury cases will present fewer problems than the trial of cases by jury. As to the latter, the Clerk is working on a proposed plan for empanelling jurors in Mineola, which he will submit to the court for its consideration.

As soon as we are prepared to hold sessions here, a schedule of assignments will be adopted, under which our judges will sit in rotation—as the Mineola business of the court requires.

My colleagues and I look forward to meeting all of those present who will attend the reception at the home of the Bar Association of Nassau County.

Judges rise.

By the Clerk: All rise.

This special session of the United States District Court for the Eastern District of New York stands adjourned sine die.

Mr. Speaker, in his remarks Chief Judge Joseph Zavatt noted that the only flaw in the present new court at Mineola, is the limited space available to the Court. The court at Mineola can only hope to make a modest beginning with its restricted quarters.

The scope of its activity for the present will be governed by the facilities which the county makes available. It is for this reason that I have urged the construction of a Federal complex at Mitchel Field.

I requested the Administrator of the General Service Administration to undertake a survey of the needs for a Federal building in Nassau County. This building would not only house the other Federal agencies but also the Federal Court facilities.

Today the Federal agencies are oc-

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

cupying 81,830 square feet of space at 16 different locations in Nassau and Suffolk Counties and paying a total annual rental in excess of \$356,000. The widespread facilities are an inconvenience to citizens and the cost of renting space is an additional load on the tax-payers.

I recently received a letter from the Administrator of GSA, Lawson B. Knott, Jr., stating that the General Services Administration is now preparing a plan for the construction of a Federal building at Mitchel Field. This plan will be submitted to the Bureau of the Budget.

To keep the record straight on this matter, I include at this point excerpts from the report which I requested from GSA Administrator Lawson B. Knott, Jr.:

Your letter of December 20 requested that a survey be made of the Federal Space requirements on Long Island, New York.

We have recently completed a survey of the Federal space requirements in Nassau, Queens and Suffolk Counties and have identified the need for future construction to provide for the consolidated housing of the agencies on Long Island. It was concluded that the best means of satisfying this need would be by construction of a Federal Office Building and an adjacent Post Office mail handling and vehicle maintenance facility on a Government-owned site, reserved for Federal construction, at the former Mitchel Field, Nassau County.

Estimated cost and other data needed for the preparation of a prospectus for the proposed public building complex to be constructed on the Government-owned property reserved at Mitchel Field are being assembled. When the prospectus is completed it will be submitted to the Bureau of the Budget for review.

In conclusion, I think I should point out that even if the events outlined above occur this year, there are budgetary problems which must be overcome before the proposed building complex at Mitchel Field can become a reality.

State of New Jersey Denies Auto Insurance Increase

HON. PETER W. RODINO, JR.
OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 27, 1968

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, last week Mr. Charles R. Howell, the New Jersey State Commissioner of Insurance, made a very outstanding and noteworthy decision, a decision that has all the earmarks of becoming a precedent-setting method for evaluating the criteria for future auto insurance rate setting cases. Commissioner Howell denied the auto insurance industry's application for an overall 19.6-percent premium increase. This decision will not only save New Jersey drivers some \$40,000,000 a year, but more importantly for the future, it establishes the validity of including an insurance company's investment income as a major factor in determining the justification for a rate increase. Moreover, Commissioner Howell has gone beyond the mechanics of the question of rate increases by also calling upon the State legislature to create a commission

to study the feasibility of changing the present tort liability system along the lines of the Keeton-O'Connell basic protection plan.

Attorney Isadore Glauberman also deserves the public's highest praise for his role as public defender at the open hearings held last year, on the rate increase application, and for his excellent analysis of why and how the rating bureau's case for higher premiums failed to take into account the full profit picture of the auto insurance industry.

Mr. Speaker, it is no less appropriate to mention and to praise the crusading role of the Newark Star-Ledger in its longstanding, in-depth, comprehensive feature coverage of the auto insurance mess.

Three recent articles covering the State of New Jersey's rate boost denial are as follows:

[From the Newark (N.J.) Star-Ledger, Feb. 22, 1968]

MOTORISTS SAVE \$42 MILLION: CAR INSURANCE BOOST DENIED

(By Herb Jaffe)

New Jersey's 3.1 million motorists were awarded a \$42 million a year savings yesterday when Insurance Commissioner Charles R. Howell threw out the request of two rating bureaus for an average 20.6 per cent auto liability insurance increase.

In taking this action, Howell established a precedent for the entire nation. No state has ever before completely denied an auto insurance increase after conducting public hearings, using industry investment income as a prime reason.

In justifying his long-awaited decision, Howell alluded directly to the income insurance companies derive from the investment of unearned policyholder premiums and loss reserves. He said, such income should rightfully be credited to policyholders before any rate increase can be determined.

FIGURES CRITICIZED

Howell's determination also explained that figures and rate making formulas supplied by the applicants, the National Bureau of Casualty Underwriters and the National Automobile Underwriters Association for the year 1965—upon which the requests were filed—were exaggerated and over-estimated.

Howell also denied applications for an average 5.3 per cent increase in physical damage coverage, based on the same reasoning as his denial for liability insurance which covers bodily injury and property damage.

"We found that the five days of public hearings last summer and fall proved extremely helpful and purposeful in making this decision," Howell said during a news conference in his Trenton office.

Howell praised Isadore Glauberman of Jersey City, the public defender at the hearings, for "a tremendous effort in an undertaking that was extremely complex."

"Mr. Glauberman's efforts plus our unique statutes in New Jersey were such that allowed us to make this determination," Howell said.

In announcing his decision, Howell formally requested that the Legislature create a commission for the purpose of conducting "a thorough objective study of our whole motor vehicle tort liability system with full study of the pros and cons of a 'basic protection' plan along the lines of the Keeton-O'Connell proposals. This plan has met with considerable support and interest of various companies and leaders of the insurance industry."

Glauberman said he was delighted with the decision. "This is a victory for the more than three million drivers in New Jersey at a

February 27, 1968

savings of more than \$40 million a year. For this I am gratified," he said.

Stephen B. Wiley, attorney for the rating bureaus, would not comment on the decision. "I want to study the determination before I discuss it," he explained.

According to a spokesman for the two bureaus, "no one here has as yet read the decision. We will probably have something to say after we study the commissioner's determination."

There are two choices open to the rating bureaus. They can either appeal the decision, or they can make a completely new request with a new filing.

Mrs. Marilyn Schauer, assistant attorney general and counsel to the Department of Banking and Insurance, explained that the rating bureaus have 45 days with which to enter an appeal.

A new filing, which could be anticipated regardless of any decision to appeal the verdict, would take considerably longer and would involve a new set of figures and other underwriting data.

PLAN DISCLOSED

The commissioner's request for a legislative study of the tort liability system was disclosed by The Star-Ledger last November. At that time sources close to Howell explained that the commissioner would request an in-depth study of the entire auto insurance system, in line with similar action taken by several other states.

"I feel there is no need at this time to delve into the entire question," Howell said yesterday. "The auto insurance picture has changed recently. It is now obvious that some federal agency or congressional committee will look into the intricacies of the system."

"My recommendation is for the State of New Jersey to study the compensatory system," Howell said. He emphasized that he neither favors nor opposes the Keeton-O'Connell plan.

"I am very interested in the plan, and I would like to know more about it," Howell explained, "but I haven't made any decision on it as yet. This is one of the reasons why a study commission is needed—to enlighten all of us on the Keeton-O'Connell plan."

The Keeton-O'Connell plan was formulated three years ago by two law professors, and its basic features include compulsory auto insurance and abolition of the fault principle in claims for the first \$10,000, with extension of the existing liability system thereafter.

SPECIFIC BOOSTS

Three weeks ago Rep. William T. Cahill (R-6th Dist.) told The Star-Ledger that he was "predicting" there would be no rate increase. However, Cahill did not define the reasons.

Howell stressed that the industry's applications were for specific increases, totaling 19.6 per cent for bodily injury liability, 22.7 per cent for property damage liability, 6.8 per cent for collision and 1.6 per cent for all other physical damage coverages.

"These requests were worded specifically, and we answered them specifically. In past years, where we granted partial increases, the rating bureaus were also informed that we were refusing their initial request, but they immediately came back with an alternate proposal," Howell explained.

"This year, however, there were public hearings held on specific requests, and these requests have been denied," he added.

Howell, who praised Glauberman's efforts in presenting an informative brief, said in his determination that the rating bureau companies for liability insurance, representing approximately 40 per cent of the policyholders in the state, actually earned \$12 million more in premiums in 1965 than their figures showed, and he explained how this was brought out by Glauberman at the hearings.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

Howell said the bureau's figures for premiums only took into account the statutory limit of \$10,000 and \$20,000 for bodily injury and \$5,000 for property damage. "We had to take into consideration the excess limits here, too," Howell said.

Excess limits are the increased amounts of insurance paid for by policyholders above the statutory limits.

Another factor which accounted for the decision was the drop in the ratio of claim frequency—or the number of claims as compared to other years. According to Howell:

The bureau ignored this more favorable ratio of loss frequency under the assumption that the frequency decrease did not constitute a trend which should be used as a factor in connection with the rating proposal.

However, the lower frequency affected the average claim cost and should, accordingly, have had consideration by the bureau."

SURPRISE MOVE

The surprise move by Howell, however, was the emphasis which he placed on investment income. At the time that he announced public hearings on the matter last May, Howell said he was anxious to "take a serious look" into the investment earnings of insurance companies—an unprecedented move by any insurance commissioner.

In his decision, Howell said:

"Investment income must be considered pursuant to the New Jersey statutes which provide that the commissioner must consider 'the financial condition of the insurer' as a factor in determining whether the rate applied for is reasonable."

"Certainly, investment income is an essential element of the 'financial condition of the insurer'. Cases cited in the brief filed by Mr. Glauberman support the use of investment income as a factor in determining the reasonableness of rate increases."

OWN FORMULA

"Under the rating bureau's own formula, the assureds are charged for the increase in claim cost caused by the delay in paying claims but are not given any allowance in the form of a credit for interest or dividends earned on investments or the realized capital gains on investments acquired with premium dollars held in reserve to pay claims at a future date."

"I therefore conclude that income on investments and realized investment gains, both of which may vary from year to year, should be considered in determining the acceptability of any rate level change proposed . . ."

It is investment income, brought out at public hearings and used as a prime reason by the commissioner for denying a rate increase, that now makes the New Jersey decision a model for the rest of the United States.

As to future significant requests, Howell made it clear that public hearings will henceforth be an integral procedure in making decisions, based on the New Jersey insurance laws which do not deny the commissioner this prerogative.

COMMISSION POWER

Howell also indicated that a special legislative commission could defer future auto rate increases until its findings are released, unless there is some sudden urgency which could affect the financial stability of insurance companies.

Vincent J. Murphy, president of the New Jersey AFL-CIO issued a statement yesterday in which he said:

"We are delighted that Commissioner Howell has rejected the applications of insurance companies for drastic increases in premium rates for auto insurance. We congratulate him on his decision and express our thanks to consumer defender Isadore Glauberman for his excellent presentation of the objections to the proposed increases."

The State AFL-CIO has long been an

ardent opponent of auto insurance rate increases without hearings.

[From the Newark (N.J.) Star-Ledger, Feb. 23, 1968]

INSURERS ASSAIL INCREASE DENIAL

(By Herb Jaffe)

T. Lawrence Jones, president of the American Insurance Association in New York, yesterday deplored Wednesday's decision by New Jersey Banking and Insurance Commissioner Charles R. Howell, in which he denied the auto insurance industry's request for an average 20.6 per cent rate increase.

Jones took issue with Howell's decision which orders companies to include investment income in their rate making procedures before submitting applications for rate increases.

FIRST REACTION

The AIA represents more than 200 stock fire and casualty insurance companies and their subsidiaries, in addition to the National Bureau of Casualty Underwriters and the National Automobile Underwriters Association, the two rating bureaus which filed for the increase in New Jersey.

The statement by Jones, the first reaction by the industry to Howell's unprecedented decision, was primarily concerned with the use of investment income in determining rates—the issue which makes the decision unprecedented.

Jones charged that the inclusion of earnings from insurance company investments in rate-making "threatens the viability of the insurance business and will inhibit the ability of the property and casualty insurance companies to serve the growing needs of New Jersey's economy."

"This decision can only serve to make automobile insurance in New Jersey harder to get," Jones warned.

RISK FACTOR

Jones cited the findings of a recent study compiled by the Arthur D. Little Co. of Cambridge, Mass. The study was released by the research firm four weeks ago, after almost one year in the making.

It indicated that the industry's profits are less than half those of other industries with a similar risk factor, Jones pointed out, adding that Howell's decision will reduce the low rate of return even more, according to the findings of the Arthur D. Little report.

While the results of the study were not available at the time hearings on the proposed auto insurance rate increase were held last summer, Jones suggested that the conclusions of the Little study should have been considered when the decision was being prepared.

"The Little findings indicate that the net profits of the property and liability insurance field are significantly below those of other financial institutions and manufacturing industries," Jones said.

Continuing in behalf of the Little study as justification for a rate increase in New Jersey, Jones added that the findings are "true, considering income from every source, and that no revision of the pricing mechanism which would reduce our profits below their present level can be justified on the grounds that present profits are excessive."

Jones pointed out that for 43 property and casualty companies the average return was 4.4 per cent for the 11 years from 1955 through 1965.

He also criticized Howell for recommending a legislative commission to study the Keeton-O'Connell plan and other reform measures for compensation of claimants.

"The association is already studying Keeton-O'Connell and a number of other proposals for change, and some of our other member companies are doing specific research in this field," Jones said. "We would be glad to extend our complete cooperation to the New Jersey authorities," he added.

[From the Newark (N.J.) Star-Ledger, Feb. 26, 1968]

AUTO COMPENSATION STUDY PLANNED BY LAW-MAKERS

(By Herb Jaffe)

A special resolution that would create a joint legislative commission to study the need for reform measures in the auto insurance compensation system is already being drafted for proposal to the Legislature when it reconvenes March 11. The Star-Ledger has learned.

The proposal, recommended formally last week by Banking and Insurance Commissioner Charles R. Howell, has the backing of the Legislature's Republican leadership and is expected to receive the support of Gov. Richard J. Hughes.

Assemblyman Barry T. Parker (R-Burlington, Ocean), chairman of the Assembly Committee on Banking and Insurance said he is preparing the resolution to study the Keeton-O'Connell plan of basic protection and other reform measures in an attempt to change or modify the existing tort liability system.

Parker said the commission would consist of six to 10 members and is expected to include insurance legal and labor representatives.

"I have already discussed the proposal with several Republican leaders in both houses, and we are in full agreement that we must definitely look into this growing problem," Parker said. "We owe such a study to the people, and we are thankful that Commissioner Howell has brought it to our attention."

Parker said that he has talked at length to Sen. Edwin B. Forsythe (R-Burlington, Ocean), Senate president, and that he, too, is firmly convinced that such a study is necessary.

Assemblyman Peter Moraites (R-Bergen), Assembly majority leader, said he is firmly behind the commission and added that the objective is "to find a method of compensatory justice for all claimants in auto negligence accidents."

"By the same token, we cannot overlook the financial stability of the insurance companies either. I think there should be a fair and comprehensive cross-section of people represented on the commission, capable of taking the whole picture into consideration."

Sen. John L. White (R-Camden, Gloucester, Salem) chairman of the Senate Banking and Insurance Committee, is on vacation, but Parker said he knows that White, too, is in support of the proposal.

Howell made the recommendation for a commission study last Wednesday after announcing that he had denied the auto insurance rate request.

"I think that such a study would be most helpful in finding a solution to what seems to be a most compelling problem," Howell said. He added that it was not necessary to study the entire auto insurance industry, as a source close to Howell predicted in The Star-Ledger last November.

TIME LIMIT

"The picture has changed in recent months," Howell said. "The federal government has already announced it will do the job of investigating the over-all industry. There is no need for New Jersey to duplicate this task, and the expense."

According to Parker, the commission's findings might be released within six months to one year. He is hopeful it can be speeded up because of the urgency of the problem.

Similar legislative studies are presently being conducted in New York, Michigan and several other states. In addition, the American Insurance Association, a trade organization consisting of more than 200 stock fire and casualty insurance companies, has recently undertaken a similar national study.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

Former Sen. John Waddington (D-Salem) had suggested such a commission last September, at the time New York Gov. Nelson Rockefeller initiated the study in New York.

Howell held up on this recommendation until the recent auto insurance rate hearings were completed and his determination made.

High School Exits

HON. ROMAN C. PUCINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 27, 1968

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, recently Dean Rupert N. Evans, who is a professor of vocational and technical education and also dean of the College of Education, University of Illinois at Urbana, Ill., delivered an excellent speech on the two exits of a high school education: one leading to higher education and the other to employment.

As this Nation begins understanding more and more the importance of career training at the earliest level of the learning cycle for American young people, Dean Evans remarks take on added significance.

Dean Evans has been with the University of Illinois since 1950 and has a very distinguished record in education. He recently served as a member of the President's Advisory Council on Vocational Education.

Dean Evans' remarks follow:

HIGH SCHOOL EXITS

(Adapted from a speech presented by Dean Rupert Evans, to the Oregon Secondary School Principals Association meeting in Eugene, Oreg., January 4, 1968)

At the 1967 AVA Convention, Dr. Paul Briggs, Superintendent of Schools in Cleveland gave a brief speech in which he stated that a high school should have only two exits: to higher education and to employment. What would this mean in practice?

A junior high school should have just one exit: to high school.

A high school should have just two exits: to employment and to higher education.

A junior college should have just two exits: to employment and to higher education.

At present, there are three exits to the high school. The third exit leads to unemployment unless family connections or luck result in a job. Even if the student who leaves by the third exit gets immediate employment, he is likely to be unemployed in the future, unless luck sends an employer who offers a training program.

There are also three high school curricula at present, but these are not exactly related to the three exits. The college preparatory curriculum is doing well. It prepares people for different specialties in college, and colleges say high school graduates are well prepared. Usually, even those graduates of the college prep curriculum who don't go to college do well in employment because of family connections and high ability. Thus it contributes to maintaining two, rather than three exits.

The vocational education curriculum is spotty. Sometimes it is very, very good. Sometimes it is of poor quality. Frequently it is nonexistent. If it is good, it leads to employment or to post-secondary education, and thus maintains the two desirable exits.

The general curriculum has no goals. It

takes rejects from other curricula and gives them watered-down content in the mistaken belief that its students cannot learn. They can learn. They just don't want to learn what school wants to teach them. Really, the only thing which allows the general curriculum to continue is the word, "general", in its title. Many people assume that this word means "general education". I am accused of being against "general education" because I am against the general curriculum. Not at all. I am for general education, but good "general education" in the high school is offered as part of the college prep curriculum and as part of the vocational education curriculum. The general curriculum should be abolished and replaced by greatly broadened occupational education complemented by a strong general education program.

Abolishing the general curriculum will go a long way toward the high school exit which leads to unemployment. Perhaps you think unemployment doesn't exist. For Negro females under 25, the unemployment rate is 30%. This is higher than unemployment rates in the depression. For young Negro males it is 25%. For young whites, it has been twice the national average for the entire labor force throughout the 1960's. Even these figures understate the real amount of unemployment. To be counted as unemployed, you must be looking for work, and many of our youth are so discouraged that they have stopped looking for work. Almost all of the unemployed come from the general curriculum.

What can we substitute for the general curriculum?

Some would suggest that we have only one exit from the school—the college prep exit, though some people call this the general education route. They use four principal arguments.

- Vocational education should be postponed until after high school.
- Industry prefers to train its own workers.
- Our schools are too small and poor to offer good vocational education.
- The best vocational education is a good general education.

Only the last of these statements is important.

Consider the argument for postponement. If vocational education is important, we can't postpone it until we have the means to give it later to all students who need it and want it. The majority of our students do not attend school beyond high school. Therefore, the argument that we should postpone all vocational education is spurious at the present time.

Now consider the argument about industry preferring to train its own. One kind, but only one kind, of training can be offered better by employers than by schools: that training which is unique to that employer's establishment. In England there essentially is no public school vocational education, but employers tax themselves to set up training. No sooner was the tax passed than employers set up schools for each industry. They did not prefer to conduct training on the job. In this country and abroad, small employers cannot offer substantial training to their employees, and large employers (with a few notable exceptions) spend most of their training budget for safety training. Large and small, employers do as little training as possible, because their test is always "Will costs of training exceed benefits of training?" Moreover, costs of training are higher for disadvantaged youth, so industry will always prefer to hire classes of people who require less training than other classes of people. What is best for General Motors is not necessarily what is best for all our citizens.

The present attitude in the Federal Government is that preparation for the world

of work is too big a job for any one of society's institutions. Therefore we must find ways of subsidizing employers as well as schools to get more job preparation. Some of the schemes now being proposed are:

- Employer tax for training—give rebates to employers who conduct training.
- Insurance program—if the employee leaves before two years, the Federal Government will reimburse the employer for training costs.

c. Income tax rebates—The Federal Government already pays half of the costs of training by employers (all training costs are legitimate business expense, and the average corporate tax is almost 50%), but the various rebate schemes would go even further.

- Then there is my favorite among subsidies: expand part-time cooperative education programs by paying to the school a greater proportion of its costs and subsidizing the employer for part of the added costs of training.

The third argument, that our school is too small to offer vocational education, has a simple answer—consolidate. Ninety percent of our students could be accommodated in high schools of 2,000 or more students each, and it is a rare case when a high school of less than 2,000 students is really a comprehensive school. For the very isolated student (and we have a few of them in places like Eastern Oregon), the only solution I can find is the large residential comprehensive school.

We must pay more attention to the fourth and most important argument that a good general education is the best vocational education, but let's look at it this way:

VOCATIONAL EDUCATION AS GENERAL EDUCATION AND GENERAL EDUCATION AS VOCATIONAL EDUCATION

Some people have tried to build a wall between vocational education and general education. Where such a wall exists, it must be torn down.

I present three general propositions:

- Vocational education cannot prosper unless it has a strong general education preceding it and accompanying it.

- For the majority of students, the practical arts (including vocational education) are the only means of lending intelligibility to more academic subjects.

- The vocational education content of general education courses is rarely presented to students.

Let us consider the importance of general education for vocational education. Technology demands more and more sophisticated workers. At the same time, the availability of more sophisticated workers permits the development of more sophisticated technology. This circle demands and provides opportunity for only those people who have both an excellent general education and excellent vocational preparation. If the vocational curriculum keeps up with the demands of employers, and it must, vocational education must demand students who are capable of learning what vocational education has to teach. This means that vocational students must have an excellent general education.

But many, perhaps most, of our students don't see real reason for general education. They are pragmatists with short-term goals; they ask "What is the use of it all?" Any vocational educator can give you yards of case histories about students who first saw the need for mathematics in a machine shop course, or the need for spelling and grammar in a typing course. But much vocational education comes to late to be of use in motivating general education learnings, and vocational educators don't know enough about how to make it really work.

Turning now to the vocational values in general education: How many academic teachers point out the obvious occupational

February 27, 1968

uses of their subject matter? Does the music teacher teach about working conditions for musicians; does the social studies teacher emphasize how our society would fall apart if it were not for people who work at useful tasks; does the mathematics teacher stress the usefulness as well as the beauty of the concepts he teaches? In the rare instances where this is done, it works wonders.

The slum child comes to school far behind other children in verbal skills, but in first-grade math he more than holds his own. Why? Because his uneducated parents teach him to count change so he won't get cheated.

But then he enters ten years of mathematics taught as if it would never be used until graduate school, and he doesn't plan to go to graduate school. Moreover, he has to be able to read to do his math, and he sees no future in reading.

What I am saying is that vocational education is absolutely dependent upon general education, and that for at least half of our students, general education is dependent on vocational education. They must never be separated, for separation damages both.

AN ACTION PROGRAM FOR NOW

I know that the general curriculum will take time to kill, for we must have a substitute for it. It will take time for the college prep and vocational education curricula to be broadened and expanded to fill the vacuum. As we proceed with the broadening and expanding, let us institute a program which will give each student a salable skill: in typing, driving, quantitative analysis, report writing, translating, machine operation, or any of a thousand more. Start this in the junior high school. Secondly, let us make sure that the skill is *really* salable by checking with employers. We have too many people who have taken four years of Spanish but can't even ask directions in Mexico City. Thirdly, let us set up placement offices in every high school, not just as a service to our students, but as the best means of feedback as to our successes and failures for those students who don't go to college. Fourth and last, let us move heaven and earth to close that third exit from high school—the exit that leads to unemployment, frustration and hatred.

Postmaster General O'Brien Dedicates New Postal Service Institute

HON. THADDEUS J. DULSKI

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 27, 1968

Mr. DULSKI. Mr. Speaker, I had the honor today to participate in the formal dedication of the new Postal Service Institute located at 7900 Wisconsin Avenue, Bethesda, Md.

Postmaster General Lawrence F. O'Brien officiated as this long-overdue facility comes into being in our postal service.

We have been making great strides in automation and modernization in our postal service. As we are constantly reminded, however, the fantastic new machines, the modern physical layouts of our post offices, the simplified procedures—all these and others are only as effective as the men who run them.

What we need in the postal service today is coordinated training for our top-management. It is not necessary—nor is it intended—that all our management

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

employees need to travel to Bethesda for training.

The idea—and it is a good one—is to provide a nucleus of training at the Institute and then these men can go out and handle training in offices around the country.

I see this Institute as a great step forward in improving our postal service.

Participating in the dedication with General O'Brien and myself were: the Honorable Richard J. Murphy, Assistant Postmaster General for Personnel; Director Edmund F. Overend, of the Postal Service Institute; the Honorable Tom Steed, chairman of the House Post Office Appropriations Subcommittee, and Senator A. S. MIKE MONRONEY, chairman of the Senate Post Office and Civil Service Committee.

I include the following dedicatory address by Postmaster General O'Brien:

ADDRESS BY POSTMASTER GENERAL O'BRIEN AT POSTAL SERVICE INSTITUTE, BETHESDA, MD., FEBRUARY 27, 1968

I am very pleased to join with you in this important dedication.

In my estimation, one of the most satisfying events in life comes when we can see the translation of a hope and an idea into solid reality.

Therefore, this occasion should be satisfying to many here today, for the creation of the Postal Service Institute reflects the thoughts, the hopes, and the hard work of many people.

Certainly, the great public servants who have already spoken to us, Senator Mike Monroney, Senator Daniel Brewster, Congressmen Tom Steed and Tad Dulski, together with their colleagues, have constantly shown a keen appreciation of our unique training needs, needs that will now be met through this Institute.

This Institute also reflects a recommendation I made over two years ago upon my return from a survey of European postal facilities. At that time I was deeply impressed by the training program offered its employees by the Dutch Postal Service. I pointed out in my report that we had been derelict in employee training programs for future leaders of the Post Office Department.

My own period of training for the position of Postmaster General took place on the job, so to speak. There were many days when I wished there were some place I could turn for a quick course in Postmaster-generalship. But, unfortunately, there was no place. And, in fact, I suppose there will never be such a course. No one could teach it but a former Postmaster General, and after serving as one of the nation's biggest targets for a period of time, no former Postmaster General would have the energy, or lack the constricting scar tissue to teach such a course.

During my period of on-the-job training there were many surprises about the nature of the post office and its problems.

Perhaps the most shocking moment of all came when I realized that the Post Office Department was not an office at all. The word "office" makes everyone think of desks, and paper shuffling, and inter-office memoranda, and organizational charts and distance from the world of action and solid accomplishment.

I found that the word "office" is completely misleading.

For today the Post Office Department is an industry. Not the mimeograph machine but the high speed letter sorter is the governing symbol of our activity.

We are, in fact, one of the greatest and most important industries of the nation.

Fortune magazine annually publishes a listing of the greatest business firms in the land. We aren't listed, of course, but our

"sales" of \$5 billion last year would rank us ahead of Texaco, U.S. Steel, IBM, Western Electric, Gulf Oil, and all of America's aircraft, chemical, rubber, agricultural, steel and machine tool corporations. The U.S. Mail is "big business."

If we consider ourselves a utility rather than an industrial firm, there is but one with larger operating revenue, American Telephone and Telegraph.

Thus, we are an "office" in words, but we are an industry in fact. And we are an industry that is increasingly turning to mechanization and modern concepts to solve our problems.

We are now involved in the most massive program of postal construction and postal mechanization and research in the history of this Department. And, again, this is a direct reflection of the support accorded us by concerned, committed, and experienced legislators, who are experts in postal matters, men such as the outstanding Congressional leaders with us today.

As a result of this urgent and badly needed mechanization program, the mail moving and processing equipment flowing into our major post offices is increasingly complicated. This equipment will change old habits of thought just as it is increasing the speed and changing the flow of mail.

Such equipment is also slowly but surely transforming post offices into communication processing factories, postmasters into industrial managers, supervisors into managerial assistants.

Another look at the FORTUNE magazine survey shows that we rank third among any industry or utility in the number of our employees. Only AT&T, with 795,000 and General Motors with 735,000 exceed the number of postal employees—and not by much.

Thus, we are the third largest civilian employer in the land.

This fact of the postal communications industry creates three responsibilities. The first of these is using our vast army of workers in the most effective manner. Work scheduling stands at the heart of effective use of manpower, in an industry such as ours, which is subject to wide hourly, daily, and seasonal variations in mail volume. For us the matching of manpower assignment to workload, the precise balance of men on the job and mail in the post office, is a matter of tens of millions of dollars. If a supervisor schedules too many men for the amount of mail that actually flows through the post office, money is wasted. If he schedules too few, the mail is delayed.

The teaching of work scheduling methods through this Institute will, I have no doubt, produce savings that will more than pay for the entire Institute itself. As a result, we are giving high priority to the development of the necessary course materials.

Still another important responsibility lies in the area of relations between employee and postal management.

As of now, many of our managers—our postmasters and their staffs and supervisors—are disadvantaged compared with private industrial managers because of a lack of training and experience in the collective bargaining process.

This Institute will help us rectify this serious omission in our inventory of managerial skills.

The third responsibility involves use of this Institute to eradicate one of the major faults of the postal service—lack of a real career ladder for our employees. The creation of this Institute bears quite directly on our hopes to provide greater opportunities for all our employees. As new methods of mail processing are introduced, as new machines are invented, as old and tired ways decline before the dynamism of the many creative minds in our Bureau of Research and Engineering, we anticipate that the Institute will play a major role in the necessary training process.

In its initial period of growth the Institute will concern itself with improving management, because the introduction of so many new concepts and new instruments has placed a heavy burden upon management, and certainly because experience has shown that a dollar spent on improving management skills quite often yields enormous dividends in terms of better service and more efficient operations. Among the specific course areas to be covered in the first year are safety management, postal engineering, maintenance management, and traffic management and materials handling.

We look forward to moving rapidly toward achieving the full potential of the Postal Service Institute.

By 1972, we anticipate a modern facility which will share space with our new Bureau of Research and Engineering in which engineers and operations specialists can engage in continuous consultation on postal problems.

We anticipate that the Institute will provide the means by which models of advanced processing machinery may be rigorously tested under laboratory conditions.

Further, though the Institute will not engage in mass education, it will be the center of a network of extension courses radiating throughout the nation.

Already the Postal Service Institute has arranged with the University of Oklahoma for a series of seminars at Norman, Oklahoma. These seminars are designed to provide postmasters with expert training in the field of labor relations. The Postal Service expects to gain much through this cooperative arrangement with the University of Oklahoma, an arrangement which, I might add, reflects the keen interest of Senator Monroney and of Congressman Steed.

And, finally, the Institute will act as a form of seedbed. Either through study here or through extension courses, thousands of men and women will gain new insight into postal problems and the solutions for those problems. When they return to their local post offices, they will, in turn, organize courses and teach locally what they have learned at PSI, and thus become a source of ideas and motivation for their fellow employees.

My friends, this is an act of extraordinary creation. For a school provides the best of the past to mold the present and influence the future. A school reflects the best effort of one generation for succeeding generations. A school is a brilliant violation of the laws of geometry—through the chemistry of learning we discover that the totality of a school's influence is far greater than the sum of its parts.

Mexico Honors Thomas C. Mann

HON. HENRY B. GONZALEZ

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 27, 1968

MR. GONZALEZ. Mr. Speaker, recently, on February 23, to be exact, the Honorable Thomas C. Mann, was recognized and honored by the Mexican Government which awarded him the Aztec Eagle decoration, one of Mexico's highest awards.

Of course, Thomas Mann thoroughly deserved this high honor, for he has had a most illustrious and successful career as U.S. Ambassador to Mexico, then Under Secretary of State for Economic Affairs. He is respected and loved in Mexico, where his merits were quickly recognized.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

Mr. Speaker, I take pleasure in placing into the RECORD the remarks made by His Excellency Hugo B. Margain, Ambassador of Mexico to the United States, on this great occasion and also the remarks by Thomas C. Mann:

REMARKS BY HIS EXCELLENCY, HUGO B. MARGAIN, AMBASSADOR OF MEXICO, ON THE OCCASION OF BESTOWING THE AZTEC EAGLE DECORATION ON THE HONORABLE THOMAS C. MANN, AT THE MEXICAN EMBASSY, WASHINGTON, D.C., FEBRUARY 23, 1968

Ladies and Gentlemen:

When President Johnson went to Mexico on April, 1966, to present the statue of Abraham Lincoln, President Diaz Ordaz gave a formal dinner at Los Pinos, the Presidential residence in Chapultepec to the distinguished United States Delegation. On that occasion, President Diaz Ordaz said, more or less these words among other things: "The people of Mexico will never forget the names of two United States public officials, who always tried to support the Mexican aspirations based on justice: Senate Majority Leader Mike Mansfield and the Honorable Ambassador Thomas C. Mann."

President Diaz Ordaz came to Washington for a State Visit during October of last year. As everybody knows, this visit was an outstanding success and a further proof of our good political relations. At the White House, in one of the most moving ceremonies: the signature of the final legal document relating to the return of El Chamizal to Mexico, I remember President Johnson, President Diaz Ordaz, Secretary Rusk and Secretary Carrillo Flores in front of an important group of officials and guests, among whom was Mr. Thomas Mann. President Diaz Ordaz, through Secretary Carrillo Flores announced (precisely in the moments in which we were to legally receive this strip of land), that the Mexican Government would bestow the Aztec Eagle decoration on Mr. Mann. In that particular moment I was near Mr. Mann, and I congratulated him and said, "Mr. Mann: Allow me to be the first friend to congratulate you with a Mexican *abrazo*." And now, we are very pleased to be here, at the Mexican Embassy, and it is a special honor for me to present, in the name of the Mexican Government, this decoration to Mr. Mann.

At this time, I am going to read a special message of President Gustavo Diaz Ordaz to Mr. Mann:

"MY DEAR FRIEND: The impression left in my mind by your dedicated efforts to overcome the many difficulties which had to be solved in the juridical settlement of The Chamizal problem, after the agreement in principle by Presidents Adolfo López Mateos and John F. Kennedy, is unforgettable.

"I remember the continuous going and coming of the then Ambassador Mann from our Capital city to the cities of El Paso and Washington, to convince persons, and surmount obstacles, in a situation which, I imagine, was a very difficult task, because it was your own countrymen from the State of Texas who were concerned with it.

"It is now very gratifying to be able to attest to you the appreciation of the people and of the Government of Mexico for your efforts, which contributed so greatly toward a solution of the old Chamizal problem, a solution which was finally reached, in which reason and justice shine.

"This sentiment takes form in the decoration of the Mexican Order of the Aztec Eagle that on this day, the 23rd of February, 1968 will be bestowed upon you by our Ambassador Hugo B. Margain, and it receives expression in these lines, which also convey to you and your family, my best wishes for your happiness and my affectionate and sincere greetings.

"GUSTAVO DIAZ ORDAZ."

February 27, 1968

Very briefly I am going to refer to Mr. Mann as a public servant. He studied Law at Baylor University, in Texas, and he is an expert in Inter-American political and economic affairs. He directed a major part of the United States' economic warfare effort in Latin America, during World War II. He dealt with both, political and petroleum matters during his assignment to Venezuela, as Ambassador (1947-1950).

During 1953-54, he was Deputy Chief of Mission at Athens, and he then, had the opportunity to become acquainted with European economic and social problems.

In 1957 he was called upon to serve as Assistant Secretary for Economic Affairs.

We all remember President Kubitschek of Brazil who in 1958 proposed "Operation Pan America" as a cure for the ills that afflicted Latin American areas, specifically economic and social issues. It was in this troubled period that Mr. Mann, as Assistant Secretary of State for Economic Affairs, made three of his most remarkable contributions to Inter-American relations.

Although the idea of an Inter-American Bank had been urged for almost sixty years by the Latin American Republics, it had been strongly opposed by the United States. Mr. Mann had the wisdom to see the advantage of, and the courage to advocate and accomplish, a change in the United States position. There is no question about that under his leadership, the framework for the Inter-American Development Bank was developed, and acceptance of the proposal within the United States Government was obtained. The Bank was established on April 8, 1959, and now has a capitalization of six billion dollars.

Latin Americans, I am sure, appreciate Mr. Mann's efforts to help stabilize the price of coffee, which is an important export commodity for fourteen of their countries. In 1958, he organized the Coffee Study Group which led to the United Nations' Negotiating Conference in 1962, and the International Coffee Agreement of August 1963.

The Alliance for Progress, as we all know, has its origin in the Act of Bogota. Great measure of the credit in this achievement must go to Mr. Mann's efforts. According to my recollection, he returned from the meeting of the Committee of Twenty One, at Buenos Aires, in the Spring of 1959, convinced that the United States had to do far more than it was then doing, if Latin America were to achieve economic and social progress.

Mr. Mann's proposed program was accepted and outlined in President Eisenhower's speech at Newport, Rhode Island, on July 11, 1960. He proposed that the initial fund for the program be five hundred million dollars, and this was authorized by Congress before the American Republics gathered at Bogota, in September, 1960, to draft the Act of Bogota and give it final approval. It was with these five hundred million dollars that the Alliance for Progress was launched in 1961.

On August 29, 1963, Mr. Mann, as United States Ambassador to the Mexican Government, after patient, persistent, negotiations signed the Chamizal Convention. He was Ambassador to Mexico during President Kennedy's unforgettable visit. President Kennedy wired Mr. Mann, after his departure from my country on July 1, 1962: "I congratulate you not only for the splendid job on this visit, but for bringing our relations with Mexico to a point where a successful visit was possible". Due to his exceptional accomplishments in Latin America as a whole, and in Mexico in particular, President Johnson, in 1963, appointed Mr. Mann not only Assistant Secretary of State, but United States Coordinator of the Alliance for Progress, and Special Assistant to the President, as well. In December, 1963, President Johnson said:

"We expect to speak with one voice on all matters affecting this Hemisphere. Mr. Mann, with the support of the Secretary of State and the President, will be that voice."

As a lawyer Mr. Mann has a permanent vocation: to devote his life to justice; as a public servant, he exemplifies integrity. That is why in the performance of his difficult tasks, he secured the respect and the appreciation of the Latin American people. It is an honor for me—on this occasion—in the name of President Diaz Ordaz, to present the Aztec Eagle to the Honorable Thomas C. Mann.

REMARKS BY THOMAS C. MANN, ON THE OCCASION OF RECEIVING THE AZTEC EAGLE DECORATION AT THE MEXICAN EMBASSY, WASHINGTON, D.C., FEBRUARY 23, 1968

Mr. Ambassador, distinguished guests and friends:

I am deeply grateful to you, Mr. Ambassador, for your hospitality and kind words and to the Government and people of Mexico on this occasion. In a very real sense, this gathering does honor to all those who worked with faith and courage to find a just solution to a boundary problem which had been a source of friction and misunderstanding between our countries since the time of Lincoln and Juarez.

Much more than a tract of land was involved. At stake was whether it is possible for neighbors to demonstrate once more that they can respect and carry out the terms of an arbitration award based on solemn treaties.

In a larger sense, the central issue was whether our two nations could find a way to resolve their differences by law instead of force. It is often said that we live today in a contract society. If this is true—and I believe it is—the ability of nations to build a peaceful world community depends, to a very considerable extent, on their willingness to resolve differences by a process of give and take, to contract terms of settlement, and to honor their contracts once they are made. This is but another way of saying what Juarez said much better a hundred years ago: "Respect for the rights of others is peace." I hope that respect, fair play and justice will always be the norm which governs relations between our two lands.

Earlier I referred to others who worked for a settlement of the Chamizal; and I used the phrase "faith and courage" because there was no lack of advice that settlement was not only impossible to achieve but imprudent and risky even to consider and discuss. It will not be possible to mention all of those who contributed to the settlement of the Chamizal boundary. It was in reality a collective effort in which many participated. But, with your indulgence, I shall mention only a few, Americans and Mexicans alike, without whom no agreement would have been possible.

Presidents Kennedy and Lopez Mateos, of course, recognized the nature of the problem and instructed their staffs to work out the details of a solution. Without this, serious negotiations could not have been undertaken and when completed, could not have been approved.

Vice President (now President) Johnson, whose affection for the interest in the welfare of the Mexican nation is well known. His guidance, support and wise counsel in the early difficult days of the negotiations earned for him the respect and admiration of the American Embassy team. Everything that has transpired since then has added to my personal respect and friendship for this man and his lovely Lady who are bearing the awesome burdens of ultimate responsibility during difficult and perilous times for our country with cool courage, wisdom and undeviating attachment to principle.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

I am, of course, not familiar with all those in Mexico who helped to make a settlement possible. But I do know that Lic. Gustavo Diaz Ordaz, first as Minister of Interior and later as President of Mexico, and Lic. Antonio Carrillo Flores, then Ambassador of Mexico in Washington and now Foreign Minister, played key roles. Moreover, their record of distinguished service to their country and to the hemisphere on so many occasions has earned for them the respect and admiration of their many loyal friends. I count myself in their number.

And, of course, Senator (then Foreign Minister) Manuel Tello and Ambassador Vicente Sanchez Gavito were the principal negotiators for Mexico. Without their tact, professional skill, dedication to principle and their discretion it is difficult to imagine how the century-old problem could have been resolved. Now that I am no longer in government perhaps it is appropriate for me to say, concerning Mr. Tello, that he not only represented his country with dignity and skill throughout his long and fruitful career but he enlightened all those who had the pleasure and the privilege of knowing him.

Governor Connally, Senators Yarborough and Tower and several distinguished leaders of the press in Texas provided leadership which was vital to an understanding of the problem in my own State.

The leaders of both parties in the Congress, Senators Mansfield and Dirksen, were, with many of their colleagues, responsible for Senate consent to the agreement reached.

The citizens, officials and representatives of El Paso, and especially my old friend, Sam Young, gave wise counsel concerning aspects of the negotiations which affected their city. Their understanding and support came early in the negotiations and sustained them.

The two Commissioners, Ing. David Herrera Jordan and Joe Friedkin, played a vital role, not only in advising their governments with extraordinary ability and common sense on policy, but in finding solutions to the myriad technical problems inherent in the negotiations.

Prominent Americans resident in Mexico City and, of course, individual Mexicans in the private sector, also encouraged and supported the negotiations from the beginning. Some of them are here tonight.

And, last but not least, Robert Sayre of the Department of State and Frank Ortiz, William Pryce and James Johnston of the Embassy staff, worked with patience, skill and dedication for many long months under the direction of our Secretary of State, Dean Rusk. Mr. Ortiz, who is now posted in Lima and cannot be here tonight, was one of the principal negotiators.

This honor, then, belongs to all of my countrymen who worked quietly and discreetly to demonstrate that, when there are men of good will on both sides, solutions can be found to problems no matter how difficult and old they may be and regardless of how seemingly charged they are with prejudice and emotion.

Finally, Mr. Ambassador, I think you know that I was one of those fortunate enough to be born and reared in a place where two great cultures meet. For those Americans who early in life came into daily, intimate contact with the Mexican people and their descendants—and who learned at first hand of their loyalty to friends, their love of all that is beautiful in nature, art and music, their love of family and pride in country, their capacity for valor and sacrifice—ceremonies of this kind have a very special meaning and a very special value.

Nancy, too, has a very special place in her heart for Mexico. We both thank you and our hostess, Mrs. Margain, and we both extend to you our warmest best wishes for the Mexican nation, its government and its people.

Joe Myers: Retired Associate Editor of the Dayton (Ohio) Journal Herald and Former President of the Board of the Dayton-Montgomery County Public Library

HON. CHARLES W. WHALEN, JR.

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 27, 1968

Mr. WHALEN. Mr. Speaker, I rise on this occasion to honor the memory of one of the distinguished journalists in my district, the late Dr. Joseph Myers.

Dr. Myers, or Joe, as he preferred to be called, died on February 17 at the age of 72. Prior to his retirement, he was the associate editor of the Journal Herald in Dayton, Ohio.

He was an eloquent, honest, humble figure, unprepossessing and informed. Above all, he was a Christian and his life, both as a journalist and an ordained minister, mirrored this exemplary fact.

Joe shunned the limelight and very probably would be chagrined to see himself the subject of my remarks here today.

His record speaks for itself. His passing saddens those of us who were privileged to know him, a man who was devoted to the betterment of his fellow man and his community.

Mr. Speaker, I insert herewith an editorial written by Mr. Glenn Thompson, editor of the Journal Herald, and obituaries appearing in both the Journal Herald and the Dayton Daily News:

[From the Dayton (Ohio) Journal Herald, Feb. 17, 1968]

JOE MYERS, GREAT MAN

Dayton lost one of its great men yesterday with the death of Joseph Myers.

Joe burned with zeal for what was good and good for Dayton. He burned with wrath against what wasn't.

He never made a great deal of money nor held the topmost place in either of his two professions, newspapering or the ministry, perhaps because of the intensity of his concerns, but few people have served this community better in our time.

The Journal Herald knew him, of course, as reporter, editorial writer and then associate editor. It is not family pride that leads us to speak so highly of him now but it was our years of acquaintance that led us to our knowledge of his fineness and to our great affection.

He loved clean government, tolerance, new ideas, progress and books. And don't you go suppressing any book, even naughty ones. His greatest wrath—and there were some great ones which were easily stirred—was for any phony. He found a great deal more good than bad in the men he knew, however. As a matter of fact, he so loved his fellow humans he had a hard time believing any of them were bad. He spent his life searching out their good efforts which he felt needed support and bad ones that needed exposure.

The town has missed him in his retirement and in his recent uncertain health. It should mourn grievously for his passing.

[From the Dayton (Ohio) Journal Herald, Feb. 17, 1968]

JOE MYERS DIES; RETIRED JH EDITOR
Joseph Myers, retired associate editor of the Journal Herald and president of the

Board of the Dayton-Montgomery County Public Library until early this year, died yesterday at Good Samaritan hospital. He was 72.

Dr. Myers wrote editorials for the Journal Herald full time before his retirement. As an ordained minister he frequently took time out from his newspaper work to supply a pulpit on Sunday. He had been ill off and on for several years with a heart condition.

He was a native of Lafayette, Ind., and a graduate (Phi Beta Kappa) of Wabash College, Crawfordsville, Ind. He earned his Bachelor of Divinity degree at College of the Bible, Lexington, Ky., and later was awarded the honorary degree, Doctor of Literature, by Culver Stockton College, Canton, Mo.

"Dayton ought to build a monument to Joe Myers as one of its great men in our time," said Glenn Thompson, editor of the Journal Herald. "Our society is crazy to think only of generals or politicians as worth statues."

"Joe was in there every day for 40 years looking for what was good and fair, and would help Dayton. He found a lot of them and he gave them all a hand. When he found one that wasn't, we all ran for cover."

"Perhaps there is somebody somewhere who has been on the side of right and good more often, and as beloved in doing it, but I never laid eyes on him."

Dr. Myers had been a member of the library board since 1954 and had been its president for three years until Jan. 17.

William Chait, director of the library and a long-time friend, said, "Of all the people I have known, he is the one I would most truly describe as a saint. He had a positive attitude toward people and good faith in people. He disagreed with people but he understood them. He was positive."

Dr. Myers began his newspaper career as a reporter with the Kansas City Post in 1921. He was literary editor and reporter for the Indianapolis News from 1921 to 1926, returning to Kansas City, Mo., where he edited The Christian and held a position as associate minister of the Linwood Boulevard Christian church from 1926 to 1935.

He held a position as associate secretary of the emergency peace campaign of the American Friends Service committee in Philadelphia in 1936 before joining the Dayton Herald later the same year.

Dr. Myers left the Herald in 1941 to become director of public relations for the Dayton Community Chest, returning as an editorial writer in 1944.

At the time of his retirement, Dr. Myers described his nearly 28 years in Dayton as the happiest and most useful in his life.

"I expect to make Dayton my home as long as I live because I can't think of a more interesting and challenging community to live in and to serve, as I may be able, in my retirement."

Dr. Myers lived with his wife, DeLyle, at 2435 Rugby road.

Besides Mrs. Myers, survivors include two daughters, Mrs. Madeleine Schulhoff, of Summit, N.J., Mrs. DeLyle (Skip) Soper, of Short Hills, N.J.; and five grandchildren.

Memorial services will be held at 1 p.m. Monday at the Whitmer Brothers funeral home. The family asks that in lieu of flowers

contributions may be made to the Dwight Young Scholarship fund, c/o The Journal Herald.

[From the Dayton (Ohio) Daily News, Feb. 16, 1968]

JOSEPH MYERS, JOURNALIST, DIES — FORMER JOURNAL HERALD EDITOR

Joseph "Joe" Myers, long-time associate editor of The Journal Herald and interim pastor all over the Miami Valley, died this morning at Good Samaritan hospital.

He was 72 years old.

The Lafayette, Ind., native graduated Wabash College in 1918, and began his newspaper career three years later at the Kansas City Post.

He also earned a Bachelor of Divinity degree at College of the Bible in Lexington, Ky., and constantly combined the ministry with his newspaper work.

He would write editorials all week long, then preach from the pulpit on Sunday.

Myers joined the Dayton Herald in 1936 as an editorial writer.

Joe Myers "was tops at the quick repartee, and he spoke out with the forthrightness of a true redhead," recalled R. Marshall Stross, who knew Myers for 27 years on the Journal and who now is press relations director for the Lutheran Church in America.

"He was always boasting that his wife, DeLyle, was the best chicken cook in the world—and never hesitated to invite you out to his home to prove it."

Myers was a student of the government he wrote about, and always reported with the depth his academic homework gave him.

"I remember how he changed his professional name from Joseph to Joe," Stross said. "It was right after the Journal and the Herald merged.

"Deke (Dwight) Young assigned him a column in the new paper with these words: 'Your writing is so erudite, so articulate, so thoroughly backgrounded—let's sign the column Joe to give it some informality!'

The veteran newsman's ministry was as important to him as his writing.

Myers is survived by his wife, Mrs. DeLyle Fox Myers, 2435 Rugby; Madeleine Schulhoff, a daughter, of Summit, N.J.; DeLyle (Skip) Soper, a daughter, of Short Hills, N.J.; and five grandchildren.

Memorial services will be held at 1 p.m. Monday at Whitmer Bros. The family requests that no flowers be sent. In lieu of flowers, contributions may be made to the Dwight Young Scholarship Fund, c/o The Journal Herald.

This Is the Price of Being an American — It Is Worth It

HON. JOSEPH G. MINISH

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 27, 1968

Mr. MINISH. Mr. Speaker, I should like to share with our colleagues a letter received by me from Mr. John R. Ken-

nedy, of West Orange, N.J. While all will not agree with Mr. Kennedy's viewpoint, I know they will be as edified as I was by his remark "this is the price of being an American—it is worth it." His letter follows in full:

WEST ORANGE, N.J.

HON. JOSEPH MINISH,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE MINISH: Please do everything in your power to implement the programs sought by President Johnson in his State of the Union message. Particularly, support and expedite the passage of the income surtax. Pressures are upward from West Orange, Essex County and Trenton for more revenue. This is the price of being an American—it is worth it. All the social legislation must flow from a sound economy and the surtax is the keystone to its subsequent soundness.

Sincerely,

JOHN R. KENNEDY.

Urban Housing

HON. DONALD J. IRWIN

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 27, 1968

Mr. IRWIN. Mr. Speaker, in light of the President's recent proposal for 6 million additional housing units and his efforts to encourage the active involvement of private enterprise in this program, I would like to take this opportunity to advise my colleagues of the ambitious steps taken by the Clairol Corp. of Stamford, Conn.

Through the efforts of Clairol, a subsidiary of Bristol-Myers, an imaginative breakthrough in the field of urban housing has been created. Early this month a \$22,000 grant was awarded by the company to the New Hope Corp., a church-sponsored nonprofit Negro housing cooperative in Stamford. The grant will be used to help acquire a 53,000-square-foot site in downtown Stamford on which New Hope will build a 90-unit apartment house for low-income families.

As a member of the board of the New Hope Corp., I was especially pleased at Clairol's generosity, which will enable one group of low-income families to take advantage of Federal assistance heretofore beyond their reach because they happen to live in a high-cost urban center. New Hope is an outstanding example of what determined people can do to help themselves if the community, government, and private enterprise will just give them a chance.

I am hopeful that other companies will follow Clairol's lead in Stamford and the rest of the Nation.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES — Wednesday, February 28, 1968

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

Lord, teach us to pray.—Luke 11: 1. Lord, what a change within us one short hour
Spent in Thy presence will avail to make!

What heavy burdens from our bosoms take,
What parched grounds refresh, as with a shower!
We kneel, and all around us seems to lower;
We rise, and all the distant and the near

Stands forth in sunny outline, brave and clear!
We kneel, how weak! We rise, how full of power!
Why, therefore, should we do ourselves this wrong,
Or others, that we are not always strong;