

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

The "Forward America" Program of the
U.S. Chamber of Commerce

HON. JOHN G. TOWER

OF TEXAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, March 13, 1968

Mr. TOWER. Mr. President, during the past month we have read a great deal about the Federal Government's concern over the crisis in the cities. But we should not overlook the equal concern of business and industry over our urban problems.

As the ranking Republican member of the Subcommittee on Housing and Urban Affairs, I can report that the subcommittee's current activities reflect an equal degree of concern in this area also.

On February 22, Allan Shivers, former Governor of my State of Texas and president of the Chamber of Commerce of the United States, called the domestic urban challenge today "no less serious than the great international challenges we faced in World Wars I and II."

Mr. Shivers made this statement while introducing the national chamber's "Forward America" program in Washington, D.C. Under this approach, businessmen are encouraged and assisted to seek solutions to urban problems by working with other community groups, all of whose resources and support are needed for success. This organizational approach was developed and tested by the chamber over a period of 8 years and reportedly has achieved considerable success in a number of communities.

Because I consider Mr. Shivers' speech and the Forward America approach both significant and representative of business and industry's concern with the urban crisis, I recommend them to my colleagues and ask unanimous consent that they be printed in the RECORD.

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

FORWARD AMERICA

(Remarks of Allan Shivers, president, Chamber of Commerce of the United States, at press luncheon, Washington, D.C., February 22, 1968)

In behalf of the Board of Directors of the National Chamber and the entire National Chamber federation, I welcome you to this important luncheon.

We are happy to have with us representatives of major national organizations that represent important segments of every community in the land. By accepting this invitation, these organizations symbolize what the National Chamber's Forward America effort is all about.

These times are trying times. Our nation is faced with domestic problems that seem to defy solution. Our cities, regardless of size, are challenged by complex problems—education, employment, civil unrest, housing—problems ranging from poverty to pollution.

No thinking citizen can help but be alarmed by these problems.

Every responsible organization and group realizes that, in seeking solutions, they have common concerns and interests.

Our challenge—now—is to move beyond common concern to concerted action.

Our domestic challenge today is no less serious than the great international challenges we faced in World Wars I and II. The dedication and the spirit that arose in every community to meet those challenges are needed today. These times demand nothing less than an all-out dedication and commitment to work together.

Through Forward America, the National Chamber hopes businessmen and business organizations throughout the country can extend the hand of help and cooperation on community problems, and—most important—can do so with other groups making up communities.

This is why it is so important—and we are so pleased—that the great organizations represented here today are with us. This "mix" of organizations reflects the kind of cooperative action needed in every community, and the kind being encouraged by Forward America.

Forward America is a realistic effort. Forward America makes no promises except to offer a mechanism for mobilizing community resources, including business leadership and know-how. Forward America does not deprive organizations of their independence. Obviously, the National Chamber and the organizations represented here today have their own views on many issues facing the nation. Forward America does not presuppose that we must all see eye-to-eye on all questions in order to work together on community problems that mutually affect us all.

Forward America is not another program to be over-laid on communities already confused by the maze of programs already existing. Forward America is a process—a way of bringing people and existing programs together to encourage coordination and cooperation.

Forward America is not new. This nation has been dedicated throughout its history to the concept of grassroots action and to the need of working together to achieve mutual goals. Through the past eight years, the National Chamber has been experimenting with various approaches that can offer communities in this modern age an organizational framework that can return more decision-making to more people. Our cities have long ago outgrown the New England town meeting. But, the need for broad-based citizenship action is greater today than ever before. Forward America suggests ways by which this can be obtained. It is a process that has been tried in a number of American communities, large and small. It is not a panacea. But, it can produce the kind of citizenship commitment that can work amazing results in communities.

We offer the Forward America concept to cities and towns everywhere in the nation. We believe that this effort goes hand in hand with others such as the Urban Coalition, which are also seeking to bring people together for more coordinated and effective action. We hope that all the organizations here today and many others can inform their memberships about Forward America, and can work with businessmen and business organizations to organize the kind of action Forward America offers.

As for the National Chamber, it will dedicate its resources to help in any way it can any community desirous of organizing its people so as to mobilize the resources needed to meet its problems.

We should emphasize that Forward America is but one of a number of efforts the National Chamber is making to approach our urban crisis.

I would now like to present Mr. Arch N. Booth, Executive Vice President of the National Chamber, who will summarize the National Chamber's over-all approach and place the Forward America effort in perspective.

FORWARD AMERICA: A PROCESS FOR MOBILIZING
TOTAL COMMUNITY RESOURCES

(By the Chamber of Commerce of the United States, Washington, D.C.)

INTRODUCTION

Today, in this most advanced nation in the world, most of us in all walks of life are concerned about the future of our communities. We are disturbed by problems that seem to defy solutions. Many of us are frustrated by the lack of opportunity to play an effective role in shaping the community in which we live and work.

Despite our democratic traditions and abundance, we have had trouble finding ways to mobilize our community's resources; to achieve the coordinated effort that community progress demands.

In the meantime, our community problems intensify.

This is a central problem of our times: the need to find and establish practical ways for all of us to work together for the common good of our communities and, in turn, the nation.

The need is clear.

The question is How?

Forward America: A process for Mobilizing Total Community Resources, suggests ways by which this can be done. And it identifies the important role American business and chambers of commerce can play in the effort.

This document defines a concept as well as a process. It reflects the actual experiences of cities, large and small, where in recent years this concept and process have contributed to progress.

Forward America is not a panacea. It offers no pat solutions to problems. Nor does it answer all questions on how the process of coordinating people and resources in any given community can be achieved. But it does offer the basic concepts needed for community action and the essential, practical ingredients needed to mobilize community resources to meet common objectives.

This booklet provides only a general description of Forward America. The National Chamber will provide additional aids in the months ahead to complement this booklet. These will help interested communities understand their problems better. These aids will also help communities get the process discussed in this booklet organized and into motion. The National Chamber's field staff will stand ready to help.

The foundation upon which Forward America stands is the fact that today's problems require sound analysis and judgment for solutions; the conviction that solving community problems requires the coordinated effort of all interested persons and groups; the recognition that people are seeking more satisfying opportunities to involve themselves in community affairs; the realization by business and professional people, local chambers of commerce and associations that they can and must play a broader role in their community.

Forward America builds upon this foundation to offer a way by which you can join together with others to secure a better future for yourself and your community.

ARCH N. BOOTH.

FORWARD AMERICA: WHAT IT IS

Every community in the United States can be a better community. Every community has unmet needs. New resources are impor-

tant to meet these needs, but just as important is a means of arriving at sound decisions to apply resources effectively.

Communities are composed of people and groups of different persuasions, interests and desires. The problem comes in relating their differing objectives to the welfare of the community as a whole.

More people today are concerned about more community matters than ever before. More people today are joining groups that involve themselves in community affairs. Ironically, however, there has been no comparable growth in the opportunity for involvement that is satisfying to people. In most places, there is no common forum for different groups to discuss problems together. There is no common access to the expert knowledge needed to explore problems objectively. There is no common procedure to develop consensus and make decisions on many matters of great public concern. There are only limited opportunities for people and groups to pull together.

Fragmentation characterizes modern America—fragmentation in government among local, state, and federal activities; fragmentation among groups of differing ethnic, racial and religious backgrounds; fragmentation within these groups themselves; fragmentation among interest groups, such as business, labor and civic organizations.

Fragmentation leads to communication gaps among groups, to uncoordinated efforts, to lack of cooperation, to mistrust and suspicion.

Diverse interests and views are a normal and welcomed part of American life. But, the failure of diverse interests to work together on matters of concern to the whole community results in a splintering of effort that is a serious obstacle to attacking community problems.

No one group in a community recognizes or fully understands all the problems facing that community, such as schools, sewage disposal, housing, race relations and industrial and downtown development—to suggest only a few. No group has the expertise to analyze all problems and suggest all solutions. No one group—not the affluent or the poor, the privileged or the disadvantaged, government or voluntary organizations, business or labor—can muster the consensus needed to mobilize all the resources for solving major problems.

Today's problems are complex and interconnected. Solutions require the coordination of resources. Solutions require effort mounted on a broad front to see a community's problems in relation to one another so that they can be analyzed properly; so that agreement on priorities can be obtained. This calls for a concerted effort in every community to bring people and groups together for discussion of community goals and of problems standing in the way of these goals, for analysis of problems, and for consensus on priorities and solutions.

Forward America suggests how the people of a community can organize for action. It is a voluntary effort to encourage and help develop working relationships among groups—government, economic, religious, cultural, labor, civil rights, neighborhood, civic and others—to mobilize community resources.

This is not a governmental mechanism, although its success requires participation and cooperation of government. It is not a funding mechanism, although part of its function will be to explore ways to pay for problem solutions. It is a process, a way of getting things done; a way to help overcome the effects of fragmentation in our urban society; a way to get action to lessen many problems in our communities.

Forward America brings together people and groups in a community to (1) identify mutual objectives; (2) name problems block-

ing achievement of such objectives; (3) examine available alternatives for solving those problems; (4) establish priorities; and (5) take action.

Chambers of commerce are logical channels to introduce Forward America into communities. They have a tradition of leadership in community and state affairs. Normally, they are the basic organization through which businessmen work toward community goals. Since business resources are crucial to community success, the involvement of local chambers of commerce is an important aspect of the program.

One reason most chambers hold key positions is that they have professional staffs. These staffs can coordinate business effort. They can provide continuity and expertise to the community work of business and professional people. Chambers of commerce can be especially helpful in developing and strengthening liaisons with other groups that are also staffed and working on community problems. In many states and communities, chambers already perform these functions.

Where chambers are not doing so, business and professional people need to reappraise the basic role of their chamber in the community. The day when local chambers can limit their activities to promotion or strictly to economic issues is past. The times demand broad business involvement in community affairs through modern chambers of commerce, organized and staffed to lead and support such involvement.

Mobilizing total community resources in the way suggested by this booklet calls for determination and effort. But the job is being done. Many cities are proving this to be an approach that works.

How does Forward America differ from other approaches being suggested to combine the efforts of groups to fight urban problems?

First, it encourages participation of all responsible groups and citizens in a community. It does not limit participation to select groups or individuals.

Second, it recognizes the benefits people gain by involving themselves in urban efforts through organizations that represent their interests. For example, business and professional men benefit by channeling their efforts through chambers of commerce, trade or professional organizations. Similarly, labor can work through its organizations, civil rights groups through theirs, and so on.

Third, it does not create a new superstructure in any community, or add another so-called "program." It is a process through which existing groups can work together for common community goals while retaining their own identities and protecting their own interests.

Fourth, it encourages action on a broad range of problems facing communities. It discourages piecemeal approaches to a few problems only. It guides the community in determining its own major problems, instead of adopting "urgent needs" with accompanying "crash" solutions that have been transplanted from other cities. It emphasizes the value of tackling problems on a local priority basis after careful study.

Fifth, Forward America has only a local voice. It has no national policy-making counterpart. There can be, therefore, no confusion caused by conflicting local and National policy objectives or declarations. Yet, local groups participating in the process continue their alliance with their counterpart national organizations. While so doing, they all have full opportunity to contribute to the betterment of their own community.

FORWARD AMERICA: HOW IT WORKS

Who should begin the Forward America effort in a community?

Obvious choices are the people already known for initiating ideas and convincing others. They are the influential leaders who regularly give of their time, resources and

ability for the progress of the area. The head of the chamber of commerce, for example, is a likely person to form an initial group of business and professional people, labor leaders, civil rights leaders, women's club officers, government officials and other such people to discuss the Forward America concept and process.

These leaders will see significant advantages for them in the approach. It can possibly save them time, effort and money by coordinating the efforts they ordinarily would make as separate citizens each contributing to separate community goals. Each leader will be able to fit himself into the process in his most logical role—concentrating on the things he does best and likes best.

The advantages to all of the responsible groups these leaders represent are also quite clear. The coordinated approach brings groups together to promote the best interests of the area. No group is left out. All can participate to the extent they want.

Defining the community

At this early stage it is important that leaders define the "community" in which the Forward America effort will operate. A "community" is an area whose occupants share mutual concerns, but this area may be a neighborhood, a municipality, a metropolitan complex or a region comprising a number of municipalities or counties.

The way "community" is defined will determine the kinds of problems that can be attacked by the process described in this booklet. The more comprehensive the area, the more comprehensive can be the objectives of the effort. For example, a small suburb in a metropolitan area that defines itself as a "community" may well be able to develop a unified architectural plan for its business district, but it may be powerless to control air pollution if that problem's roots go beyond the suburb.

Thus, a key decision in Forward America is how comprehensive are its objectives. If the aim is a true total approach, the initiators may want to consider discussing the process with leaders of other adjoining communities making up the total area.

Identifying leaders

Identifying people to be prime movers in Forward America should be done with care. The presumption that all people of central importance in a community are generally known is false. Many go unrecognized by most people and others prefer not to have their names thrust before the public. But leaders of influence are essential to the success of any action. Their interest and support—their involvement—should be assured before proceeding.

Normally, the search for leaders will go unpublicized. Until a sizable number of them is convinced that the time is right for Forward America, no purpose is served by publicity.

Determining what is needed to organize total community participation

When there is general agreement among enough leaders to initiate the process they may want to assume the job of serving as an executive or steering group to guide operations. They will then want to obtain the supporting services that will be needed. The board of directors of a chamber of commerce is in a position to offer these services. A chamber of commerce in most communities is an organizational leader and it has staff and other resources to undergird the job of mobilizing community resources. Further, its members have the prestige, knowledge, the communications opportunities and the leadership to give continuing life to an area program such as Forward America.

At the same time, the executive group will want to obtain a comprehensive statement of population, economic and social trends and projections for the community. This

statement can later give all participants an opportunity to see where the community is headed; to forecast what may happen if no areawide action is taken, and to decide whether or not they like that probable course of events.

The executive group will most probably need to invite others to develop the data for the trends and projections statement. Government statisticians, business marketing specialists, educators, librarians, utility officials are the kinds of people who have background for such an assignment.

In addition, the leaders heading up Forward America should participate in a preliminary series of discussion meetings (usually three, at least) on community affairs and on the concept and process of mobilizing community resources. Such meetings can give the executive group the fundamentals necessary for them to identify the kinds of persons and groups who should be involved, the organizational structure needed to make the process work, and to map plans and time schedules.

Involving people

Once the initiators agree on general direction and method, they can put the idea of Forward America before the leaders of all responsible organizations in the city not yet included, and before the citizens as a whole.* All organizations that represent interests of people in the area have a logical role. All citizens should have an opportunity to participate. Getting word to them will require substantial communication efforts.

Several methods can be used to gain this participation, none of which are exclusive of the others. Personal contacts by members of the executive group can be most important. Forums or congresses attended by the heads of all organizations or the public at large offer another avenue. In large cities, such public meetings can be held on a "neighborhood" basis. Still other methods are sustained TV, radio and newspaper campaigns, or direct mailings, including opinion polls and questionnaires. Methods which include direct personal contact are the most satisfying and effective.

Identifying goals and problems

In this initial contact with community-wide group leaders or the public at large, the basic ideas for mobilizing community resources can be presented and discussed. The trends and projections for the community can be reviewed, as can the advantages of getting together to help meet the challenges these trends and projections may mean. Most important, broad community goals and objectives can be defined and given priorities. Some of the critical obstacles that stand in their way can be identified. Thus, people are given a chance to be involved at the outset in some of the key decisions and issues affecting their community.

Studying problems

Once the goals of a community have been defined and given priorities; once some of the problems in the way of these goals have been identified, the next step is to study these problems and find ways to solve them.

In every city there is a reservoir of information on local problems. Research reports, planning studies and statements of fact and opinion by experts are frequently at hand but seldom have been widely considered or implemented. These kinds of information can be gathered by small committees of experts and other people assigned to study specific problems. Many of the people who can contribute to these study committees can be recruited through the various com-

munications media discussed above, including the forum or congress for leaders or for the public at large.

In addition to defining problems, these same committees can suggest ways to overcome them. In some cases, feasible solutions may not be known, and the committees will want to recommend more research, possibly by outside experts. Ample time should be allowed for the committees to make these studies. Quick answers should be discouraged.

With a number of such study committees at work, the extent of, and available solutions for, many problems can be determined. Involving leaders and members of many groups in these studies assures a comprehensive perspective on a problem and helps the community understand how one problem may be related to others and may affect the area in several ways. This, in turn, helps identify the resources needed to solve the problems. It also identifies the people, groups and agencies that can provide the resources.

Substantial publicity to the work of these committees will help generate awareness and public understanding and support.

Developing priorities

Another kind of job needed in the Forward America process is sifting the reports and recommendations of study committees—and selecting the problems and solutions that should receive priority attention. This job is best done in two steps.

First, some initial sorting must be made. Extremely good judgment is needed to do this properly.

Here is where the executive group or another group of top leaders of the area can make a key contribution. People who are accustomed to viewing the community as a whole and in perspective should be assigned the job of suggesting priorities. Key community leaders should have this responsibility. But, in no case should they presume to speak for all groups. Their conclusions should not be final.

This is why a second step is needed. Preliminary suggestions for priorities can be put before another forum of organization leaders or the public at large to get a judgment on priorities and on alternate approaches to solutions. Before this second forum convenes, the suggestions for priorities should be placed before the entire community with sufficient time for review and basic understanding. This can be done through the news media and special publications.

Assigning responsibility for action

The forum decisions point the way to the next step: Action. Some action will logically be governmental; other action will be private, frequently through voluntary organizations. Customarily, the executive group will request the most appropriate unit of government or the most appropriate voluntary organization to assume responsibility for action. Unless an action is pinpointed for which there is no capable organization to assume responsibility, the executive group of Forward America should refrain from becoming an action group itself, or from creating new action groups in the community. A cardinal feature of the process is that it does not create a new "layer" of control or organization. It upgrades group action by bringing all interests together to work cooperatively but independently. Organizations concerned with community problems not included among the highest priority needs are encouraged to continue their efforts, hopefully in a new and more favorable environment of public awareness.

Reviewing, reporting and revising

The executive group that has guided the approach up to this point should review periodically and report progress to the community. The group should plan for subsequent meetings of community leaders or the public at large, as needed. In this way,

responsible groups will continue to have a part as the future of the area is charted.

Forward America is a continuing process. Community conditions change. Problems change. Priorities will change. Forward America, not being a project, does not start and end. When one priority is successfully achieved, the next is tackled or a new priority is selected as a result of changing circumstances. When leaders retire or resign from the effort, they are replaced by people of equal competence and stature. This is why the process places emphasis on the involvement of organizations. Organizations provide the continuity necessary for the process to stay alive from year to year.

Throughout this pamphlet, there is emphasis on the role of groups and group leaders in the Forward America process. This approach reflects the recognition that Americans tend to express their views and seek important goals through the voluntary associations they make—in churches, business and professional organizations, labor unions, civil rights groups, civic, fraternal, neighborhood, and social organizations. But organizations are people and the process is designed to serve not organizations per se, but people.

Thus, the decisions reached and the recommendations proposed under Forward America must reflect the desires and goals of people and must flow from their involvement in the process. A well-run process will be open to the widest range of people—whether they participate as group representatives or as individuals—and its ultimate viability will depend on widespread citizen support for the consensus Forward America represents. There will be plenty of work for all those who want to be involved. There must also be ample opportunity to reach out through the community to all the people—formally organized groups or not—to know their needs and hopes and test their support for a community consensus on problems and actions.

This is the Forward America idea.

It has generated satisfaction equally for the voluntary organization leader, the officer of government and the private citizen in a number of communities.

It is an approach required for more positive direction to community growth and development. It may well provide the type of decisions and actions upon which the survival of our voluntary organizations and even our communities depend.

Dollars for Gold

HON. LOUIS C. WYMAN

OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 12, 1968

Mr. WYMAN. Mr. Speaker, I voted against removing the assurance of protecting our remaining supply of gold at Fort Knox. The vote to do this in the House was only 199 to 190. The bill passed because of strong administration arm-twisting and a personal plea from our distinguished colleague, the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. MILLS].

At this hour, the financial wolves are howling at the door to our gold vaults already. Some urge an increase in the price of gold in U.S. dollars. This, of course, would be an admission that our dollars have cheapened; that inflation has cut deeply into their purchasing power, and that the financial policies of the present administration have also failed us—along with this same administration's notorious failures in foreign policy and in other fields at home, principally the public safety.

*Depending on local circumstances, this stage of Forward America may be limited to communications with group leaders only, delaying full involvement until a later point in time.

But perhaps few Americans realize the windfall profits that would go to the Soviet Union and France should the price of gold be increased. This is precisely what both these nations have intended to result from their gold acquisitions over recent years. This is an understandable objective from a Communist nation but it is disgraceful from our erstwhile ally, France.

On this subject, I commend to the attention of all who are concerned by the fiscal crisis that is upon us the following excellent editorial from today's Wall Street Journal. This editorial succinctly points out that if we would but get our own house in order, our budget in order, and our Government operating in the black, that pressure would be off the dollar in short order.

Mr. Speaker, our dismal fiscal crisis is just one more compelling reason for the American people to elect a Republican President this year. Four more years of L. B. J. would indeed break the bank.

The editorial referred to follows:

BETTER THAN GOLD

Influential bankers and economists are urging the Government to move toward an increase in the price of gold, as Lee Silbermann reported in this newspaper recently. Most of them recognize the advice for what it is, the counsel of despair.

Despite all of the official assurances of stability, a continuation of present policies before long will shrink the U.S. gold stock to a point where some drastic action will become inevitable. If the gold price is not raised the Government may have to stop selling gold or abandon the metal altogether. Instead of waiting stoically for a messy situation at best, why not try to raise the gold price in an orderly fashion?

One trouble is that a price increase presumably would require unanimous agreement of major Western countries, something that has of late been difficult to achieve on any topic. Once a conference was called, moreover, a speculative run on gold would become almost a certainty. An orderly gold-price rise therefore is almost a contradiction in terms.

Even if it were somehow possible to put through a price increase without thoroughly disrupting international financial markets, the result might be a good deal less than salubrious. For one thing, if the U.S. went back on its oft-reaffirmed pledge to maintain the \$35 price, how much credence would the world put in pledges to retain the new level?

Actually, a price boost—with its windfall profits for the likes of France, Russia and South Africa—would do nothing at all to improve the long-term U.S. balance-of-payments position. This country could go on pouring out gold a while longer but, assuming no changes in basic policies, its gold sooner or later would be gone.

What must be done is to change those basic policies. It must be done, that is, unless the Government relishes the notion of plunging the U.S. into the sort of currency chaos that so long has been unhappily characteristic of a number of South American nations.

The changes are simple enough in principle; only the political will so far is lacking. They involve nothing more than the injection of genuine responsibility into the nation's fiscal and monetary policies. If the Government wants the world to believe the dollar is sound, it's going to have to start acting accordingly.

More responsible policies could have, and should have, been adopted several years ago with little or no shock to the economy. The longer they are put off, the greater the impact is sure to become.

The gold drain of recent years has stemmed from a number of factors, one of which is admittedly the Vietnam war. But other countries certainly would not be so eager to trade dollars for gold were they firmly confident that the dollar is, as the U.S. keeps contending, just as good as gold.

For that reason gold serves a useful purpose in the U.S.: It keeps annoying the policy-makers. True, they can postpone effective corrective action by doing all sorts of things, curbing private foreign investment, taxing purchasers of foreign securities, persuading other governments to buy U.S. bonds. Like all roads, however, this one has an ending.

What that ending will be is solely up to the Government. If it does finally opt for a solid dollar, though, one happy result for the policy-makers is that they could stop worrying about gold. If Government became responsible and stayed that way, in fact, gold might become a topic of little consequence.

Should such a state ever be achieved, the nation could even consider calmly whether it's absolutely necessary to contend with the inconveniences of storing and handling bullion. A sound dollar, after all, is in many ways much better than gold.

Forceful Leadership of Borg-Warner Corp. by Robert S. Ingersoll

HON. BIRCH E. BAYH

OF INDIANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, March 13, 1968

Mr. BAYH. Mr. President, in the March 8, 1968, issue of Time, attention is called to the remarkable accomplishments which Borg-Warner Corp. has made under the forceful leadership of Robert S. Ingersoll.

From a company facing numerous and serious difficulties, Mr. Ingersoll, with foresight and determination, has built and reorganized it into one of the leaders in the field. The State of Indiana, Mr. President, has been one of the prime beneficiaries of his tremendous efforts.

His immense success is deservedly attested to by the Time article, and I ask unanimous consent that this Time magazine article be made a part of the RECORD at this time.

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

AWAY FROM WHIMSY

In 1956, when Robert S. Ingersoll succeeded his aging father as president of Borg-Warner Corp., one of the U.S.'s biggest producers of auto parts, he found a company beset by crises. Not the least of his troubles was that Ford had just announced it would build its own automobile transmissions, lopping a neat \$100 million off B-W's volume. Beyond that, the organization chart was in dangerous disarray. The four companies that had merged in 1928 to form Borg-Warner continued to compete with one another head-on; their four top executives rarely condescended to drop in on the headquarters building in Chicago. And new acquisitions followed the same separatist line. Earnings, which had hit a record \$41 million in 1955, plunged to nearly half that by 1958.

The tall, rail-thin and prematurely bald new president saw that his company was desperately in need of an overhaul, no matter how costly or time-consuming it might be. First, Ingersoll consolidated his divisions, cutting the number of the men who reported

directly to the president from 37 to eight. Even as he strengthened the company's historically dominant auto-parts sector, Ingersoll sought to rebuild the other product lines, easing the company away from the cyclical and whimsical swings of Detroit.

PINT-SIZE PLASTICS

The company's industrial-products division, which already included Morse Chain and Pesco pumps, was expanded with the acquisition of Byron Jackson Pump Co.; the division now claims 22% of sales. B-W's builders-and-consumers division—with its well-established Norge line of household appliances—went out and added York Corp., manufacturers of air conditioners. This division now has gathered 30% of company sales.

In 1935, Borg-Warner had acquired two steel companies and a pint-size plastics company now called Marbon Chemical; that collection formed a chemicals division. While steels have progressed gradually, representing some 4% of total sales, Marbon chemists have developed a plastic named Cycloc, which is now used for everything from football helmets to Western Electric-built telephones. As a result of this discovery, chemicals became B-W's fastest-growing division. Sales boomed from \$36.4 million in 1962 to \$99 million last year—giving the division 10% of the company's turnover.

For all the diversification, Borg-Warner's auto-parts division has hung onto a big, 34% chunk of sales, even though last year's so-so Detroit performance contributed to B-W's 8.4% fall-off in earnings, down from \$47 million the previous year, on record sales of \$952 million.

But while the U.S. picture was disappointing, Borg-Warner auto parts were finding new markets abroad, where sales increased by 16%, to \$45 million. Operating in twelve countries, B-W has "commonized" such parts as clutches and axles to fit most foreign cars. Traffic jams from London to Tokyo are giving foreign drivers a yen for autos with shiftless transmissions, but only 10% of the cars in Europe have them. The Borg-Warner-built "automatic stick shift," optional this year in Volkswagens, should become a trend setter. In Japan, where 97% of the cars use manual shift, automakers are eager to acquire B-W's tightly patented know-how. So far, however, Government restrictions against foreign investments have stymied all efforts to organize a company, which Borg-Warner resolutely insists it must control before allowing production.

In any event, with some 30 acquisitions to his credit at home and abroad in a brief eleven years, Robert Ingersoll, 54, has moved his once-ailing auto supplier deep into the prosperous conglomerate area. That strenuous task accomplished, he now plans to confine his personal role to "looking to the future of the corporation." Taking over some of his more hectic activities will be James F. Beré, 45, a graduate of the auto-parts division who last week was named president.

Fifth Freedom Flap

HON. WILLIAM A. STEIGER

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 12, 1968

Mr. STEIGER of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I know the House read with interest the recent Presidential message on education.

The Wall Street Journal reviewed the message in a manner which deserves our attention. The article by Jonathan Spivak should be read—and re-read—by all in order to better understand the

gulf between promise and performance of this administration.

I include at this point in my remarks the Spivak story:

FIFTH FREEDOM FLAP: JOHNSON'S EDUCATION PLAN IS LESS THAN CANDID ON CUTBACKS
(By Jonathan Spivak)

WASHINGTON.—"It's all the baloney that bothers me," grumbles a skeptical Federal schoolman.

"An all-out attempt to make what is a relatively modest program seem much more than that," complains a veteran leader of an influential education lobby.

Thus, despite public praise for the President's ambitious new education program, dubbed the "fifth freedom," the private reviews are scarcely rave. There is no quarrel with Mr. Johnson's ultimate objective—to remove all racial and economic barriers to college education for qualified students. It's the present performance that is so troublesome. And therein may lie a domestic problem for the President entirely of his own making.

The big budget cutbacks in several burgeoning school programs, particularly college classroom construction, and the hold-the-line approach in other Federal education endeavors can be understood in the light of war priorities. The hesitation to embrace sweeping new school solutions may be essential because of the deep debate within the higher education community over desired directions—general support for institutions or scholarship aid for students. But why not admit it?

The obvious explanation, of course, is that candor is costly in an election year. The current parade of Presidential messages, the ambitious forecasts of bold new five-year programs, the appointment of an array of new study commissions to grapple with unsolved social problems all help to create a public impression of motion. The upper reaches of the bureaucracy loyally foster this fiction.

"It is a broad and comprehensive message. It moves us along in a constructive manner," insists Wilbur Cohen, Under Secretary of the Health, Education and Welfare Department. Even less circumspect are Presidential aides more politically attuned to White House wishes. "Major proposals," "Most significant," "Very important," they proclaim.

No doubt the President is deeply devoted to expanding Federal education aid, and will do so when budget and politics permit. In truth, the new year's proposals contain some useful and highly significant reforms of existing activities. But the exaggerations, evasions and omissions apparent in the fifth freedom education message overshadow the positive contributions, and could make the President's longer-run aims far more difficult to achieve.

Liberals who share his social goals may be disenchanted with the seeming sophistry of claiming progress while programs are being cut back or are at best standing still. Conservatives who might be satisfied with the President's determined efforts to economize could be confused by a false illusion of expansion.

SEARCHING FOR THE REALITIES

Some HEW officials believe a franker Presidential portrayal would have been, in the long run, better politics. "He could have just talked about what he has done in the past five years," says one. But such openness is expressed only on the lower rungs of the bureaucratic ladder, so it is instructive to search for the realities behind the rhetoric of the education program set forth in LBJ's new budget and subsequent message to Congress.

Consider the contention by Education Commissioner Harold Howe II that the fifth freedom proposals "taken together constitute the largest package of higher education legis-

lation ever considered by Congress." Technically this is true. An enormous Administration effort has been expended in developing the nearly-billion-dollar bundle. But in other years the expiration of such major measures as the 1958 National Defense Education Act, which happens to run out this year, would have been seized on by the President as an excuse for substantial liberalizations; the program's clientele can always be counted on for political support. Yet for most college aid legislation this year, simple extensions are all that's being sought.

The major "new" higher education proposal, the Education Opportunity Act of 1968, aims to insure that "no student will be denied an opportunity to develop his talents because of financial inability to meet basic higher education costs." HEW's high command insists the pledge represents new Federal policy and promises substantial aid over a five-year period. But, in the short run, parents will continue to feel the pinch.

The number of \$500-a-year Federal scholarships for low-income freshmen starting college in the fall of 1969 will be cut almost in half, to 63,000 from the previous year's 105,600. The reason: The continuing expense of maintaining scholarships awarded in earlier years. Moreover, although 237,000 more college students are to receive Federal benefits, to lighten the budget burden most of these are to be furnished through Government-guaranteed low-interest bank loans; in today's tight money market, not even the President can assure that private lenders will make good on this commitment.

QUALITY OF GRADUATE SCHOOLS

A \$10 million Office of Education effort is proposed for uplifting the quality of instruction at the second-string graduate schools—small, strapped institutions, as distinct from the wealthy Harvards and Californias. A fine idea—and precisely the purpose of an existing National Science Foundation "centers of excellence" program that is being cut back by \$9 million because of budget stringencies.

The President proposes another "new measure . . . to increase Government-sponsored research in our universities." But, on fuller explanation, this turns out to be only an appeal that Congress appropriate in full the research funds already requested in the budget by such agencies as the NSF, the National Institutes of Health and the Atomic Energy Commission.

Much is made of a new statement of Presidential principles underlying Federal aid to higher education. But the most controversial issue—whether Federal funds should help students pay rising costs (the desire of most private schools) or should help institutions hold down tuition fees (the demand of public universities)—remains as unresolved as ever.

All this criticism may sound cynical and, of course, any President has the privilege of portraying his program in the best possible light. But undue emphasis on glib generalities may obscure less dramatic details of the "fifth freedom" that could significantly enhance the effectiveness of Federal education aid.

Some samples:

For the first time the Administration wants to appropriate funds a year in advance for elementary and secondary school aid, allowing localities more time to plan for the expenditure of this \$1.2 billion annual outlay that benefits 9 million poverty-stricken children. Currently, Congressional dilly-dallying delays the availability of such money until well into the school year, and local officials must make hectic last-minute arrangements to disburse the dollars. The Administration also wants to extend such "advance funding," eagerly sought by educators, to Federal vocational and higher education programs.

Three existing college student aid programs—low-interest direct loans, scholarship

grants and work-study projects—will be consolidated and simplified. This reform will eliminate varying administrative requirements and financial arrangements that have burdened the colleges and probably deprived some deserving students of aid. Similarly, Federal financial strictures will be eased to give local school officials wider leeway in allocating vocational education funds.

Important as these modifications are, they don't easily lend themselves to campaign oratory. Mr. Johnson's reliance on rhetorical substitutes could squander the political capital he has accumulated as the "teacher" President who has already vastly expanded Federal education efforts.

Baltimore's Mayor Thomas J. D'Alesandro III

HON. JOSEPH D. TYDINGS

OF MARYLAND

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, March 13, 1968

MR. TYDINGS. Mr. President, today marks the end of the first 100 days in office for Baltimore's fine new mayor, Thomas J. D'Alesandro III. The Baltimore Sun, in a major article on March 11 by Robert A. Erlandson, has characterized Mr. D'Alesandro's record as that of an "activist" who "has thrown himself headlong into the battle to solve the city's immense problems, fiscal, social, and economic."

Mayor D'Alesandro has brought extraordinary energy and understanding to his office. He has recruited an exceptionally able staff of personal assistants and department heads. As the Sun article points out, and as I can verify personally, the mayor has infused each of his aides—and all his associates including U.S. Senators, Representatives and State legislators—with his sense of urgency in attacking the city's problems.

Mayor D'Alesandro has taken personal charge of efforts to meet many of the city's problems including the preparation of the budget, planning under the model cities grant, cleaning up neighborhoods and improving housing, guaranteeing equal employment opportunity, and providing a comprehensive summer program of jobs and recreation for young people.

Mayor D'Alesandro's energy and drive may conceal from observers the fact that he is also a very humane and thoughtful man who, personally, is deeply concerned about the quality of life in his city. The personal qualities of Mayor D'Alesandro are, I think, well revealed in a very fine statement I heard him give recently at the Manresa breakfast in the Lord Baltimore Hotel. I want to share it, as well as the fine article from the Baltimore Sun by Mr. Erlandson, with my colleagues.

Baltimore is fortunate indeed to have Mayor D'Alesandro's leadership and his record of the first 100 days have verified the wisdom of the voters last November.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Sun article of March 11, 1968, and Mayor D'Alesandro's remarks of February 4, 1968, be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the items were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

**D'ALESSANDRO TAKES STOCK OF FIRST
"100 DAYS" IN JOB**

(By Robert A. Erlandson)

Mayor D'Alessandro took office last December 5 promising to end discrimination in the city, to launch an unprecedented school construction program and to "recapture control of the policies and purse strings of city government."

When he steps into City Hall Wednesday morning, he will have completed the traditional "Hundred Days" in which initial assessments are made. And Mr. D'Alessandro believes that in this time, he has set his Administration firmly on its way to breasting the tide.

"We are on top of things," he declared, yesterday, adding "we are not just reacting to everything."

His over-all aim has been to "give the people a sense of confidence in the government" and he believes he has done this by establishing dialogue with all segments of the community, white and Negro, including militants, with business and especially within the city government.

While Baltimore's problems are perhaps no more nor less than those facing any comparable city, Mr. D'Alessandro took office facing certainly more intense difficulties than any of his predecessors.

He has become an "activist" Mayor and has thrown himself headlong into the battle to solve the city's immense problems, fiscal, social and economic.

The 38-year-old chief executive generally arrives in his wood-paneled office on the second floor of City Hall before 9 A.M. and generally does not return to his Mount Washington home before 10 or 11 P.M. "on an average day," seven days a week.

In between times he faces an unceasing round of appointments, meetings, appearances and conferences. Daily schedules are shattered, frequently because the Mayor's "open-door" policy forces him into impromptu meetings, many of them confrontations with civil rights or neighborhood organizations coming directly to him to protest particular problems or groups of problems.

Mayor D'Alessandro has one of the largest personal staffs any Baltimore Mayor has ever had, four men working now and one due to move in next week. He drives his aides as hard as he is driving himself and has infused each with his sense of urgency in attacking the city's problems.

TOP PRIORITY

The most baffling problem is the continuing increase of crime, said the Mayor, who has launched an "all-out war" against crime as his top priority program, along with education.

He has created a crime advisory group composed of officials and citizens which is charged with producing some short-term practical suggestions to fight crime, as well as a long-range program.

Mr. D'Alessandro sees the group as a means of involving many segments of the community in problems which many of its members have had little contact with before.

In education, Mayor D'Alessandro has worked with the city Finance Department and the Commissioners of Finance to cancel \$50,100,000 of existing but unused bond authorizations so that he could propose an \$80,000,000 bond issue for school construction and still preserve the city's credit rating.

On May 1, the Board of Estimates must present the city budget to the City Council and Mayor D'Alessandro has taken personal charge of the preliminary preparation of the budget which will go to the board later this month.

TAKEN CHARGE

"I'm convinced I've taken charge of the city government," the Mayor asserted. "I've been meeting with the department heads about the budget to get their thinking about their requests."

With the establishment of a fiscal screening committee, comprised of Hyman A. Pressman, the city comptroller; Daniel Paul, the city auditor, and Charles L. Benton, the finance director, "I've gained control of the budget," Mr. D'Alessandro said.

As a result of the committee's work and of his meetings with department heads he said department requests total about \$100,000,000 more than last year, while, the Mayor said, in previous years they have been over \$200,000,000 higher than the year before.

In the field of social relations, Mr. D'Alessandro points to the Job Bank he is setting up in cooperation with local businessmen and the State employment service, and the Community Service Program, which is aimed at preserving sound fringe neighborhoods bordering the blighted inner-city areas.

The Model Cities Program, which will concentrate services to revitalize a designated inner-city area, is in the planning stage.

Mayor D'Alessandro said that producing Model Cities plans in time for a Federal deadline of next November is one of the critical projects of his first year in office.

He launched his attack on housing ills with plans for a new city Department of Housing and Community Development, and he is ordering concentrated clean-ups of ghetto neighborhoods, as well as compiling an inventory of vacant buildings in the city.

The Mayor lavished praise on William Donald Schaefer, his successor as City Council president, as the "unsung hero" of the new Administration. Mr. Schaefer is not only the Administration spokesman in the Council but is also in charge of the vacant-house survey and many other chores he has undertaken for the Mayor.

In attacking discrimination, the Mayor has required all firms doing business with the city to certify they are equal-opportunity employers, and he is trying to persuade private businessmen to open job and promotion opportunities to all races.

JOBS FOR THE POOR

He has ordered a survey of all city agencies to determine where job opportunities for the poor can be found.

Mr. D'Alessandro has appointed Negroes to various high positions in the government and last week nominated a militant civil rights leader to the School Board.

"Everyone is aware of the serious, urgent, even, in some minds, insoluble problems of the cities," he said. "These problems have been generations in the making and it is going to take years to undo them."

"Yet, notwithstanding the fact that 100 days is a drop in this bucket, I believe there are good reasons for putting a Mayor's first few months under close scrutiny. The times are such that a Mayor has no time to lose. If he is going to take charge, if he is going to begin to make progress, he must take charge—he must set the tone and tempo of his administration and begin to put his plans and programs into action immediately."

"I FEEL COMFORTABLE"

"The first and foremost job I have tried to do in my 100 days is to restore public confidence in city government," Mr. D'Alessandro said. "As I said in my inaugural address: 'I absolutely reject the counsel of those who say we (as a people and as a Government) are not up to the challenge.'"

"My first 100 days have confirmed this belief. I like being Mayor. I feel comfortable in the job, not overconfident, but comfortable in the feeling there are ways in which

definite progress can be made in solving our critical economic and social problems."

**REMARKS OF MAYOR THOMAS J. D'ALESSANDRO
III, MANRESA BREAKFAST, LORD BALTIMORE
HOTEL, FEBRUARY 4, 1968**

I have looked forward to being with you this morning . . . because it gives me the opportunity to speak to you on a personal basis—not as the mayor of Baltimore, but as a fellow Catholic layman . . . as a fellow parent . . . as a fellow taxpayer . . . and as a fellow citizen, who is just as concerned and worried about what is going on all around us, as you are.

A million things seem to be going wrong at once.

Crime is increasing at an alarming rate.

Taxes are rising.

Our country is still at war.

And everywhere you turn, there is unrest—unrest in the streets of cities . . . unrest in family relationships . . . and unrest in the innermost feelings and faith of all persons of religious conviction.

I share these feelings. I wonder, like you do, about what our society is coming to. I wonder, like you do, about what is causing the tremendous problems and conflicts that are troubling us. And I worry, like you do, about what all of us can do about them.

I don't pretend to know the answers. I don't think there are any easy answers or solutions.

But I do think it is within our power—and it must be our urgent purpose—to think hard about these questions . . . to have a direct confrontation with the critical economic, and social, and moral, problems of our times . . . and to seek together to broaden our understanding, and to strengthen our resolve, to find solutions to them.

Many complex, changing forces are at work in the world today. Here closest to home, these forces have converged to create the crisis which faces Baltimore and all large American cities.

It is no exaggeration to say that we are living a time of revolution.

We are in the middle of an industrial revolution, a scientific revolution, and a social revolution.

We are seeing, in our lifetime, on a day-to-day basis, more change, at a faster rate of change, than any people, at any other time, in history.

Twenty years ago, 25 percent of the people in the United States lived in urban areas; and 75 percent lived in rural areas.

Today 80 percent live in urban areas and only 20 percent live in rural areas.

20 years from now, 95 percent of our entire population will live in or about cities.

Of all the scientists and engineers who have ever lived, 97 percent are living and working today.

There has been more construction work done on the face of the earth in the past 30 years, than in the previous 3000 years put together. We in the United States are currently building new colleges at the rate of one per week.

Perhaps the most dramatic example of all is our recent exploits in space. Only a few years ago, space ships and moon shots were unheard of, except in science fiction books.

Obviously these are only a few samples of the modern technology of our times.

We must move with these times. We must try to adapt and adjust our lives to the demands of a whole series of complex, and rapidly-changing events and circumstances.

However, this is no easy job. You, I, and millions of other concerned and confused citizens know how tough a job it is.

For one thing, the rate of all of this change is so overwhelming. No one today can be on top of even a small part of all the specialized scientific and technological knowledge that controls our day-to-day lives, and this is bound to frustrate and frighten any person

who values—as we all do—his own individuality and self-sufficiency.

What's worse, and more basic, is the fact that not all of these changes that have been taking place have been all for the better—particularly if you consider how they have hurt the city.

The problems of Baltimore City, like the problems of all large American cities, have been generations in the making.

They are not the fault of the people of Baltimore, or of any segment of our population.

Rather, they are the fault, or result, of the industrial, scientific and social revolutions I drew reference to—and the fact is that our country, as a whole, has not been prepared to cope with the deep changes in the entire structure of our society, which these revolutions have caused.

For example, the industrial revolution began the migration of people from farms to the cities. Cities became crowded with low-skilled labor.

However, in the late 1800's, and the early 1900's—when the heavy migration of Catholics to this country occurred, and our grandfathers and fathers worked their way up the economic ladder—there was a plentiful supply of jobs at the bottom of the ladder. They were hard jobs, but each man had a chance to work his way up.

Today, automation and computer technology have eliminated a great many of these jobs, and the new immigrant in the city—who comes, in the main, from southern, rural areas, and has been uprooted by modern labor-saving farm machinery—does not have this same kind of opportunity.

Yet, more of these new immigrants—white and Negro—are coming to the city than ever before. More than ten million people migrated from farms to cities from 1950 through 1960, and it is these people today who are on the outside of society looking in . . . who are looking for jobs, who are not finding jobs, and who are winding up on the unemployment rolls.

So in this sense, while the industrial and technological revolution has created unprecedented prosperity, it has also created unprecedented social and economic problems.

Let me give you another example: Highway construction.

Baltimore, like other cities, has spent, and is spending, millions and millions of dollars on new highways. These highways are essential for commerce, but at the same time, they encourage industries to locate in the suburbs—out of transportation reach of the inner city poor who are looking for employment . . . and they also encourage people to leave the city and live in the suburbs.

As the rural poor move in, the middle-income, tax-paying homeowners are moving out.

On the one hand, there is a greater demand for municipal services of every kind. Yet on the other hand, there are fewer taxpayers who are able to pay for them.

Another example is medical research. During this century, life expectancy has increased by nearly ten years. Most senior citizens live in the city, and, as a matter of fact, they make up the fastest growing segment of the city's population.

Today we have 95,000 persons over 65 years of age, or 10% of the city's total population. During the next ten years, while the overall population of the city is expected to stay the same, the number of persons over 65 is expected to rise to about 110,000, or close to 12% of the total population.

We are delighted to have, and to keep, these senior citizens. They make tremendous contributions to the life of the community. But the financial facts of life are that they do not, on the average, carry their share of the tax load. A study in 1960 showed that half of all persons over 60 in the city had an average income of less than \$1,300 per year.

In essence, then, these are the kinds of trends, and the tides of the times, which have caused the city to be in the economic, and social, and financial condition it is in.

There is one other factor which I want to draw reference to, and that is what President Kennedy called "the paradox of poverty in the midst of plenty".

There is unequaled prosperity in this country. . . . There has been dramatic social as well as scientific progress. . . . Yet all of this just makes it that much harder for people who have so little, to accept their poverty in the midst of so many people who have so much.

Sometimes I feel that we have talked so much about taxes, about budgets, about schools, about expressways, and about buildings, that we have lost sight of people.

The city is made up of people, most of them little people and it is easy to lose sight of exactly how much deprivation many of these people suffer, and exactly how many basic human needs many of these people have.

You and I have our problems and our needs. But when all is said and done, we live like kings compared to many other people, who are almost incredibly worse off.

There are over 100,000 people in the city who live in dwellings without plumbing, water or heat.

Over half of the adult population of Baltimore has had less than an eighth-grade education (20% have less than a fifth-grade education).

In the inner city areas that the city has designated for our new model cities program, approximately 105,000 people live. . . . But the conditions under which they live is a disgrace.

Fifty percent live on incomes below \$3,000 per year.

The official unemployment rate is 10%, but over 70% are unskilled, under-educated and under-employed.

The infant mortality rate is 33% greater than the rate in the rest of the city.

The tuberculosis rate is 2½ times that in the rest of the city.

And, based upon studies in other cities, at least 25% of the young people between the ages of 16 to 21 have never, never, seen a doctor.

The first step we must take . . . if we are going to understand what is happening in the city, and if we are going to do something about it . . . is to face up to these facts.

We usually call these financial, or economic, or social problems . . . and they are. But they are also moral problems . . . for, so long as this many people are without decent health, education, and shelter, you, I, and the total community have failed in our basic moral and religious duty to our fellow citizens.

It is Government's basic responsibility to provide these essential necessities of life. But Government cannot do the job alone.

There must be the kind of citizen participation—and individual sense of social responsibility—which Pope John expressed so often, and I would like to quote a few words from Vatican II's Constitution on the Church in the Modern World.

"Since all men possess an eternal soul and are created in God's likeness . . . since they have the same nature and origin, have been redeemed by Christ, and enjoy the same divine calling and destination . . . the basic equality of all must receive increasingly greater recognition.

" . . . with respect to the fundamental rights of the person, every type of discrimination, whether based on sex, race, color, social condition, language or religion, is to be overcome and eradicated as contrary to God's intent.

" . . . There must be made available to all men everything necessary for leading a life

truly human, such as food, clothing and shelter . . . The right to choose a state of life freely and to found a family . . . The right to education, to employment, to a good reputation, and to respect".

I am proud of, and grateful for all that is being done here in the Archdiocese of Baltimore . . . Under the courageous and wise guidance of his eminence Lawrence Cardinal Shehan . . . To translate this religious faith, and this spiritual sense into acts that will help to achieve true economic opportunity and social justice for every person in our community.

As you know, only several weeks ago, the archdiocese published the Baltimore Urban Parish Study, which is a 20-year master plan for parish activities and facilities in the inner city and which, in its own words, is to help our church to a new involvement in the life of the city and its people.

This past summer, the archdiocese administered Operation Champ, an inner city recreation program, run by inner city residents. Operation Champ was a major factor in keeping our city cool during the hot and troublesome summer months.

Where Cadoa Hall has gone down, new housing for senior citizens, sponsored by the archdiocese, will go up. And in the new town of Columbia, our church is participating in an inter-faith corporation which will build housing for middle and low-income persons.

As mayor, I am in a special position to be aware and appreciative of these invaluable contributions to the rebuilding of our community.

However what I really want to call to your attention is how, as a layman like you, I draw inspiration and faith from the commitment of our church which is behind these programs.

I am convinced that if we are truly to rebuild our city, religious faith and moral courage must be the foundation on which we begin to build.

Churches of all faiths and denominations must participate more fully in trying to solve the terrible economic and social problems of our times . . . and once churches lead the way, other segments of our community, and all people of good will, will follow.

Let us, together, face up to these problems.

Let us, together, begin to muster the will, and to find the ways, to meet this critical challenge.

We must strive for a true brotherhood of man.

We must seek true sustenance and justice for every person in our community.

And therefore we must search for God's grace and guidance along the way.

I hope, this morning, that I have been able to help you to understand, and to share with me, how I see the posture of our city in these troubling days.

I hope I have been able to show you what lies behind our problems, and what—with faith, commitment and with the whole community working together—can lie ahead.

With a common purpose, and with God's help, we shall speedily progress along the path to a better life for all of our people.

Thank you, and God bless you.

Report on Negro Revolution

HON. JOSEPH S. CLARK

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, March 13, 1968

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, the oldest Negro college in America, Lincoln University, in Oxford, Pa., has recently

established a center for interfaith studies and has appointed a distinguished religious leader and teacher, Rabbi Martin A. Weitz, as its director.

Rabbi Weitz recently wrote for the bi-monthly Jewish journal, *Brotherhood*, a perceptive and sympathetic report on the Negro revolution. I ask unanimous consent that the report be printed in the *RECORD*.

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

NEGRO REVOLUTION
(By Dr. Martin M. Weitz)

The Young American Negro is in revolt from his old folks' ways and the black bourgeois image in the Third American Revolution.

He has a *faith of doubt* and a *doubt of faith* that will not permit him to follow easy escapism of parents, nor take private solace in the contemporary challenge of America. This search gives him no rest, leaves him no peace, and disturbs him no end. He is in a vast no man's land, which as yet has no definite bounds. His involvement is an encounter not with destiny, but with disarray. The long hot summer, with its meaningless, destructive riots has left him confused. Where shall he turn? What shall he do? What can he believe?

He may not drift to the extremes of the Black Muslims or a left-motivated Stokeley Carmichael or H. Rap Brown. Not for him the superficial Father Divine, Brother Mohammed Ali or "Baby" Adam Clayton Powell. He is in quest not so much of a comrade as a cause, not so much to lose himself as to find himself.

The Jewish community across the land is much disturbed with the leftist and anti-Semitic tendencies manifested by the New Politics Conference in Chicago last Labor Day weekend. Black Power may satisfy emotions of people fed on frustration, but it does not solve real problems. These require coalition with government, labor, business, religious and civil rights groups.

The young American Negro needs the voice of experience and the voice of America in leadership against so-called Negro anti-Semitism. He needs, more than ever before, an A. Philip Randolph, a Whitney M. Young, a Dr. Martin Luther King, who already have spoken against the evils of anti-Semitism. James Baldwin denounced it as "the most ancient and barbaric of European myths."

We cannot blame Black Power and Negro anti-Semitism or whatever suits our primitive levels of prejudice, and utterly ignore the deep discriminations, the vast impoverishment, the constant repudiation of basic rights which bred them and fed them.

Negroes do not yet have full equality in areas of housing, education and employment, nor do they know legal justice in vital areas. Would you, too, not be impatient for the basic rights and dignity that are yours in the law of the land?

We as Jews must labor for these rights because they are *right*. They are our mutual heritage from the Bible and the Constitution. "All men are created equal" is but political translation of the Bible theme, "Love thy neighbor as thyself."

Marvin Wachman, president of Lincoln University, at its opening convocation September 21, emphasized: "I am still optimistic, despite the grim story of the past summer. Expectations and promises have been much greater than accomplishments. As in all revolutions, the two must be brought closely together. The university is the place to do exactly that."

Revolution comprises struggle on many fronts today; eradication of slums, educa-

tional and job opportunities, and rehabilitation of millions of lives, especially the Negroes of America lifting them from despair to aspiration.

Today it is the Negro who is in the forefront of the struggle for freedom. In this struggle he will find that his best friend and ally is the Jew, who fought and won many battles for equal rights in democratic societies in America and across the world.

The Economic Aspects of Trade With Communist Countries: The American Stake

HON. THOMAS B. CURTIS

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 13, 1968

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, on December 7, 1967, I testified before the Subcommittee on Europe of the House Committee on Foreign Affairs in conjunction with the hearings being conducted by the subcommittee on the advisability of expanding trade with Communist nations. Because the printed hearings of the committee will not be available for some time and because I have had several requests for copies of my remarks I am inserting them at this point in the *RECORD* in order to make them available to those who are interested:

THE ECONOMIC ASPECTS OF TRADE WITH COMMUNIST COUNTRIES: THE AMERICAN STAKE

(Remarks of Hon. THOMAS B. CURTIS before the Subcommittee on Europe of the House Committee on Foreign Affairs, December 7, 1967, at hearings on East-West trade; Congressman CURTIS is a congressional delegate for trade negotiations and second ranking Republican on the tariff-setting House Ways and Means Committee, which has primary legislative jurisdiction in the foreign trade area, including East-West trade; Mr. CURTIS is also senior House Republican of the House-Senate Joint Economic Committee)

Mrs. Kelly and members of the Subcommittee, thank you for the opportunity to present my views on the controversial subject of trade with the Communist countries. This is very important work, for a number of reasons.

First, the subject itself is a highly controversial one, as you know, and deserves open discussion in the public forum of the Congress and its Committees. Second, it is a subject on which the Congress itself is loosely organized, which is one reason why I have accepted your kind invitation to appear here.

My point is this: responsibility for U.S. trade and commercial policy with Communist countries is separated among several House standing committees. The Ways and Means Committee has the responsibility for setting tariffs, and would be the legislative forum in which a bill to extend "most-favored-nation" treatment to these countries would be heard. The Foreign Affairs Committee has the "Battle Act", or the Mutual Defense Assistance Control Act of 1951, which authorizes the State Department to control exports to nations threatening the security of the United States, and authorizes United States participation in the 15-member COCOM (Coordinating Committee), the organization that maintains the agreed-upon list of strategic items that the members will not export to Communist countries. In addition to the

Battle Act, of course, the Foreign Assistance Act contains provisions having to do with commercial relations with Communist countries.

Besides the Ways and Means Committee and the Foreign Affairs Committee, the Banking and Currency Committee also has jurisdiction through the Export Control Act of 1949. This Act is the President's authority to control exports of strategic goods through our extensive export licensing system. The Export Control Act thus provides the authority under which the President implements our COCOM agreements on strategic items, though the COCOM list is far shorter than the U.S. export control list.

Here is a clear case of bad planning by Congress. It is *our* responsibility to control and coordinate our own work flow. In this case we did not do so, and without reason, it would seem. In a memorandum addressed to me dated April 26, 1966, the Legislative Reference Service of the Library of Congress said: "We find nothing in the legislative history of these measures which directly answers your inquiry as to why they weren't integrated, why their provisions seem duplicative and why they were assigned to different committees."

The problem of overlapping jurisdictions does not end with the three committees I have named. Of the 20 committees of the House (16 in the Senate) there are about 15 whose jurisdictions in at least some way include foreign economic policy.

A partial accounting would of course include the Foreign Affairs Committee if only because of its East-West trade role, the Banking and Currency Committee for its work in the field of export financing and international monetary problems, the Agriculture Committee for its jurisdiction over P.L. 480, the sugar quota program, and the cotton textiles quota program, the Judiciary Committee for its role in international anti-trust, patent and copyright problems, and the Education and Labor Committee for its peripheral authority in the area of fair labor standards, and in the International Labor Organization.

The structure of Congress now provides no formal means for bringing together these committees to coordinate their approaches to foreign economic programs.

Coordinated Congressional work in the foreign economic field depends on Congress itself. One of the strengths of Congress is its flexibility. It can create its own task forces, ad hoc or continuing, including members of Congress from all the relevant committees, to properly synthesize Congressional work on the broad range of foreign economic issues in which so many of its committees have a part. Certainly Congress should itself take such steps as are necessary to do well its own work in this important field.

So I would here recommend that Congress itself undertake to create better procedures to coordinate its work in the area of trade and other commercial contracts with the Communist countries.

POLITICAL CONSIDERATIONS

If I may, I would like now to move on to some of the economic considerations that I consider important. In doing so I do not wish to ignore the political aspects of the "East-West trade" problem. These certainly are important, indeed, perhaps even overriding. On the political side of the question some have made strong arguments that the objective of expanded East-West commercial intercourse is justified if only on the basis that it will reduce suspicions, tensions, and frictions that can spill over into violence, thereby reducing the hazard of a general war, and that such commercial contacts would prove worthwhile even if they had no influence whatever on the internal economic policies of the Communist countries.

But this is not the question I am here to address. Instead, I would leave this political, essentially foreign policy question to those in Congress who properly deal with foreign affairs, like yourselves. My interest in the economic aspect of the trade question, and my objective here will therefore be to expose some economic problems which may have a very important bearing on your decisions in the foreign policy area.

ECONOMIC POLICY CONSIDERATIONS

In spite of considerable propaganda to the contrary, I would say that, on balance, U.S. commercial interest in "East-West" trade is relatively small. The Battle Act Report for 1966 indicates that total "free world" exports to all Communist nations (including North Korea, and North Vietnam but excluding Cuba) was \$5.6 billion in 1963, an increase of \$440 million over 1962. In 1964 this figure was \$6.8 billion, in 1965 it was \$7.5 billion, and in 1966 it was \$8 billion.

Total free world imports from all Communist countries in 1963 according to the 1966 Battle Act Report were \$6.2 billion, an increase of \$.7 billion over 1962. In 1964 total free world imports were \$7 billion, in 1965 \$7.8 billion, and in 1966 \$8.3 billion.

The trade of all 15 Coordinating Committee (COCOM) members has maintained a stable share of total free world trade with Communist countries. On the export side, COCOM members' share of trade has fluctuated around 50% of total free world export trade with the East since 1959. On the import side, it has averaged about 47% of the total since 1959. So—while COCOM members have increased the dollar value of their exports from the East from about \$1.86 billion in 1959 to about \$3.7 billion in 1965, and their imports from \$1.9 billion in 1959 to \$3.9 billion in 1965, their share of the growth has been stable, though I will show later that European COCOM members' share of trade has decreased. Full trade data for 1966 are not yet available because the Battle Act Report has not yet been published.

What is the relevance of these data? In comparison with U.S. exports for 1966 of \$29.2 billion, and imports of \$25.5 billion, COCOM members' export-import trade with the East is very small, indeed. In relation to the growth of most nations' GNP and trade during the period since 1959 the volume of industrial COCOM trade with the East is not important.

THE TRADE POTENTIAL

If you accept the argument that the present U.S. economic stake is small, then the question is: "how large is the potential?"

Many large, well-managed U.S. firms with extensive international undertakings and a wide knowledge of world commercial conditions and opportunities have decided that expanded U.S. trade with Communist countries is desirable for commercial as well as political reasons. At least one would think so if advised by certain businessmen as they are represented by business organizations such as the U.S. Chamber of Commerce and the U.S. Council of the International Chamber of Commerce. And, of course, the "Miller Report" to the President expresses this view.

Large, heavy manufacturing firms do see the opportunity for one-shot deals worth several millions of dollars. Other firms see wide opportunities for taking advantage of latent markets for certain types of consumer products.

Of the first type, the plant sale is a good example. The company that can land a \$70 million contract to construct a plant not only can make a handsome initial profit but gets in good position to reap the fruits of future deals. For certain firms these types of prizes thus seem well worth competing for.

Of the second type, an outboard motor manufacturer whom I met in Brussels, during my trip there last year in relation to the Kennedy Round negotiations, is a good ex-

ample. Head of a Belgian subsidiary of a U.S. firm, his interest was in selling outboard motors to the state-owned resorts in the Black Sea. His eagerness to take advantage of this unexploited market was great indeed. Clearly he had found an area where the Soviet Union and perhaps Bulgaria and Rumania might want to buy consumer items and where there was also a chance that sales could actually be consummated. It is from such European subsidiaries of U.S. firms that much of the incentive for increased trade with Communist countries apparently comes. This impression was substantiated by the President of the Chase Manhattan Bank in Frankfurt, who as a banker and a leading figure among the American Chambers of Commerce in Europe had a very good grasp of the aspirations of U.S.-related firms operating in Europe.

AN ESTIMATE OF THE REAL POTENTIAL

In spite of the desire of many U.S. firms to engage in trade with the East, and their belief that it can be profitable, I am led to examine what the real possibilities for increased two-way trade might be.

A number of factors appear to inhibit increased U.S. sales of both types of products. *The Nature of Communist economic systems prevents free exchanges of goods and capital.* I like to use in this respect a metaphor comparing oil and water. In the metaphor, then, increasing East-West trade without resorting to strict bilateral controls is a problem of mixing the oil of the Communist system with the water of free enterprise.

In the case of Austria, for example, trade with the East is controlled and bilaterally balanced yearly in dollar units of account. Even trade between Britain and East European countries is bilaterally balanced though not strictly.

To quote an article by Maurice Ernst in a 1966 study for the Joint Economic Committee titled *New Directions in the Soviet Economy*, "The application of Soviet type policies and institutions in Eastern Europe had interrelated effects on the domestic use of resources and on foreign trade opportunities. Trade opportunities were to some extent limited by Western controls, but Soviet and Eastern European policies were much more important limitations."

WILL THE EASTERN COUNTRIES CHANGE?

Now the question becomes, will, and how fast will, the Communist countries change their state trading systems to reflect the image of free market economies?

Among the Eastern European countries, the reorientation of economic planning toward greater freedom from bureaucrat managers has developed slowly in the past two or three years. Formerly, as in the Soviet economy, the stress in economic planning was on politically determined output targets and on materials balances. A host of economic inefficiencies stemmed naturally from such "command economies." Now, however, at least according to Ernst, we are told that the desire to develop the branches of production for which the economy will be best suited in the long run, to use modern technology, and to compete in world markets has at least partly replaced the early drive to increase the quality of production at all costs. For the Soviet Union this theme is evident in the draft five year plan presented in February 1966. In spite of these developments, scholars of Eastern economies conclude that, while trying to make plans more rational and management more flexible, the Communist regimes have tried to avoid any real loss of state control over their economies.

In the Soviet Union change will probably be a good deal slower than in East Europe. There, at least according to Hertha W. Heiss in *The Soviet Union in the World Market* for the Joint Economic Committee 1966 studies, in spite of a growing awareness of the po-

tential of foreign trade as an instrument of foreign policy, "foreign trade remains a small part of overall Soviet economic activity and its basic economic function in the Soviet scheme of things has remained essentially unchanged. That is, the procurement from abroad of goods needed for plan fulfillment, when they are not available domestically, with exports thus primarily serving the purpose of financing necessary imports."

SOVIET CONTROL OF ITS FOREIGN NEIGHBORS

One of the topics of interest to me when in Europe in December 1966 was the economic relationships between the Soviet Union and its former "satellites", and I would like to express my conclusions briefly here. It would seem that one result of the centrally planned economies of East Europe and the Soviet Union was that the Council for Mutual Economic Assistance (Comecon), which has been considered an instrument of economic control by the U.S.S.R., never really worked. None of the European members would accept the kind of supranational planning that was required were coordinated intra-bloc specialization actually to be realized, in spite of a lot of persuasion by Khrushchev. But, of course, to say that because Comecon was ineffective as a means of intra-bloc economic cooperation and is now a dead letter is no argument that there is new "freedom" within Eastern economies. Instead of supranational control there is strong national economic planning, even though that planning may now be beginning to operate through market-economy devices. I have seen used the term "market socialism." This may be applicable to most of the Eastern European countries because ownership of the means of productions remains in the state.

Instead of economic domination through a planning organization like Comecon, is it more likely that the Soviet Union has achieved a measure of control, and at the same time perhaps a measure of bondage, through the expansion of its raw materials trade with the Eastern European Communists? In 1963, the U.S.S.R. supplied nearly 100% of the area's net imports of materials and fuels, compared with two-thirds in 1960 and only 40% in 1955. The Soviet exchange of industrial materials and food for machinery and equipment, the largest element of Soviet imports, is certainly profitable when the machinery and equipment embodies advanced technology that the U.S.S.R. can produce only with difficulty, if at all. This exchange may not be profitable, however, when the imports consist of ordinary machinery and equipment, which embody the same general level of technology available from Soviet production. According to Dr. Ernst, most Soviet machinery imports from Eastern Europe probably are of the latter type.

One reason I mention this two-way relationship is that it points out an avenue of strategy that is at least intellectually bemusing: an aggressive strategy of trade warfare that would entail U.S. willingness to supply to selected East European countries industrial raw materials at delivered prices less than those charged by the Soviet Union, and to stand willing to purchase those countries' industrial manufactures were the Soviet Union unwilling to continue purchasing them. However, in a time when U.S. policy is aimed at "detente", such an aggressive policy would no doubt be considered inappropriate.

REAL CHANGE HAS BEEN SLIGHT, AND THE PROSPECTS FOR INCREASING TWO-WAY TRADE ARE NOT ENCOURAGING

But the essential point I wish to make is that to date change in the economies of Eastern countries has been quite slight. It is a direction we probably want to encourage them to pursue, but we must not be deluded by it—state ownership prevails and comprehensive planning will continue. Like the mercantilists, Eastern economic and political

planners consider trade largely a means of increasing state power.

Until Eastern economies so reorient their production as to be able to produce economically and well products they can sell for hard currencies, there is apparently little prospect that really meaningful two-way trade with the West can grow. This is of course precisely the argument now being used to allow a selected few actual production industries in East European countries to deal directly in foreign markets rather than to deal through foreign trade organizations (FTO's), the agencies that are mostly responsible for foreign trade.

By dealing in "markets" (the free world economy) it is thought that these industries will develop competitive lines of products that will enable greater sales, greater hard currency earnings, greater purchases of badly needed industrial goods, and more rapid economic development.

So we can see that Eastern countries' ability to buy is limited by many factors. It is limited by the ability to compete and sell in world markets, which is limited by the very nature of Communist economic organization. And, most importantly, it is limited by the ability to pay with currencies and gold.

THE EASTERN COUNTRIES' ABILITY TO PAY

About the ability of the Soviet Union to purchase with hard currencies there has been much discussion. This discussion is important here because, no matter how Western countries' credit policies differ, the actual ability of Eastern countries to pay with hard currencies will be the ultimate limitation on purchases from the West, and therefore on increased two-way trade.

It would seem that the Soviet Union has limited hard reserves. Its traditionally favorable balance of trade reversed in 1964 with a deficit of \$55 million, largely because of large purchases of U.S. grain. The deficit on trade account is not likely to be offset on capital account because of the drain of the Soviet foreign aid programs, though such data seem difficult to obtain. U.S.S.R. ability to produce gold is said to be much less than some, particularly in the London bullion market, have believed. I discussed this matter at some length with officers of the U.S. Embassy in Paris where the U.S. stations its representatives to the COCOM, who assured me that the U.S. view that the Soviets are not really so rich in gold now prevails at least among NATO members.

In view of this situation, Soviet interest in long-term credits from the West is clear. It also explains the more conservative Soviet approach to use of short and medium term credits and to purchases from the West in general which has been especially evident since Khrushchev's ouster. This reticence to spend hard currencies and sell gold with abandon results from a strong Soviet desire for autonomy. I understand the Soviet Union tries to keep hard currency and gold reserves large enough to meet its needs for a period of 8 months, which is a very large reserve by normal standards. One reason it keeps such a stock, I have read, is in case of a crop failure or other such emergency need.

I do not have adequate data indicating the extent of the Eastern European ability to buy. If I rely on statistics in the 1966 Battle Act Report alone, the import and export trade of the Eastern European countries as a group (Poland, East Germany, Czechoslovakia, Hungary, Rumania, Bulgaria, and Albania) with the free world has been very closely balanced: exports were \$3.129 billion and imports were \$3.1 billion for 1964.

The extent of this close bilateralism is striking. Existing trade with the free world does not produce a surplus of hard currencies that could be used to buy from the United States, and, until these countries begin to produce items saleable in quantity in the

U.S. market, it seems that there can be little significant improvement in trade.

THE EFFECT OF NEW U.S. TRADE LEGISLATION ON COMMUNIST COUNTRIES' ABILITY TO BUY

At this juncture one might argue that, were the United States to apply most-favored-nation tariff rates to the East European Communist countries, the possibilities for their expanded export trade would be greatly increased, and therefore we ourselves would be able to sell more to them.

I must say that my examination of a selection of potential export items gives little cause for optimism about the future of increased trade if it is to be based on these items. For example, for the Soviet Union, bristles, dried mushrooms, pine needle oil, oils and certain glass, pile rugs, rifles and phonograph records might have sales potential in the United States. The same products and types of products—evidence of what I would consider to be a low level of economic development—reappear in the lists of tables for other Eastern countries. Textiles—wool rugs, and wool apparel from Rumania, cotton cloth and cotton apparel and wool fabrics from Hungary—are already very highly "import sensitive" in the United States. Glass—from the U.S.S.R., Rumania, Czechoslovakia—could be considered to be in the same category, witness the only partially removed escape clause on Belgian glass. Bicycles—from Czechoslovakia—have been the subject of antidumping investigations. Leather footwear—from Rumania—is the subject of a continuing barrage of "protectionist" sentiment in the U.S. The most promising potential trader is Czechoslovakia, which is listed as being able to supply such advanced manufactures as medical instruments, electrical measuring devices, and machine tools. But other "sensitive" items for import from Czechoslovakia include steel wire and nails.

Is it really likely that these nations can produce these items more cheaply than the United States can? If they cannot, and if the price that is placed on such exports is artificially low so as to enable sales in the U.S. market, then it can be expected that American industries will use unfair competition arguments against them, including but not limited to antidumping, countervailing duty actions and special marking requirements. I could even foresee the possibility of massive consumer embargoes against "Communist products." Even if such goods are priced realistically and are below or comparable with U.S. prices, the same types of arguments will be used against them. Because pricing systems in such countries are at present meaningless, it would be very difficult indeed to defend low-price imports in terms of the usual comparative advantage arguments.

One could argue that by promoting Communist exports to the U.S. at MFN rates, we would be displacing exports of the developing countries to this market.

This is a particularly valid criticism in the cotton textile sector. As you know, at least one reason why European countries do not wish to bind themselves to increasing annually textile imports from the developing countries members of the Long Term Cotton Textile Arrangement (LTA) is that they want to be able to balance bilaterally their trade with the Eastern European countries by taking from them cotton and other textile products as needed to strike balances.

Thus, on the basis of possible exports the ability of Communist countries to buy from us and our interest in buying from them is small. And the prospect of expanded trade at MFN rates in some items likely to be traded causes real question.

To substantiate somewhat my conclusions, I would like to quote from p. 68 of the May 1965 report on East-West Trade of the respected Independent British research orga-

nization, Political Economic Planning (PEP), with whose director I visited when in Great Britain last December:

"... there will probably be steady progress in the size of the trade and the conditions under which it is carried on. But this progress is not likely to be dramatic for a long time to come.

"The size of the trade is limited by the East's ability to export to the West, and there is no sign that this is going to increase enormously over the next few years. Consumer goods of the quality required in the West, and probably capital goods too, are likely to become available in quantity from Eastern Europe only insofar as the East European countries evolve in the direction of market economies, so that the consumer's choice bears more directly on the products. A change of this sort, even when it has been initiated, takes time to work itself through the economy and to become reflected in a consistently high quality of production."

I would say that these conclusions are shared by the Business and Industry Advisory Committee (BIAC) to OECD in its May 1966 Report expressing the consensus of the OECD member business organizations it represents.

The PEP Report does go on to specify certain steps, many of them institutional adjustments and arrangements, that can be taken to allow greater East-West trade on what it considers to be a sound basis. In line with official British policy, the PEP Report is based on the decision that greater East-West trade is desirable. But the constraints it acknowledges on the potential volume and the nature of the trade are sobering.

IS COMMERCIAL COMPETITION WITH EUROPE AN IMPORTANT CONSIDERATION?

This leads me to discuss briefly the problem of European COCOM members' sales to Eastern Communist countries. Unquestionably the dollar value of this trade has increased—European COCOM members' exports increased from \$1.7 billion in 1959 to \$2.7 billion in 1965. But the percentage of the total value of their trade with the Communist world has actually declined from 46% in 1959 to 32% in 1964 and 35% in 1965. It is true also that since the middle of the 1950's the size of the several COCOM lists of strategic embargoed products has declined to the rather silly point where they only contain about 120 items. It seems quite true that any real Western cooperation has broken up entirely on the issue of the amount of trade with Communist countries, and on the terms for financing that trade. The United States does indeed, as U.S. Ambassador to the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development Philip Tresize in Paris, explained to me, seem isolated in a sense "behind" our European friends and allies.

I would argue that this apparent conflict of policies should not give us much pause. If you accept my argument that there is relatively little present and potential commercial U.S. interest in sales to the Communist countries, and if you also accept that, as Europeans argue, there is also a profound technology gap between American and European industry, then we have very little indeed to lose in maintaining a separatist attitude. So I would pose this question: Why not continue to allow Europeans to sell items not on the COCOM list, and why not continue to enforce meaningful controls on U.S. exports to the Communist countries? European trade with the East is now bilaterally controlled to the extent that it seems rather repugnant to have to arrange our own trade along similar, "mercantilist" lines.

SOME ELEMENTS OF SOVIET ECONOMIC STRATEGY

In a December 1962 compilation of study papers for the Joint Economic Committee

Mrs. Penelope Thunberg, now a Tariff Commissioner, wrote:

"Soviet economic intercourse with industrialized non-Communist countries has always represented a time-saving device, for trade has made possible a rapid shift from a primitive to a modern, more productive technology in a large number of industries. So long as some part of the Soviet economy lags technologically behind the West, the U.S.S.R. will always have available a ready device for buoying its growth rate through imports. In shifting to a more advanced—i.e., more productive—technology, the Soviet Union borrows all the resources, including time, that must go into the research and development of more efficient techniques."

Mrs. Thunberg's observations about Soviet purchases of time and technology through trade are borne out at least in the Penkovsky papers, particularly Chapter IV, titled "Penkovsky's Committee", which deals with the State Committee for Co-ordination of Scientific Research of the U.S.S.R. Council of Ministers. There he describes the very complex and very thorough technological espionage organization maintained by the Soviet Union. The espionage function of this organization is at least hinted at in the U.S.S.R. Council of Ministers May 1961 Decree on Reorganization of Research which provides that:

"Soviet science and engineering must in the shortest possible time take the leading position in the world in all decisive fields of science and engineering"

and that, in furtherance of this goal, the State Committee on Research shall

"study and evaluate scientific and technical advancements with the aim of utilizing those advancements in the national economy of the U.S.S.R. and also coordinate the international scientific and technical contacts of the ministries, administrations, and scientific research organizations."

The activities of the AMTORG in the United States have long been suspect if not completely documented, and I understand that part of the Soviet technological development effort consists in purchasing highly advanced manufactures for use as prototypes in building their own. To support this I would like to quote from a study by Mr. Donald Petroni, partner of the Paris law firm of O'Malley & Myers, titled "Doing Business in Eastern European Countries": "Without such [patent] protection, any United States firm that sells one or more pieces of equipment to an Eastern European buyer must understand and assume the risk that it will be copied." Even with patent protection it is difficult to be sure patents are not violated. There have been several important cases of violation in Eastern Communist countries.

If the United States possesses the most advanced technology in many areas and continues to generate it, a policy of withholding technology-carrying trade may continue to have strategic significance, if in fact the policy we wish to pursue is one of restraining the growth of totalitarian regimes.

Do we wish to continue to attempt to restrain the growth of totalitarian regimes? I realize this is the nub of the question. But it would be beneficial to this discussion and perhaps also to public discussion if the arguments for and against "East-West" trade were couched in these terms, rather than muddled with arguments of U.S. commercial advantage that I consider to be overstated and ill-founded.

Perhaps there is now a basis for deciding that it is best to accept the Soviet system in a spirit of tolerance as one would tolerate a different religion. Assuming that we make that essential decision, perhaps there is some political benefit to the United States in a

selective and flexible policy of expansion of trade in "non-strategic" items. (I think it might be best to pass over the question of what is strategic and non-strategic, with a quick acknowledgement that there certainly is no good dividing line. I lean towards the idea that for a tightly planned economy continually strained by unrealistic output goals, all imports whether strategic or non-strategic tend to lessen the squeeze and allow more resources to be devoted to strategic, perhaps autarkia, objectives.)

THE POSSIBLE POLITICAL GAINS FROM TRADE

What are the benefits we might gain? I think you will agree that the main arguments are that by selectively and flexibly pursuing trade the United States might be able to favor some Communist countries over others, thereby increase the dependence of certain of these countries on the United States, and at the same time decrease their dependence on the Soviet Union. Still further one could argue that expanding U.S. trade and commercial contacts with the Communist countries could encourage those economies to further rationalize and structure their economies by using market economy techniques, one could even hope that eventually governments will divest themselves of ownership of enterprises at least in non-crucial areas as they strive to produce consumer goods of high-enough quality to be genuinely desired in the West. Such production would have to be accompanied by genuine cost accounting. The result of such developments would be junking of the bilateral arrangements between East and West European countries, real multilateralism in trade, and along with it freely convertible currencies.

The above is a happy prospect but it is indeed far in the future. In the near term we have to deal with the realities and encumbrances of Western commercial contact with the East—contacts constricted, in fact dominated, by the nature of the economies with which we deal. The facts of state planning and state ownership and therefore of state-trading require bilateralism and prevent multilateralism.

A fact of very great interest and some portent is that, in spite of its desire that trade be expanded, the BIAC report cited above says that "in the foreseeable future at least BIAC sees little possibility of any substantial change in the present fundamentally bilateral character of trading relationships between East and West."

At best the BIAC can only recommend that within bilateral arrangements certain difficulties should be smoothed out, but it cannot even recommend doing so through multilateral instead of bilateral action. The Report concludes only that "more is likely to be achieved by pragmatic efforts toward securing an equitable and mutually advantageous expansion of trade by means of a quid pro quo technique for negotiating meaningful and balanced concessions on the basis of effective reciprocity under the different economic systems." This is hardly a bright forecast for the future of East-West trade in an open market.

It would seem to me that a very great deal depends on the real motivations of the East Europeans and Soviets themselves. I myself might be more prone to accept an expanded East-West trade policy were I assured that in fact the United States through trade could influence those countries to develop open societies in which people are allowed an increasing measure of personal and political freedom.

Even were we to be assured about their real motivations, the fact that the Soviet Union and the East European Communist countries are giving tangible as well as moral

support to our enemies at war, North Viet Nam and the Viet Cong, creates tremendous political difficulties to a policy of greater trade. So, apart from the factual considerations that I have been exploring, this political question is of paramount importance to our discussion.

CONCLUSION

So, in summary, I would say that, in strictly commercial terms, the United States has little real and little potential commercial interest in increasing trade with the Communist countries in the near future. In fact, I can foresee certain economic disadvantages to such a course of action, most notably the possibility that we would have to embroil ourselves in mercantile bilateral trading agreements which to me are distasteful at best.

Thus the base for the argument for increased East-West trade shifts from the economic to the political. Here it seems to me the key questions are, can we really influence the Communist countries to shift toward freer societies? Can we influence not just their economic development but their political development as well? And, ultimately, will increased trade relations really bring about decreased political tensions and reduce the risk of war? I have often said that more war and peace are wrapped up in trade than most of us are willing to recognize, and perhaps here there is indeed a valid argument for the encouragement of "East-West" trade. But these, I submit, are the questions for your Subcommittee to study and discuss, and for your recommendation to your colleagues. I certainly commend your interest and your effort, and await your conclusions with great interest.

Travel Tax Proposal

HON. WILLIAM F. RYAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 13, 1968

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Speaker, the administration's travel tax proposal remains dubious public policy, failing to deal with fundamental international economic imbalances and inviting retaliation.

A recent editorial by WCBS radio puts the matter succinctly; the text of the editorial, which was broadcast on February 19 and 20, follows:

TRAVEL TAX PROPOSAL

Treasury Secretary Henry Fowler's proposal to cut tourist travel abroad and keep American dollars at home is impractical and illogical. It is an administrative nightmare; it discriminates against the low-budget traveler; it is likely to provoke other countries to respond in kind.

The Fowler plan would limit tourist spending in Europe, Africa, Asia and most of the Pacific to a subsistence level: \$7 per day for each traveler. Any spending in excess of this sum would be taxed on a sliding scale, reaching 30 per cent at \$15. The departing tourist would have to declare the number of dollars he was taking with him; he would also have to estimate his travel tax and pay in advance. On his return, after the usual scrimmage for bags and after passing through customs and immigration checks, the frazzled tourist would have to declare how much cash he had left, and file a tax return. Secretary Fowler has obviously devised a plan that for inconvenience alone is a stroke of genius: it's guaranteed to send all but the hardest traveler to Athens, Georgia, instead of Athens, Greece.

Tourist restrictions, however, cut two ways. The plan's fundamental weakness, we think, is that it invites retaliation on the part of foreign countries. It simply makes no sense to urge Americans to stay at home and at the same time expect Europeans, let's say, to visit our shores. In addition, one overseas airline as a result of the Fowler plan has threatened to re-examine its buy-American policy: the line purchases all its aircraft from Boeing in Seattle. Reprisals of this sort could in the long run prove more costly to the balance of payments problem than the cure prescribed by the Administration.

Mr. Fowler's proposal hints at a kind of economic isolationism that hardly squares with principles of a free society. Congress should consider attracting foreign travelers to the United States as a far more positive means of reversing the dollar drain than locking Americans in.

A Soviet Appeal for High Courage

HON. LUCIEN N. NEDZI

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 13, 1968

Mr. NEDZI. Mr. Speaker, we have watched with interest the recent literary trials in Russia and the struggle of some Russian intellectuals against the renewal of the ugliest manifestations of Stalinism in Soviet society.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I place in the RECORD the eloquent protest petition which appeared in the Washington Post of March 2, 1968. The battle lines between repression and liberalization shift to and fro. Whatever the trend, it will influence Soviet attitudes toward America. These developments merit our closest attention.

The document follows:

A SOVIET APPEAL FOR HIGH COURAGE

(NOTE.—The following document is an abridged translation of a petition now being circulated in Moscow. Addressed to "U.S.S.R. scientists, to those in culture and the arts," it refers to recent literary trials, and other events. By such statements, openly signed, Soviet liberals and intellectuals are fighting conservative and police elements in the Soviet government.)

We, the signers of this letter, address you with words of profound alarm for the destiny and the honor of our country. For several years ominous symptoms of restoration of Stalinism have been evident in the life of our society. This is manifest most strikingly in revival of the most terrible acts of that era—through organization of harsh tribunals to judge people who have dared to defend their dignity and inner freedom, who have had the audacity to think and to protest.

To be sure, repressions have not reached the proportions of (the 1930s). But we have sufficient basis for the fear that among state and party officials there are more than a few who would like to reverse our public evolution. We have no guarantees that the year 1937, little by little and with our tacit connivance, will not come upon us again.

The most recent trial, of four young people, has gone beyond all bounds in the trammeling of human rights. Even Andrei Vyshinsky would have envied the organization of that trial, but he at least was able to drag out confessions and testimony by witnesses. Yuri Galanskov, a very ill person, was sentenced to seven years' hard labor. The only—less than circumstantial—evidence of his guilt was the testimony of a base and craven per-

son, Andrei Dobrovolsky. Aleksandr Ginsburg was sentenced to five years' hard labor despite all the testimony of witnesses and the material evidence.

Those who tried to enter the courtroom were subjected to open blackmail and a jeering humiliation of personal dignity. Photographing, ceaseless shadowing, checking of documents, eavesdropping on conversations—that is a far from complete list.

The organization of the trial and the behavior of the judge deprived the defendants of their right to defense, and the animal hooting of the so-called "public" shrouded them in an atmosphere of moral intolerance. On the bench were persons who read magazines or dozed, awakening only to demand increased penalties.

The naive hopes for a complete healing of the life of society which were inculcated in us by (de-Stalinization) decisions of the Twentieth and Twenty-Second Congresses (in 1956 and 1961) did not succeed in being realized. Slowly, but remorselessly, the process of restoration of Stalinism is going on.

From the highest platforms the name of I. V. Stalin has been pronounced in an entirely positive context. The newspapers have reported the applause which has resounded at mention of his name.

Not a single one of the democratic beginnings has been brought to completion. The literary or artistic taste of the favorite still has the force of law. Films are rotting in film libraries which would do great honor to our art. In crowded studios and attics beautiful paintings are aging.

In the social sciences the ruinous and irreversible dictate of politics continues to be mandatory. For a scientist, deviation from truth is death, but our historians who deal with most recent times, philosophers, and political economists are forced to do this every day. If at times a grain of truth creeps into print, the authors become subject to witch-hunts.

What is most humiliating, regular surveillance in all its forms has become a part of daily life for quite a few Soviet people.

Again we remind you that mute acquiescence with Stalinists and bureaucrats who deceive the people and the leadership, who sit on all trouble signs, all complaints, and all protests, leads logically to that which is most to be feared: to lawless punishment of people.

In these conditions we appeal to you who are creative people, people in whom our citizens have boundless faith: raise your voices against the impending danger of new Stalins and Yezhovs (a former police chief).

You are the heirs of the great humanistic traditions of the Russian intelligentsia. Before you is the example of courageous behavior on the part of the modern progressive intelligentsia of the West (apparently anti-war protesters).

We understand that you labor under conditions in which fulfillment of your civic duty is in every instance an act of courage. But there is indeed no choice between courage or cowardly complicity in filthy deeds.

**Rev. Earl V. Best, Minister of Refuge
Christian Church, Noblesville, Ind.,
Delivers Opening Prayer in House of
Representatives**

HON. WILLIAM G. BRAY

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 13, 1968

Mr. BRAY. Mr. Speaker, the practice of opening each day's session of the House of Representatives with prayer serves as

a reminder to us all that we are today, always have been, and always will be, truly "one nation, under God."

Today's opening prayer was delivered by Rev. Earl V. Best, minister of the Refuge Christian Church in Noblesville, Ind., which is the church of our friend and colleague, Congressman RICHARD L. ROUDEBUSH.

Reverend Best served as a chaplain in the U.S. Navy during World War II. In 1962 and 1963 he was national chaplain for the Veterans of Foreign Wars and for the past 9 years he has also served as Indiana State Chaplain for the Indiana VFW.

Reverend Best's words this morning were, I am sure, an inspiration to us all, and we are pleased he could be with us.

Lusk, Wyo., Women Take Lead in Publishing Unique Brochure

HON. WILLIAM HENRY HARRISON

OF WYOMING

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 13, 1968

Mr. HARRISON. Mr. Speaker, an energetic group of women in Lusk, Wyo., have taken the initiative in publicizing their community and explaining life in the area from the perspective of the lady of the house.

The Lusk Woman's Club has had published an attractive, easy-to-read brochure entitled, "A Woman Talks to Women About Lusk, Wyo."—a publication which the Lusk Herald calls unique in promotional efforts of Wyoming.

Distribution of the brochure began early this month with mailings to the Chicago Boat and Travel Show, the Congress, and to Vice President HUBERT H. HUMPHREY.

The Lusk Herald recounts in its March 7, 1968, edition how the brochure came into being as the "brainchild of Mrs. Dale M. Bardo, member and past president of the Woman's Club."

The town newspaper continues:

The brochure is directed to women and what they deal with, intended to encourage women to come West with professional and industrial husbands that are interested in establishing themselves in areas like this. It is intended as a tool in bringing professions and industry to Lusk.

The brochure is certainly unique and from all indications highly successful. It is a tribute not only to the ladies who created it but to the town of Lusk itself and I publicly congratulate the many people behind the endeavor.

I include the newspaper article at this point in the RECORD:

WOMEN TAKE LEAD IN PUBLISHING UNIQUE BROCHURE

Lusk Woman's Club places in distribution this week a brochure about Lusk and Niobrara County that is unique in promotional efforts of Wyoming if not a much wider area, a work that should also build a sense of county pride as nothing else has done in many years.

It is titled, "A Woman Talks to Women About Lusk, Wyo." and in view of national and urban problem, relates these to Lusk's advantages. It asks the question, "Do you think that towns of 1,890 population have

to be dowdy . . . dull . . . with limited advantages? Well . . . perhaps some small towns are . . . but let's look at Lusk."

Then it goes on to ask—

Do you hunger for clean, deep blue skies? for pure air? for perfect-tasting crystal cold drinking water?

Are you weary of streets unsafe for your children? of traffic congestion problems?

Are your children in split sections in crowded schools, with lessened opportunity for the education they will need?

Are you concerned over the dehumanizing environment of urban life?

Do you want for your children the closeness and personal warmth of a small place? the all-around development not possible in a large place?

Are you already living in a small town but long for greater diversity in your life?

Might you prefer to live in a small town if you could be certain of quality education, of excellent shopping, of access to things which make the quality of life interesting—certain that it is a good place to rear a family?

Carrying pictures of Lusk's seven church buildings, the High School Hospital, Library and Niobrara Country Club, the brochure evaluates the town and county strictly from a woman's viewpoint, and much research was undertaken to give authentic enumeration of fields into which the high school graduates have gone and a partial list of those from here who have provided leadership to state and nation. To quote:

"The relative isolation characteristic of the area has proven to be its strength, for it forces its people into resourcefulness, producing a vigorous, individualistic, yeast breed of participants rather than spectators. This land takes a person's measure. Residents strive to match their efforts to those of earlier resolute and imaginative individuals who poured out their strength, love and generosity to build a good place to rear a family, a good place to live."

And the brochure closes, so typically woman—"Oh, almost forgot . . . crisp crackers, no floods, no mildew in closets, no cockroaches, hardly a moth to be found . . ."

DISTRIBUTION STARTED

Distribution was started over the weekend with the mailing of a packet to the Chicago Boat and Travel Show at which the Wyoming Travel Commission has a display. Other packets will be sent to Minneapolis and Cleveland Travel shows.

In addition, copies are being mailed to Senators McGee and Hansen, to Representative Harrison and Governor Hathaway, to Roy Peck, director of the Wyoming Natural Resources Board, and to the Commerce Department of the University.

And particularly, a copy will go to Vice-President Hubert H. Humphrey because of his interest in and work on the problems of drift to urban areas.

Locally members of the Club are beginning distribution this morning to hotel and motel to filling stations and businesses in Lusk.

And above all, the Club emphasizes that the pamphlet is available without charge to the general public for mailing away to anyone interested, mailing to service men is encouraged. Copies may be secured from The Lusk Herald, the Town Office, or from Del Oberst, secretary-treasurer of the Lusk Chamber of Commerce.

A NEW IDEA

Actually the brochure is the brain-child of Mrs. Dale M. Bardo, member and past president of the Club. She headed the committee preparing it and did the writing, but as she says, with the styling, advising, guiding and help of her printer-journalist husband who is foreman of The Lusk Herald.

The work incorporates the research of a number of Club members, and once the project was underway suggestions and ideas

poured in from many interested individuals. Mrs. Gene Lenz, a University graduate in art, prepared the cover under her professional name of "Renk."

Mrs. Bardo emphasizes that the brochure was not written from the viewpoint of comparing Lusk with the rest of the state, but from the viewpoint of how Lusk stacks up nationally.

It is directed to women and what they deal with, intended to encourage women to come West with professional and industrial husbands that are interested in establishing themselves in areas like this. It is intended as a tool in bringing professions and industry to Lusk.

Though one person wrote the pamphlet, many persons will recognize words or phrases and sometimes ideas which developed in earlier conversations about the brochure.

Lists of students from the schools do not include those who are still working on undergraduate degrees or who are unfinished with the bachelor degree. It is emphasized that all tabulations and listings are backed by documentation.

The Club thanks all who helped so much with research, and Mrs. Bardo particularly wished to apologize to those who looked up information which could not be used due to space limitations.

Acknowledgment is made to the Lusk Lions Club for assistance in the financing. The assistance of others may be needed for reprinting as soon as the present 5,000 printing is exhausted. The Lusk Herald was thanked for assistance in securing the underwriting, and the taking of photographs, and designing.

Erosion of Freedom

HON. JOHN B. ANDERSON

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 13, 1968

Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, a constituent of mine, Mr. John Fizzy, Jr., of Rockford, Ill., was recently awarded a Freedoms Foundation Honor Medal for a letter to the editor entitled "The Erosion of Freedom." The letter appeared in the April 1, 1967, issue of the Rockford Morning Star, Rockford, Ill.

I take pride in calling the Members' attention to Mr. Fizzy's letter:

EROSION OF FREEDOM

TO THE EDITOR:

Today we are witnessing what future historians may rightfully describe as the "Age of Complacency". Everywhere we see changes being made that will have their effects on us as well as future generations to come.

The government is now determined to take care of us from the cradle to the grave. As we view the "galloping socialism" that is upon us we cannot help but ask, "What has happened to America?"

Are we as a nation blind to the "Communist conspiracy"? Do we not see the danger in government controls and welfare programs? If so do we not realize that little by little our freedom is being taken from us?

Each new program initiated by the government carries with it a price tag. It is inconceivable to think that it could be otherwise. You either have more government controls and less freedom or you will have increased taxation and inflation. It is naive to think that you can get something for nothing.

Recently I heard a speaker tell of an experiment that had been made with a frog. It seems that a bucket of hot water was prepared and a frog was tossed in it. Regardless of the number of times this was done the frog always seemed to muster the strength and

energy to hop out. However, if you put the frog in a bucket of cold water and gradually heated the water he would remain there until "his goose was cooked." In other words he was dead before he realized that he was being cooked.

This experiment with the frog can be compared to our freedoms. If all of our freedoms were to be suddenly taken away we would fight immediately. On the other hand take away our freedoms gradually and we more than likely will not even voice a complaint.

JOHN FIZZY, JR.

Freedom's Challenge

HON. JAMES A. McCLURE

OF IDAHO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 13, 1968

Mr. McCLURE. Mr. Speaker, I addressed the Lincoln Day banquet in Mountain Home, Idaho, recently and found myself sharing the platform with Miss Connie Yrazabal, a senior at Mountain Home High School.

Miss Yrazabal's speech, an excellent presentation entitled "Freedom's Challenge," was a glowing tribute to America and its traditions. As they say, it was a tough act to follow.

I include the text of the speech as a part of my remarks:

FREEDOM'S CHALLENGE

(By Connie Yrazabal)

Freedom has a meaning in America that it does not have anywhere else. Ask our boys in Viet Nam. In America, freedom and the love of it is assumed. Freedom is the center of all our thoughts, actions, and our being. It is what makes the difference in our customs and is the difference in the will to do what is right from despair.

We should be ashamed of those Americans who burn their draft cards, tramp the picket lines and indulge in the sit-ins. It's odd how those Americans forget about their forefathers who fought for the existing rights and freedoms of today.

We should be ashamed that our country's name is blackened by the Hippies and so-called flower children, who breed filth and insanity and say that peace and freedom are products of free love.

We should be disgusted of living in an area with agencies and products that try to make the rest of us believe that obscenity is a part of our American culture, through movies, literature and on stage.

We should be ashamed of those people who feel that a steady job and income is unnecessary when they expect to receive a monthly welfare check supplied by the government. Our country has provided workshops, Job Corps and many other opportunities to people like these; but still, stupidity and illiteracy exist today.

We should be ashamed of those Americans who relax in their comfortable homes and criticize the leaders of our government along with the war in Viet Nam. How many of these people do we see working to strive for better government and peace?

We should be ashamed to have knowledge of those certain civil rights groups who proclaim equal rights for all but yet strive to promote propaganda in our colleges throughout the nation.

Stand tall and don't be ashamed to be an American! Take America as it is, embracing the idea that Americans have always had, and that it is within our power to make it better. We are loyal citizens not because

we think our country is perfect but because the American system is durable!

Many downgraders of Americanism profess to love all mankind while they hate and scorn the nation that gave them birth, education, and opportunity. When we fall to live up to the best that freedom makes possible, we know it is our own fault and not a flaw in Creation! Let us show our appreciation of this treasure, of freedom, and to continue to uphold it in its highest respects.

This is the time, now, for all of us to stand and be counted and be willing and anxious to respond. We don't need draft cards to compel us to begin in hard work and thought, as we strive for what we know is right. You and I have a great American Heritage which we can fight for and preserve for future generations. But the task is not mine or yours alone. It is the task of every American citizen working together to preserve our freedom and democracy. A strong Republic needs actions and pledges of loyalty from all its citizens and a determination on the part of everyone to learn the ways of democracy and to apply their knowledge wisely and courageously!

We should not be ashamed or disgusted but give thanks to the merciful Lord, that we were so lucky to be born free American citizens in a nation under God with truly mercy and justice for all!

The 50th Anniversary of Lithuanian Independence

HON. BIRCH E. BAYH

OF INDIANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, March 13, 1968

Mr. BAYH. Mr. President, a few weeks ago, it was my distinct privilege to attend and participate in a most inspiring ceremony. Held in the warm and thriving Hoosier town of Beverly Shores, the program commemorated the 50th anniversary of Lithuanian independence.

One of the many inspirational moments of the proceedings was the statement of Richard C. Christopher, president of the Town Board of Beverly Shores. In it, he captures the true meaning of the occasion.

It is with true pleasure, Mr. President, that I ask unanimous consent that Mr. Christopher's remarks be printed in the Extensions of Remarks.

There being no objection, the remarks were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FIFTIETH ANNIVERSARY OF LITHUANIAN INDEPENDENCE

To all here assembled we, the people of Beverly Shores, extend our warm welcome. We are both pleased and proud to join with you in this program commemorating the 50th anniversary of Lithuanian Independence. Well known are the cultural contributions made by the Lithuanian people to the whole world, to the United States, above all to our own community. Equally well known is the Lithuanian love of freedom and independence. And if the reports coming out of Lithuania today are true, then, even though your people presently suffer under the oppressive clouds of Communist conformity, the fierce light of independence, originality and creativity shines through. It is clear beyond dispute that the Lithuanian talent for free self-expression will not be denied. And it is our hope and belief that the day will surely come when the people of Lithuania will once again walk their land in freedom. In that

shining hour may we then all walk together as free men forever.

Hopeful Appalachia Sees Poor Get Poorer

HON. M. G. (GENE) SNYDER

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 13, 1968

Mr. SNYDER. Mr. Speaker, I should like to bring to the attention of the Members of the House an article written by Harry M. Caudill which appeared in the Cincinnati Enquirer, February 25, 1968.

Harry M. Caudill, lawyer and author from Whitesburg, Ky., specializes in the problems of Appalachia and its people. He is the author of "Night Comes to the Cumberlands." Here he expresses his opinion that despite the war on poverty, which encouraged the rural poor to see escape from their plight of jobless insecurity, hunger, and winter cold, the situation is getting worse. And he blames the Government.

The article follows:

HOPEFUL APPALACHIA SEES POOR GET POORER—
MINING CORPORATIONS GROW RICH AND
POOR LOSE LAND FOR DAMS

(By Harry M. Caudill)

On September 27, 1966, President Johnson established the National Advisory Commission on Rural Poverty and, in a touching little ceremony, delegated to its 25 members the task of making a comprehensive study and appraisal of current economic situations and trends in American rural life. In its final report to the President one year later the Commission might have pointed out (but did not) that despite the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964 and the once highly-touted "War on Poverty," the United States government is probably causing as much poverty in the hinterlands as it is eliminating or relieving.

The Great Society which the President proclaimed with ample fanfare in the last presidential year was received in the boon-docks with much less incredulity and much more hope than greeted it in the urban ghettos. The city-dwelling poor were generally too cynical to expect much to come of it. Their hopes had been dashed too many times by too many baffling circumstances—low wages, idleness, racial discrimination, inflation, over-crowding, high rents, broken homes and the grotesque indignities of "welfare"—to expect much from the new campaign.

But in the small towns and villages and on the eroded farms where nearly half of the nation's 35 million impoverished citizens reside, there were unmistakable stirrings of hope. There an almost child-like faith in the capabilities and good intentions of Washington had survived as part of the heritage from an earlier time. In countryside where distractions are fewer memories are longer, and across the intervening generation millions gratefully recalled FDR's New Deal and the bread and optimism it had brought.

Surely the Great Society efforts to upgrade the poor have been harmless at their worst and sometimes, on a small scale, they have been positively beneficial. All have been palliative in character without attacking any of the deep-rooted sources of destitution. Head Start aims at giving an extra and much needed year of schooling to youngsters who, in the main, are destined to attend the same dismal public schools that turned their parents into semi-literates.

Neighborhood Youth Corps offices aid a relative handful of youths who might other-

wise drop out of the classroom. Job Corps activities have started some youthful derelicts on the road to useful and responsible citizenship. In parts of Appalachia work experience and training programs pay low wages to men who perform labor of dubious social utility while undergoing scarcely any training. And countless meetings and endless discussions have used up the energies of Community Action groups in preparation for ever-deferred marches against the Bastion of Wants—while paying handsome salaries to multitudes of social workers and political hacks whose duties as "community organizers" defy both description and definition. But in rural America as in the central cities, the well-springs of poverty still bubble.

Much, perhaps most, poverty in rural America has come down to us as part of our frontier heritage. The frontier bequeathed to Appalachia, most of the deep South, the Ozarks and numerous lesser areas elsewhere an enervating "culture of poverty" which held successive generations to low aspirations and minimal achievements. We have not yet come close to devising a scheme to lead the people of these cultural backwaters, and the Indians who were simultaneously stranded by an on-rushing technological civilization, into amalgamation with the "main stream." And until such amalgamation occurs in substantial measure the hill-billy, the red-neck, the Negro and the Indian cannot compete successfully in the job market for the cash that banishes poverty.

Reams have been written about Appalachia's impoverished state since John F. Kennedy campaigned in bleak and dying West Virginia in 1960. The television camera has given the nation repeated glimpses of apathetic mountaineers sinking inexorably into a New World Albania.

A cogent warning of these sorry things to come was sounded by the West Virginia Tax Commission in 1884. The commissioners were alarmed by the spectacle of ignorant mountain farmers selling the gigantic natural wealth of their land to non-resident speculators for prices ranging from 50 cents to a few dollars per acre. With the title to the state's vast deposits of coal, petroleum, natural gas and limestone the economic destiny of both land and people was passing into distant hands. The commission warned that unless the people quickly realized the magnitude of wealth of which they were ridding themselves and the implications of the situation they were creating they would become mere hirelings and "West Virginia will be almost like Ireland and her history will be like that of Poland."

The West Virginians did not heed the advice. The end of their century-long post-frontier isolation had set them down in the midst of a vast industrial revolution of which they had not the faintest comprehension. They and their like in the hills of Tennessee, Eastern Kentucky, Western Virginia, Northern Alabama and Western Pennsylvania continued to sign the title deeds and, when pits were opened by enterprising northerners, sent their sons to toil in them for low wages and under deplorable conditions. The stage was set for a massive and ruthless exploitation that continues unabated to this day.

Appalachia is one of the world's richest resource regions. Eastern Kentucky, for example, has vast deposits of iron, ore and silica-rich sandstone in addition to its huge beds of brines, coal, oil and gas. Even diamonds and platinum have been discovered within the steep, low, rocky hills. The extraction of this wealth has built the nation's most prosperous corporations. Penn-Virginia Corp. (formerly Virginia Coal and Iron Corp.) clears after taxes about 61% of gross receipts and usually pays dividends amounting to 45% of gross receipts. This record is equalled by Kentucky River Coal Corp. For perspective compare these achievements with General Motors which in good years clears a dime out of each dollar received and pays five cents to the stockholders.

Today Appalachia boasts the richest corporations and the poorest people in America. The great wealth pays only token taxes to local schools. The sales taxes on bread and other consumer items is inadequate to support decent public facilities. The region is trapped in a downward cycle of poor schools, poor jobs, poor pay and poor people.

And when the Appalachian Regional Commission had studied the sinking territory for two years it could find little more to recommend for its rescue than new roads—roads that will be primarily useful in speeding up the extraction of raw resources. Congress has written the commission's recommendations into law and the exodus of the people was accelerated as the mountaineers follow the new highways into overcrowded cities simmering already with violence and discontent. Today if one drives across the heart of Appalachia from Athens, Ohio, to the West Virginia line and up Twelve Pole Creek to Williamson and westward through the Kentucky hills he will marvel that so many costly federal rescue efforts have produced in 300 miles of squalor no single visible symptom of uplift.

The region cannot prosper as long as it remains a vast colonial territory ripped by absentee owners. If extraction could provide the good life the Appalachians would be rolling in riches. In the last 80 years they have exported more than \$500 billion worth of raw resources and, simultaneously, have become synonymous with poverty. Desperately needed are tax reform and a fundamental reorienting of the economy to guarantee heavy investment of profits within the plundered valleys, but such proposals are unthinkable in the present context. No important segment of either major political party is willing to talk in terms of any remedies that would jar the vast steel, electric power and coal interests while they fatten on the almost boundless resources of withering counties whose inhabitants are as apathetic as the people of Haiti.

If Lyndon Johnson and the Congress ever develop a real determination to aid this stricken land and its bewildered populace they can do most that needs to be done by the passage of a single act. The legislation would reverse the cycle of poverty in Appalachia and bring justice and a surge of well-being to scores of counties in other parts of the nation where minerals are taken from the earth.

For years state legislatures have considered but declined to enact severance taxes on minerals. The logic behind such proposals is overwhelming—as is the influence of the extractive industries in the state house corridors. Mining and drilling draw people into the resource counties while simultaneously depleting the resources that constitute the major part of the tax base.

A Federal severance tax appears to be the only hope of ever rescuing from perpetual fiscal crisis the counties that depend on the extraction of minerals. Such a tax should amount to 50% of the money accruing to the mining or drilling firm because of U.S. depletion allowances—and such allowances should be extended to the producers of all minerals. A total 10% of the revenue collected should finance federal programs to combat air pollution, water contamination and other environmental damage resulting from the industries. The balance should be remitted to the states where the mining occurs. Some 30% of it could be used by the states for similar reclamation projects with the balance sent to the counties. Federal laws should require the counties to invest the windfall in "people development"—elementary and secondary schools, colleges, scholarships, libraries, health centers, medical services.

Such a scheme would end the outrageous tax loopholes that have sown so many millionaires and even billionaires across Texas. It would divide the greatest tax bonanza in the history of government between immense-

ly profitable corporations and the underprivileged communities through which their trains and pipelines run. It would transform scores of hollow, destitute counties into going concerns, make them attractive to new industries, create countless new jobs and, in all probability, inspire the building of a number of new towns in areas now threatened with total depopulation. Star state's ultra-reactionary oil tycoons contributing in fair measure to the health and education of the state's numerous poor induces a heart-warming glow.

Solemn laws now guarantee the deep South Negro's right to vote, but is scarcely arguable that the franchise is yet to bring him visibly closer to economic security. Like the ragged Appalachian whites huddled on absentee-owned mineral beds, the southern rural black has been effectively fenced off from the wealth of his region's soil.

At the end of the Civil War the freed slaves were penniless outcasts and successive reform movements—Reconstruction, the New Freedom, the New Deal, the New Frontier and the Great Society—have been content to leave their descendants precisely that. If the Negro is to remain on the land and prosper he must own the land he now works as a sharecropper or wage hand. Simply put, millions of acres ought to be purchased from the vast plantation estates and distributed to Negroes and poor whites under long-term, low-interest purchase contracts. The American South needs the same kind of land reform U.S. agencies have prescribed for many Latin American and Asian countries.

The Negro and his poor white fellow-sufferer cannot prosper, no matter how long and hard their toil, as long as the land beneath their feet belongs to gigantic fiefdoms that garner with little effort most of the crops and all of the huge federal subsidies.

Sometimes as one ponders the plight of the poor he is struck by the helplessness in the face of impersonal governmental schemes—some of which appear to have been designed to grind entire segments of our social and economic understratum to powder. The most shocking case in point is the Corps of Engineers with its almost insane compulsion to drain all still water and dam all flowing streams.

An enormous "reservoir building" program is under way in the eastern third of the nation and the impact on the people is often more traumatic than the effect on the land itself. In countless places hare-brained schemes have uprooted whole communities—many of them thoroughly integrated and modestly self-supporting—and sent the inhabitants pouring into the same riot-torn slums sociologists say were already hopelessly overcrowded.

When the corps selects a valley for its next victim it always proclaims lofty aims. The new dam will provide flood control for communities downstream, assure water quality controls and create a veritable wonderland for people seeking recreation. Local boosters in the county seats and state capitols take up the hue and cry. Almost always the supporters of the undertaking live outside the area to be flooded and include few farmers. The middle class appears willing to inundate most of the nation for lakes on which to ride cabin cruisers on weekend jaunts.

The people who are summarily routed out of their homes to create new deep-draw and often supremely ugly impoundments are generally just plain folks—the kind of undistinguished, trusting and, withal, innocent people who rarely write to a congressman and doubt that their opinions count for much in any event. They are politically weak and socially disorganized. In most effected communities they are direct descendants of the first settlers. Few have had meaningful experience with the pushy, aggressive society that suddenly demands a surrender of their land. In

multitudes they are annually routed out of their homes, reduced to poverty, bitterness and despair and sent to dwell in the urban ghettos.

Typically, the corps sends appraisers to look at the land and improvements. Sometimes professional appraisers contract to evaluate the land—often people from distant cities who suspect that high appraisals will deprive them of future business. Talk of the impending dam has long since forced land values in the valley down while driving them up in nearby watersheds. The appraisers report to the corps, but the corps does not show the appraisal to the land-owner.

It bargains for his land without divulging its own official estimate of its value. The threat of condemnation with attendant attorney fees and court costs hangs like a pall over the simple farmer and his worried wife. Generally they ruefully accept the corps' offer and the generals who run the agency are enabled to report to Congress that they purchased some 30% of the land involved in their projects at less than appraised value.

The communities are shattered, of course. Churches, schools, social groups and political precincts are scattered to the wind. The displaced rarely are paid enough to relocate in similar circumstances—rising land values in neighboring valleys eliminate all hope of that. Many buy "mobile homes" and move into cluttered "trailer camps." The uprooting kills many of the old outright; the abrupt loss of the familiar simply shatters them.

Few of the boaters who brainlessly heave beer cans into the nation's growing spangle of man-made lakes ever reflect on the anguish the blue waters conceal. National planners ought to reflect on it, though, in view of the fact that Federally financed projects now drive about 110,000 families off their land each year.

Long over-due tax reforms, land redistribution, the forming of poor people's co-operatives for buying and selling, just compensation for lands taken for public purposes and sensible resettlement schemes for the displaced—these and other fundamental proposals have been kicking around beneath the surface in Washington for years. No truly great society can be built without them. No honest undertaking to aid the wretched of the American earth will omit them. They are the indispensables, like wheels for an automobile and wings for an airplane.

But sadly, there is little or no hope for them in the foreseeable future. The nation is dominated by the rich, vast corporations, a bloated military and a self-centered middle class that is happy with its suburban comforts. All are biased against the poor and will tolerate only bland gestures for their benefits—gestures that save the conscience without upsetting any established privilege.

The long continued neglect of the rural poor is a national disgrace. Many of the seemingly insoluble problems of New York, Chicago, Newark, Detroit and Los Angeles originated far away in the swamps, fields and mountains the mayors of those cities never heard of and will never visit. As the small towns die and the farms are deserted the prospect for social peace and internal stability declines. Last summer was long and hot but those ahead may be much hotter as indigent newcomers bring new grievances and discontents to slums that are already explosively tense.

A mountain woman just returned to Kentucky from Detroit after the riots of last July summed up the situation pretty well: "Me and my family got out and left Detroit because it ain't safe to live there anymore. We ain't got nothing here but welfare, and may starve into going back but we shore don't want to. The whites are just as bad as the niggers when it comes to riotin' and lootin', and between 'em I'm afeared they're again' to burn Dee-troit down!"

Can a nation with a \$186 billion budget, an interminable war and most of the world's real wealth learn something from an illiterate

and destitute mountain woman? Before the fires leap up again will anyone listen?

Rapid Increase in Lung Cancer Noted Among Asbestos Workers

HON. EDWARD J. PATTEN

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 13, 1968

Mr. PATTEN. Mr. Speaker, for some time now I have been deeply concerned about the occupational health hazard presented to workers from asbestos, a material which is in broad use throughout the Nation in construction, and which, on the basis of a number of careful medical studies, is believed to be the cause of lung cancer and other cancers among those exposed to it. Last year, I introduced H.R. 12913, calling upon the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare to set standards establishing limits to the amount of asbestos to which workers will be exposed in the air they breathe, and to set regulations covering its handling by both producers and users of this material.

This year, I am a sponsor of H.R. 15571, a companion bill to H.R. 14816, the bill introduced by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. O'HARA] for an Occupational Safety and Health Act. On March 7, during hearings on these two bills, Dr. Irving J. Selikoff, of the Mount Sinai School of Medicine, City University of New York, who is a recognized authority on asbestos and the dangers it presents, testified before the Select Subcommittee on Labor. I am told by one member of that subcommittee that Dr. Selikoff's testimony was "the most instructive, the most factual, and just about the most frightening testimony we have yet taken on Capitol Hill. Many of use have worked occupational health and safety hazards."

In his unemotional, quietly authoritative manner, Dr. Selikoff pointed to the results of painstaking studies he has made of some 632 members of two locals of the Asbestos Workers Union in the New York-New Jersey metropolitan area since 1942. Of these workers, 27 have died since 1942 of asbestosis. Dr. Selikoff said:

Since there is no other cause for pulmonary asbestosis but the inhalation of asbestos fibers, these deaths have been unwarranted and unnecessary.

Applying the statistical methods accepted in his profession, Dr. Selikoff found that of the 632 workers studied over a 19-year period, 203 should have died, while 255 actually did die; 37 should have been expected to die of all forms of cancer, but 95 actually did. Seven of these deaths ought to have been from cancer of the lung or pleura, the actual experience was 45. Dr. Selikoff went on to tell the subcommittee that the figures since 1963 have been, if anything, a little worse.

I cannot argue with, or improve upon, one further statement Dr. Selikoff made during these hearings. He said:

It is evident that, somehow, we have failed these men. They had every right to look to

their government and public health authorities, and to the physicians and scientists who guide them, for protection at their work. They were not given this protection.

Mr. Speaker, I urge the Committee on Education and Labor to give careful and urgent attention to H.R. 14816 and related bills. I, for one, do not look forward to being told next year or 10 years from now that we have continued to fail to offer the protection workmen have the right to expect from hazards in the very air they breathe.

Under unanimous consent, Mr. Speaker, I include Dr. Selikoff's statement at this point in the RECORD, and, in addition, an article by Thomas O'Toole that appeared in the Washington Post subsequent to the testimony of Dr. Selikoff:

STATEMENT BY DR. IRVING J. SELIKOFF BEFORE THE HOUSE COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION AND LABOR, SELECT SUBCOMMITTEE ON LABOR, ON H.R. 14816, THE OCCUPATIONAL SAFETY AND HEALTH ACT OF 1968, MARCH 7, 1968

Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, my name is Irving J. Selikoff. I am Professor of Community Medicine at the Mount Sinai School of Medicine of the City University of New York, and Director of its Environmental Sciences Laboratory. I am Editor-in-Chief of "Environmental Research," a recipient of the Lasker Award in Medicine of the American Public Health Association, a Diplomate of the American Board of Preventive Medicine. I am President-Elect of The New York Academy of Sciences, a Member of its Scientific Council, and have served as Chairman of its Division of Environmental Sciences.

I detail these responsibilities both as identification and as an index of my professional and scientific interest in the problems with which this Bill is concerned, but I must confess at the outset that while my studies and research have been professional and scientific, the applications which may be derived from them are emphasized by my responsibilities as a citizen and a physician. The data I shall present are rigorously scientific; but I hope you will interpret them not only as cases in a tabulation but as persons whose health and lives are our responsibility.

I propose to describe to you my research experiences with one group of workmen in this country, so that you might use it as an example or as a yardstick against which to evaluate this proposed bill, to test whether it is necessary or unnecessary, whether it goes too far or not far enough, whether it is sorely needed or will prove superfluous. Because if this bill is not the answer, an answer must surely be found for the difficulties I will review.

For the past six years, I have been investigating occupational health hazards among insulation workers in our construction industry. These men apply the thermal insulation to pipes, ducts, boilers and other structures in buildings, factories, shipyards and other facilities. They are self-reliant, skilled craftsmen. The first union of insulation workers in the United States was formed in New York City in 1884 under a charter issued by the Knights of Labor (predecessor of the American Federation of Labor) as "The Salamander Association of Boiler and Pipe Fitters." Partly from these beginnings, the present union of insulation workers in this country was chartered in 1910 by the AFL as The International Association of Heat and Frost Insulators and Asbestos Workers. They are an important part of the construction industry. The trade is an important one and it is not too much to say that modern construction and modern industry would halt without their work. The union has some

18,000 men on its rolls and there are probably almost an equal number of insulation workers who are not members of this union, often because of conditions of their work, as being employed in maintenance work, doing insulation work as part of other occupations, being members of other unions or by virtue of doing special insulation applications as spraying.

During the course of their work, these men use many materials, some of them mineral or of other inorganic nature. While we have had little knowledge concerning possible adverse effects of most of the materials with which they work (in part, because of their rather recent introduction and inadequate opportunity to observe the presence or absence of such effects), one of the materials with which they work has been under suspicion for some time. I refer to asbestos. This mineral fiber, with unique characteristics and of great value in our industry, is found in a number of the products which these men use in their work and have used for more than seventy years.

In 1924, Cooke in England described a case of severe lung scarring—asbestosis—who had spent 20 years weaving asbestos textile products. In the next decade, numerous similar cases were observed, so that by the mid-1930s the hazard of asbestos as a pneumoconiotic dust was universally accepted. Textile factories in this country were also studied and our Public Health Service fully documented the significant risk involved in asbestos textile factories in the report by Dreesen and colleagues in 1938. Precautionary measures were urged in this report and elimination of hazardous exposure was strongly recommended.

Unfortunately implementation of the recommendations was haphazard and inadequate and the conditions and dangers, recognized and described 40 years ago, are still with us.

It is an unhappy reflection on all of us—government, public health authorities, the medical profession—that at this time in the United States in the 1960s, 7% of all deaths among insulation workers are due to a completely preventable cause, pulmonary asbestosis.

It may be of interest to outline the studies which have demonstrated this continuing, disabling and fatal hazard. With my colleagues, Drs. E. Cuyler Hammond and J. Churg, I have been studying the health experiences of insulation workers in the New York-New Jersey metropolitan area, Locals 12 and 32 of the IAHIW. On December 31, 1942, these Locals had 632 members. We have followed each one of these men from that day to the present. During these years, 27 men have died of asbestosis, of a total of 367 deaths. Since there is no other cause for pulmonary asbestosis but the inhalation of asbestos fibers, these deaths have been unwarranted and unnecessary. Moreover, many of the men who have not been so badly affected as to die of the disease, have been and are disabled to a greater or lesser extent. Thus, more than half of the insulation workers examined by me with more than 20 years from the onset of their work, have the abnormal X-rays of asbestosis and almost one-third have shortness of breath of some degree.

It is evident that, somehow, we have failed these men. They had every right to look to their government and public health authorities, and to the physicians and scientists who guide them, for protection at their work. They were not given this protection.

If the problem were to be limited to this difficulty, it would be bad enough and sufficient spur to remedial action. However, these workmen face an even greater and more worrisome hazard. There is hardly an asbestos insulation worker in this country who is not concerned with the possibility that cancer, induced by the asbestos to which he is ex-

posed, will overwhelm him as he reaches the prime of life. This hazard, too, comes as no surprise to us. In 1935, Dr. Kenneth M. Lynch, then Professor of Pathology and now Chancellor of the University of South Carolina, described the case of lung cancer in a man who also had asbestosis. Because both of these diseases were then rare, Dr. Lynch suggested an etiological relationship. In the next 20 years, numerous similar cases of this association were recorded. Indeed, the Chief Inspector of factories in Great Britain, reviewing all the cases of asbestosis known to their Department, found in the mid-1950s that approximately 20% had associated lung cancer. Sticklers for statistical niceties insisted they were unconvinced, however, and wanted even better data.

Our experiences have supplied these requested morbid figures. I refer you again to the 632 men who were members of the Union in New York-New Jersey in 1942. You may wonder why we went so far back (especially since we have also been following 890 members of these Locals who joined in 1943 or after). The reason lies in an important characteristic of disease associated with industrial asbestos exposure. Asbestos disease rarely occurs in less than 20 years from onset of exposure. Thus, men who work with asbestos do not get asbestosis in five, ten or fifteen years after starting work—asbestosis will become significant and death may follow 25, 30 or more years following the start of their first job.

A similar period of clinical latency is true of asbestos cancer, as well. When this oc-

curs, it strikes 25, 30 or more years after the initial exposure. Incidentally, this is true of many other cancers, as well, both those related to industrial exposure and those not so related. For example, the youngster of sixteen or eighteen who starts smoking has no immediate fear of lung cancer, and correctly so. Unfortunately, he does not look ahead to his late forties or fifties, when the risk appears. Similarly, the bladder cancer following beta-naphthalene exposure, the lung cancer of certain chromate workers, and even the skin cancers following arsenic ingestion; all have a long period of latency. For this reason, any evaluation of the carcinogenic potential of a substance, such as asbestos, must include a long period of observation in humans. I will talk more of this later.

To return. There were 632 members of these Locals on December 31, 1942. We have followed these men, as I have said, to the present. Since we knew the ages of each one of these men in 1942, it was possible for Dr. Hammond, who is Director of Statistical Research and Epidemiology for the American Cancer Society, to determine how many cancers we might expect among these 632 men in subsequent years. We then compared the actual number of deaths and causes of death among these men, with what should have occurred among them, had their experiences been the same as the general population in the United States, age, year and sex being taken into account.

The following Table outlines the data we obtained from January 1, 1943 to December 1, 1962:

OBSERVED AND EXPECTED NUMBER OF DEATHS DUE TO CANCER AMONG 632 ASBESTOS WORKERS EXPOSED TO ASBESTOS DUST 20 YEARS OR LONGER

	Years				Total, 1943-62
	1943-47	1948-52	1953-57	1958-62	
Total, all causes:					
Observed (asbestos workers).....	28.0	54.0	85.0	88.0	255.0
Expected (U.S. white males).....	39.7	50.8	56.6	54.4	203.5
Total cancer, all sites:					
Observed (asbestos workers).....	13.0	17.0	26.0	39.0	95.0
Expected (U.S. white males).....	5.7	8.1	13.0	9.7	36.5
Cancer of lung and pleura:					
Observed (asbestos workers).....	6.0	8.0	13.0	18.0	45.0
Expected (U.S. white males).....	.8	1.4	2.0	2.4	6.6
Cancer of stomach, colon, and rectum:					
Observed (asbestos workers).....	4.0	4.0	7.0	14.0	29.0
Expected (U.S. white males).....	2.0	2.5	2.6	2.3	9.4

The Table demonstrates that of the 632 men, 203 deaths could have been expected had their experience been the same as the general population. Instead, 255 men died. As we look for the reason for the extra 50 deaths, it becomes evident that cancers of several types are responsible for the excess deaths.

Thus, while we might have expected six or seven deaths due to lung cancer among these men, there were 45. While we would have expected nine or ten cancers of the stomach or colon, there were 29.

Incidentally, since 1963 the figures have been, if anything, even worse. While we would have expected approximately 50 of the remainder of the men to have died in the past five years, there have been 113 deaths. And, while we would have expected 3 to have died of cancer of the lung or pleura, 28 have died of this disease. It is surely a tragedy to reflect that 1 in 5 of all insulation workers who now die in the New York-New Jersey metropolitan area die of lung cancer. More than half of the 368 deaths among these men in the past 25 years have been due to cancer of one or another type. If these figures are projected to the country as a whole, and if no improvement in the health hazards these men face is achieved, we may look forward to perhaps 6,000 deaths of lung cancer and to perhaps 15,000 deaths of cancer in general among men in this single asbestos trade alone, in the U.S.

I do not relish the role of Cassandra, and for the purpose of demonstrating the neces-

sity for the development of an occupational health program for the insulation trade, the data already presented might suffice. Nevertheless, another dimension exists which may be useful in your considerations and which should be, at least briefly, mentioned. I refer to a hazard not even suspected until several years ago. While lung cancer, as I mentioned, was observed in association with asbestos more than 35 years ago, in the past several years, we have found that another tumor, mesothelioma of the pleura or mesothelioma of the peritoneum, has also begun to attack asbestos workers. This has attracted a great deal of attention, since until the recent past, this highly malignant tumor was considered to be extraordinarily rare—so rare as not to be separately coded in the International Classification of Causes of Death. Accurate data are hard to come by but in the past in general, mesothelioma was found in approximately 1 in 10,000 deaths. It was a very rare tumor.

Now, it is not at all rare among individuals exposed to asbestos. Thus, in the last several years over 250 cases have been collected in one laboratory in South Africa, primarily in the area about one group of asbestos mines. Over 350 cases have been collected by another group of investigators in Great Britain and, again, asbestos exposure has been traced for the majority of these.

We, too, have been struck by the early reports, especially by those of Dr. Christopher Wagner of South Africa, and noted that in

our first 255 deaths, 4 had been due to mesothelioma. This number was, of course, too few to warrant extensive comment. However, since January 1, 1963, 13 of the next 113 deaths have been due to diffuse mesothelioma of the pleura or peritoneum! It would appear that this invariably fatal tumor has been added to the already heavy risks of the insulation worker and that one in ten deaths among them will be caused by it!

Mesothelioma is curious in another way—one that has caused us much concern. While the cases seen in my Laboratory have been among industrial workmen more or less heavily exposed to asbestos dust, in many other instances the degree of exposure to asbestos has been very light indeed and there has been no clear correlation between degree of exposure and the likelihood of occurrence of the tumor. Newhouse and Thompson in London have presented very disturbing data in this regard. They investigated seventy-six consecutive mesotheliomas at the London Hospital, most seen within recent years, to study the relationship of asbestos exposure. As expected, in 31 of the 76 cases, the individual had worked with asbestos. Of the 45 cases who did not work with asbestos, in 9 instances the only asbestos exposure occurred by virtue of their having lived in the household of an asbestos worker (who often came home with the dust on his clothes). That left 36. Eleven cases occurred in people who merely lived within ½ mile of an asbestos factory in one district in London!

Similar cases were reported by Wagner in South Africa, while in this country Lieben & Pistawka, reviewing 44 cases of mesothelioma in Pennsylvania, found that 20 had potential occupational exposure and 24 did not. Of the latter, 8 occurred as the result of neighborhood exposure by virtue of living near a factory using asbestos and in 3 cases there was potential household exposure. Thus, one death occurred in a minister living across the road from an asbestos plant, one was a child whose father was an asbestos worker and another death occurred in a woman whose sons worked with the material. Borow and his colleagues have recently reported 17 cases of mesothelioma in New Jersey. Again, 15 were in asbestos workers, but two were in individuals who merely lived in a town which had a large asbestos factory.

The very real question has thus been raised—is asbestos-induced cancer limited to those men who regularly are exposed to significant amounts of the dust, or is it a much wider hazard than this? A moment's reflection may highlight the potential problem. We have little accurate data concerning the number of men employed in the United States who are regularly and directly exposed to asbestos, as in asbestos textile plants, asbestos product factories, insulation work, etc. Perhaps 100,000 or more men are regularly so employed. The hazards I have outlined would be serious enough if this were the only group involved. But are those indirectly occupationally exposed at similar risk? If so, the problem is much wider. For example, insulation workers work side by side with more than 3,500,000 other construction workers, often in the same room, inhaling the same dusts—steamfitters, electricians, carpenters, plumbers, masons, tile setters and others. Incidentally, to their indirect exposure must be added occasional direct exposure of their own in some instances, as a carpenter sawing an asbestos-cement board, a plumber using asbestos roving, or the electrician stripping asbestos-covered wire. Much of the asbestos now used is used in the construction industry and much of the increase in world production (500,000 tons per year in 1930 to over 4,000,000 tons per year at present) has been utilized here.

I believe enough has been said to indicate that an important occupational health problem exists in this trade, one that requires urgent and energetic corrective measures. I would urge you to consider the Bill before

you in relation to the data I have presented. My own reading of the Bill suggests that it will go a long way in improving the unfortunate conditions that now exist. Again, from my own experience, a number of observations may be pertinent in evaluating specific approaches contained in the Bill.

1. I am convinced that the problems I have detailed can be solved and health hazards eliminated. Suggestive evidence is available in Great Britain, Germany and in this country indicating that both asbestosis and bronchogenic carcinoma can be significantly reduced in incidence as levels of asbestos exposure are drastically reduced. The asbestos industry in general and the insulation industry in particular are much too important and much too valuable to be limited or injured by default. Appropriate safety measures are thus in the interests of both the industry and its employees.

2. Workmen in the trade expect and await the measures necessary to eliminate or diminish the hazards to which they are exposed. I recently inquired of them what problems they had noted in their practical experience. Over 13,000 took the trouble to write me with suggestions about cleaning up their trade, ranging from the availability of improved masks through less dusty materials, improved working practices, appropriate exhausts, appropriate health examinations and the vacuuming of clothes before going home.

3. It is idle and largely inaccurate to "blame the industry" for the present situation. It is sometimes not appreciated that "industry" is not an all-powerful monolithic single entity—certainly it is not in the insulation trade. In this trade, most employers are small business men, with limited resources, employing few men. When I looked into this matter at the end of 1965, there were over 900 employers in the industry, employing an average of 17.6 men per shop.

Such employers have neither the expertise, nor funds, nor knowledge to have detected these health hazards. They are just as much upset by them as are their men. Nor can they mount the necessary engineering and industrial hygiene programs to develop adequate safeguards to remove these hazards. They will be anxious, I am sure, to undertake appropriate occupational health and industrial hygiene programs once these are suggested to them. This, I assume, is in line with the purposes of the Bill.

4. In the insulation trade, it is my impression that, while all would welcome the necessary measures, unless the public health authorities and those responsible for the occupational health measures take action, nothing will be done. In large part, this is because no one knows where the responsibility actually lies. Does it belong with the materials manufacturers? The individual employer? The regional employers' associations? The national employers' association? The national materials manufacturers' association? The local unions? The international union?

5. The problems we have discussed are excellent illustrations of the urgent need for extensive strengthening of the Occupational Health Program of the Public Health Service. Their task has been tremendously extended and complicated in the last 20 years by the widespread introduction of numerous new materials, the biological actions of which are usually untested. Are there other asbestos lying in wait for us? Only the Public Health Service includes the possibility of long-term surveillance necessary for detection of those effects with a long latent period, as occupational cancer. Their continuing responsibility includes the coordination of observations made by scientists in various fields at various times. Moreover, they often have the opportunity of studying large groups of men, often occupational lists. Few employers, except the very largest, have this opportunity.

Moreover, workmen often go from job to job within the same industry, especially in the construction trades. No one employer can expect to follow his employees long enough for long-term effects to be defined. Indeed, since such effects may vary with the same material from industry to industry, only a body which can observe all industries may be able to detect such effects.

What I am saying is that industry is simply unable to police itself in the detection and definition of such hazards as have occurred. The industry needs help.

6. I would suggest that it is very much in the interest of industry in general, and the insulation industry in particular, to have, as the proposed Bill suggests, adequate authority given to the Department of Labor to set those standards necessary to reduce or eliminate occupational health hazards. I do not refer to those callous statistics which indicate that it is cheaper in the long run to have adequate safety and health precautions than to pay workmen's compensation costs. While this may be true, there is a much more important aspect to the question.

In many instances, where there is intra-industry and inter-industry competition, it is often the most conscientious employer who is at a competitive disadvantage. This is certainly true in those industries in which there is a risk of pneumoconioses or dust diseases of the lungs, as silicosis, coal workers' pneumoconiosis, talcosis and asbestosis. Since there is, as we have been, a long latent period—usually over 20 years—between dust exposure and disease resulting from such exposure, precautions taken today will bear fruit, in the form of the employees' good health, two decades or more hence. But at that time, it is highly likely that the employee will be working elsewhere! The employer in investing in current occupational health precautions, sees no immediate benefit, not even in reduction of workmen's compensation costs. If he must pay the latter to current employees who are ill, he is paying for the neglect of another employer twenty or thirty years before.

This analysis is relevant to the insulation trade today. I have spoken to many insulation contractors. They have been very concerned with the difficulties that have become evident and earnestly wish to remedy matters. Yet they have told me that if substantial investments or significant changes in working practices and conditions were required as part of the program to make this trade safe for the men working in it, such investments should be industry-wide and should not penalize those who undertake them in favor of those who do not.

Standards based upon information collected and evaluated by experts in the Public Health Service, set on practical and realistic levels by the Secretary of Labor with adequate enforcement powers, and required by all employers in the industry seem essential to correct the serious situation I have outlined. The industry itself has neither the academic and scientific nor the administrative resources to prepare the appropriate corrective program and, the economic facts of life are such as to mitigate against the broad application of such a program by voluntary persuasion alone.

Moreover, these influences are even more relevant when considering the social and community responsibilities which may exist. If the use of asbestos insulation materials should be shown to include some health hazard to other construction workmen as the result of concomitant indirect occupational exposure, we would need some mechanism as that outlined in this Bill to insure appropriate corrective measures, since many employers might hesitate to undertake expensive precautionary measures to prevent uncertain disease that might occur many years later among men they did not know, did not employ and for whom they had no re-

sponsibility—especially if in making such an investment they assumed an intolerable competitive disadvantage.

In concluding, may I add a few words of personal comment and opinion. As I read this Bill, it seemed to divide responsibility fairly and effectively. What we now know would be used to set enforceable standards immediately. The institution of beryllium safety standards has resulted in a significant reduction in beryllium disease and similar advantages will be obtained with other noxious agents, of which we already know a good deal; enough to prepare practical, realistic safety programs.

I noticed that Secretary Wirtz on February 15 testified that over 1,000 workers are expected to die from radiation-induced lung cancer in uranium mines. I am sure we all regret these deaths from a hazard which has been recognized since 1879. And we have enough knowledge to point the urgency of a protective program for our insulation workers in this country, who should no longer die of asbestosis, lung cancer, pleural and peritoneal mesothelioma. We should help industry help itself in the development, installation and administration of an industry-wide program which will penalize no employer but will help the many thousands of workmen who look to us to accept our responsibility to protect them against serious occupational hazards.

On the other hand, the Bill looks forward to an important expansion of the research responsibilities and capabilities of the Occupational Health Program of the Public Health Service. This is urgently needed. At this time the Program is composed of highly skilled, energetic and dedicated scientists. But their responsibilities, already heavy and numerous, are increasing almost geometrically. The Surgeon General, Dr. Stewart, stated in his testimony on February 20 that "... workers are coming in contact with literally hundreds of new chemicals and formulations in industrial uses every day." He noted that these "... chemicals have increased so fast in number that we have recommendations for only 400 out of 6,000 in commercial use." Industry has increased in complexity and potential hazard. The tasks of the Occupational Health Program must somehow be accomplished and I would strongly urge that the strengthening of the Occupational Health Program as envisaged by this Bill be supported.

In conclusion, may I thank you, Mr. Chairman, and the Members of the Committee for your invitation and for the opportunity of reviewing those of our experiences relevant to the Bill you are considering.

[From the Washington (D.C.) Post,
Mar. 8, 1968]

RAPID INCREASE IN LUNG CANCER NOTED AMONG ASBESTOS WORKERS

(By Thomas O'Toole)

One out of five asbestos insulation workers in metropolitan New York now dies of lung cancer, an eminent physician told Congress yesterday.

"If these figures are projected to the country as a whole, and if no improvement in the health hazards these men face is achieved," said Dr. Irving J. Selikoff, "we may look forward to perhaps 6000 deaths of lung cancer and perhaps 15,000 deaths of cancer in general in this single asbestos trade alone."

Dr. Selikoff is professor of Community Medicine at New York's Mt. Sinai Hospital and president-elect of the prestigious New York Academy of Sciences.

Testifying before the House Select Labor Subcommittee, Dr. Selikoff said these statistics "come as no surprise" to asbestos industry observers.

"In 1935," said Dr. Selikoff, "Dr. Kenneth M. Lynch, now Chancellor of the University

of South Carolina, described the case of lung cancer in a man who also had asbestosis," a combination he said was rare. But since then, Dr. Selikoff said, "numerous similar cases of this association were recorded."

The New York doctor told the Subcommittee, which is holding hearings on President Johnson's proposed Occupational Safety and Health Act, that nobody has taken steps to curb the spread of cancer in asbestos workers, despite the mounting evidence that the disease is on a rapid rise.

For the past six years, Dr. Selikoff said, he has conducted an intense study of 632 asbestos insulation workers belonging to the New York and New Jersey locals of the Asbestos Workers Union.

The 632 men had been asbestos workers since 1942, Dr. Selikoff said. On the basis of normal life expectancy trends, 203 could have been expected to die by 1962. But, instead, said Dr. Selikoff, 255 men died. Looking for the reason behind the extra 50 deaths, he said, it became evident "that cancers of several types" were responsible.

"We might have expected six or seven deaths due to lung cancer," he went on, "but there were 45. And while we would have expected nine or ten cancers of the stomach or colon, there were 29."

Dr. Selikoff explained that the "people who work in a dusty atmosphere not only breathe it in, they eat it, too."

Since 1962, he said, "the figures have been even worse."

"While we would have expected 50 men to have died in the past five years," Dr. Selikoff said, "there have been 118 deaths. While we would have expected three to have died of cancer of the lung or pleura, 28 have died of this disease."

Of equal concern, Dr. Selikoff went on, is a relatively new tumor related to asbestos exposure called mesothelioma, which is a cancer of the lining of the chest or peritoneum.

This is such a rare cancer, Dr. Selikoff said, that it is found to cause one out of every 10,000 deaths. But of the 113 deaths in the asbestos worker group in New York, he said, 13 have been from mesothelioma.

"This makes it one out of every 10 deaths among asbestos workers," he said, "instead of one out of 10,000."

Fino Urges Tax-Free Interest on U.S. Savings Bond When Held to Maturity

HON. PAUL A. FINO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 13, 1968

Mr. FINO. Mr. Speaker, on Monday, I introduced legislation to make interest on U.S. Government savings bonds held to maturity free from Federal income taxation.

As a result of Great Society inflation over the last few years, savings bonds are becoming an ever-more questionable investment. The interest they pay at maturity is hardly more than the inroads that inflation has made on the purchasing power of the value of the bond. On top of this, the holder still has to pay Federal taxes on the interest, normally in the year he collects it. Thus, many taxpayers in middle-income brackets find that inflation and taxation have robbed them of their interest and perhaps even more.

Of course, the Great Society knows that the smart fat cats of Wall Street

would not touch series E taxable interest bonds with a 10-foot pole—for patriotism or any other reason. They get 5½ to 6 percent interest on their Government loan obligations—FNMA participations, for example—or they get a tax break on interest. Many municipal bonds paying 3 to 5 percent are free of Federal taxes, which is a windfall. However, you have to be rich to buy these bonds because they come in thousand-dollar-and-up denominations. There is no such break for the little man.

My bill would take away the Federal tax from the interest on a Federal savings bond held to maturity. This would give the little man the same break that the Great Society now reserves for the fat cats of Wall Street. It would make U.S. savings bonds into profitable, instead of losing investments if kept until maturity, and it would no doubt encourage savings bond sales which would be good for the economy.

I hope that the committee on Ways and Means will give serious and favorable consideration to this type of legislation.

Statement of Leadership Conference on Civil Rights

HON. WILLIAM F. RYAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 13, 1968

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Speaker, the Senate has finally acted on legislation to provide Federal fair housing guarantees and protect the activity of civil rights workers. The House should act promptly on this legislation. In addition, we should give highest priority to legislation giving full enforcement powers to the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission.

The Leadership Conference on Civil Rights, representing nearly 100 civic, trade union, religious, and student organizations, has adopted a statement in support of these three legislative goals and supporting other important national policy objectives.

The January 30, 1968, statement of the Leadership Conference on Civil Rights follows:

STATEMENT ADOPTED BY THE ANNUAL BOARD MEETING OF THE LEADERSHIP CONFERENCE ON CIVIL RIGHTS, JANUARY 30, 1968

At this time of racial and social crisis, the Leadership Conference on Civil Rights, on the occasion of its annual board meeting, reaffirms its conviction that solutions to our nation's domestic problems can and must be achieved through peaceful, democratic means and within the American political system.

It is a reaffirmation made with a sense of burning urgency. For unless this Congress and this Administration act quickly, our reaffirmation may become empty rhetoric.

The bill the Senate is now debating, the civil rights protection act, would do much to protect citizens from violence in the exercise of such elementary rights as serving on juries, going to school, getting a job, using public transportation, visiting a restaurant or movie or enjoying the parks or other facilities paid for with their taxes. It would protect those working to help people achieve and exercise the rights to which they are constitutionally entitled.

But this bill alone will not advance us very far toward full equality. It does not address itself to two glaring injustices—the denial of equal access to housing and jobs. If the Fair Housing Act and the bill to strengthen the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission now before the Congress are added to the civil rights protection bill, we would then have legislation that would at least offer hope that Congress means to continue the work it began in 1964 and 1965 of correcting injustices through law.

We therefore call upon the Senate to combine the three bills into a single measure and to keep the Civil Rights Act of 1968 the pending business of the Senate until the filibuster is broken and this broader bill is passed. We call upon the President to exert the utmost influence in support of this course of action.

We deplore current efforts that tend to compromise the civil rights protection bill rather than strengthen it. The debilitating compromises being circulated are unnecessary and unacceptable retreats from the Fourteenth Amendment. We urge the shelving of these proposed compromises and the return to the civil rights offensive through the passage of the fair housing and equal employment amendments.

Because we believe that civil rights require not only the establishment and enforcement of rights in law, but also the realization of social and economic conditions in which alone the fulfillment of these rights is possible, we reaffirm our support of a legislative program that will guarantee decent jobs to all who are able to work, adequate housing, full education and a living income to all citizens mired in poverty.

We support the President in his call to private industry to help find 500,000 jobs for the hard-core unemployed. But it is a task that cannot be left to private industry alone. We urge enactment of legislation already before this Congress that would oblige the government to act as employer of last resort by channeling workers into needed public service jobs.

We also support the President's call for "a 10-year campaign to build six million new decent housing units for low and middle-income families."

The announced cuts in anti-poverty programs underscore the need for this Congress to provide adequate funds for the welfare and education programs it has already authorized. We know too well the disillusionment created when a program of promise is held out to desperate people and then withdrawn. We call on this session to vote sufficient funds to enable threatened programs to continue.

The first session of the 90th Congress committed a crime against the poor when it adopted welfare provisions that force mothers to take jobs, often wretched ones, or lose their benefits, and that put severe limits on aid to children in fatherless homes.

We therefore call upon this session to repeal these provisions and upon the President and the Department of Health, Education and Welfare to see that defenseless people do not suffer.

The goals we set forth tonight are modest, minimal and necessary. We shall do all in our power to fulfill them in 1968. We cannot and must not falter in our drive toward full equality.

The "Pueblo": How Long?

HON. WILLIAM J. SCHERLE

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 13, 1968

Mr. SCHERLE. Mr. Speaker, this is the 51st day the U.S.S. *Pueblo* and her crew have been in North Korean hands.

Need for a Code of Fair Competitive Practices in World Trade

HON. THOMAS B. CURTIS

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 13, 1968

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, a recent speech by Mr. John R. Morrill, vice chairman of Kearney-National Inc., of St. Louis, points up the need for international governmental agreement on fair trading practices.

Using the electrical equipment manufacturing industry as an example, Mr. Morrill points out how foreign manufacturers are selling their products in the United States at prices substantially below the prices they are charging the government-owned power systems in their own countries. This policy is being carried out with full knowledge of the governments concerned. The governments, in fact, actually encourage this policy by rebating taxes on export shipments.

But even more harmful, European nationalized power systems refuse to buy American products at any price even when the American supplier underbids the European competitor.

Mr. Speaker, I have long been an advocate of fair competitive trading practices among nations. Tariffs are not the only barriers that impede the free flow of goods and services. When the Congress considers the administration's anticipated trade bill this spring, strong consideration should be given to new authority to negotiate on nontariff barriers and to develop a code of fair practices in international trade.

And, Mr. Speaker, it is about time to hammer home the point that in the debate on international trade policies there are three, not two, major points of view. First, the pure protectionist who wants protection against all competition, fair or otherwise. Second, the pure free-trader who wants all economic differentials removed whether they are designed to compensate for unfair competitive practices or not. Third, the fair trader who believes that the best way to free up trade is to make it fair and to do this agreed-upon rules of fairness with enforcement methods are essential.

Most American businessmen and labor leaders are really fair traders not protectionists or freetraders, yet the exchange of vituperations between the protectionists and the freetraders make it sound as if they are the only ones who have a right to be heard.

I have always been a fair trader, and just as I have resented in the past being called a protectionist by the freetraders, so do I resent today being called a free-trader by the protectionists. I want to continue my disassociation from both groups. Neither can claim me, but I will listen to the arguments of both as they bear on the specifics under consideration.

Mr. Morrill's speech follows:

PURCHASING POWER EQUIPMENT FROM FOREIGN SOURCES

(By John R. Morrill)

There is no subject more critical to the utility industry than the one we are dis-

cussing today. The decisions to be made next week, next month, and next year on purchasing from foreign sources by the purchasing men in this audience cannot help but have important effects. Your decisions will not only affect the growth of the electrical industry in this country but may very well effect the progress of the American utility industry itself.

There is a large amount of important information about this subject that has not been presented adequately to the electric utility industry. Nor has this vital data been presented in proper form to the Congress and the federal agencies involved with foreign trade. The information I will present to you is largely in the public domain but it has not been gathered together heretofore. I welcome the opportunity of making this information available to you.

During 1967 I was president of the National Electrical Manufacturers Association but I am not representing NEMA today. Some of my data is from NEMA studies. Other information is from many sources, and may not represent a collective NEMA viewpoint. Although I am associated with Kearney-National, I am not speaking in behalf of our company interests either.

Rather, I am here this afternoon representing one John Morrill, United States citizen, who has a deep and abiding interest in the growth and progress of America, and in particular, that segment of America having to do with serving American industries and consumers with electricity. My view looks at the equipment manufacturers and the utilities almost as one. It probably cannot be said in every case that what is good for one is good for the other, but I have a strong feeling that there are a great many areas where this is surely the case.

I'm not sure you all agree with me on this statement. In the last few years, with shortages, delays and rising prices, I've seen emotion at work. You've been a little unhappy with some of your suppliers. Some have been a bit arbitrary in your opinion. But I would venture that if this forum today is to have any real value, emotionalism should be rejected and the basic issues evaluated by reason alone.

You have just listened to a very interesting presentation by an outstanding engineer and executive from American Electric Power. It is interesting because it brings to our attention the reasons why one individual and one company have made purchases from foreign manufacturers and will probably continue to do so. These reasons may have a validity by themselves. But I submit that there may well be other considerations that have an over-riding significance to the future well-being of the utility industry in America; and it is these considerations that I want to lay on the table. We need to develop a total perspective on this important subject of international trade.

Today the words "free trade" stir the emotions. They have almost become a sacred cow. Anyone who is opposed to free trade is a protectionist, obstructionist and worse. Attacking free trade is almost like attacking motherhood. Willard Wirtz, Secretary of Labor, said, "Protectionism and featherbedding come down to the same thing." The columnist John Chamberlain wrote recently, "I have tended to look on the protectionist as a man with a hand on my wallet."

Since people do feel that way, it is difficult to get thoughtful attention to some of the thorny and complex problems existing in this area of international trade. We tend to oversimplify. We generalize instead of digging into the causes and effects that determine whether a particular policy is really to the benefit of all Americans. I surely do not need to mention to this group that there can be government policies that presume to benefit some segments of American life but can be very detrimental to others. Government policy today is causing inflation and raising your cost of financing. There should be noth-

ing sacred about so-called government policy to this group.

Can you honestly say that the government policy of "free trade" is going to be beneficial to the utility industry? Time will tell, but there are grave and complicated problems that need to be examined objectively. That bag of gold at the end of the free trade rainbow which is the long-term, economic well-being of the utility industry, may be a deceptive illusion.

To put this matter of purchasing electrical equipment from foreign sources in its proper perspective, let's see if we can find agreement on what might be termed some basic verities—basic truths. I have discussed this subject with some of you to get your viewpoints. It appears to me you want and need certain conditions to exist, in order to operate with ever increasing efficiency and to maintain your growth and stability.

First. You need a resourceful group of equipment manufacturers who will work closely with you in developing improved equipment that will enable you to operate more economically and more reliably.

Second. You need lively competition among those manufacturers to spur them to achieve efficiency in their own operations and imagination in their product development.

Third. You need an industry that provides adequate manufacturing capacity to meet your expanding requirements.

Fourth: You need an equipment manufacturing industry that is economically healthy and provides a fair return on its investment. You know you need this to serve your customers. Equipment manufacturers need this to serve you.

Fifth. And this moves now to a broader viewpoint. You need a growing America with an expanding viable economy to provide jobs and homes for our rising population. After all, these people are your future customers.

Sixth. You need government policies which will encourage international trade on a fair basis, but will not destroy the first five conditions I have just mentioned.

So here are Six Basic Verities. At least I am calling them that because my discussions with you in the last three months have indicated that you believe these conditions are essential to your own long-term best interest.

If we examine what is happening today in the light of these basic verities, perhaps we can blow away the emotional smoke of free trade generalizations and see what the real problems are.

The fact that you can buy turbines, generators, power transformers, and THV circuit-breakers from European manufacturers, at lower prices, than you can buy from American companies, is well established. The facet that many of these European manufacturers are selling their products at prices substantially below the prices they are charging the government-owned power systems in their own countries has now also been established. Recent studies by both NEMA and individual companies indicate that these foreign manufacturers probably would go bankrupt if they sold all of their output at the prices they sell these products to you.

This is what is known popularly as "dumping" and is an ancient form of commercial warfare. This policy is being used as an export strategy by most European governments. It is being condoned and actually encouraged by many of our own government agencies. I use the term dumping in an economic rather than technical legal sense—to mean a policy of selling for export at discriminatory prices below the levels charged in the producer's home market, whether this differential is based on government subsidy, tax abatement, incremental costing, or a combination of these.

A careful study made in England during the past two years proved that the English

transformer manufacturers were, with full knowledge of the British government, selling power transformers at 30% to 40% higher prices to the British Central Electricity Generating Board (the GCEB) than they were quoting and selling in the U.S.A. The NEMA study was based on certain public data but also on some very careful intelligence work with key sources of information. The fact that there is a general kind of legal cartel operating in Great Britain among the heavy equipment manufacturers is quite common knowledge, and the acceptance of so-called "acceptable price levels" by the GCEB has also been established. Indeed, even articles in the electrical trade press have appeared, explaining the need for this policy, if British companies are to be successful in the export market. The title of one such article which appeared in the November 1965 issue of the British publication *The Electrical Review* was, "Adequate Home Prices are Essential for Competitive Exporting." Another article of August 1966 in the same magazine was titled, "Price Competition Inappropriate for Heavy Electrical Companies."

I have in my files a copy of an agreement between the GCEB and the four largest power equipment manufacturers in Great Britain. It is dated March 23, 1967. In this agreement the GCEB agrees to pay prices that will guarantee a profit of 16½% on purchases from these manufacturers for circuit breakers and switches in 132 KV, 275 KV, and 400 KV ratings. The agreement, if I read it correctly, allows research, administrative and selling charges for export business to be included in costs to arrive at the 16½% profit.

While I do not have copies of the arrangements between manufacturers and the nationalized power systems of France and Switzerland, I understand that similar agreements exist. Thus these foreign manufacturers are competing in an unfair way with American manufacturers whose government properly will not permit such arrangements in the U.S. because of our anti-trust laws.

Arrangements of this kind are certainly repugnant to American concepts of doing business, and would no doubt be found in violation of our anti-trust laws. I submit they result in competition unfair to the American manufacturers.

The fact is that the public power agencies of our government, such as TVA and Bonneville, have accounted for most of the purchasing from foreign manufacturers in recent years. This would make it appear that our own government is not only condoning the dumping practices of foreign manufacturers but is actively encouraging them. When the results of the English power transformer pricing study were recently presented to officials at one of the largest public power agencies in America, they showed little interest and smilingly agreed that American manufacturers, "do have a problem."

Now dumping is not exclusively European policy. American manufacturers have resorted to this strategy too. As a matter of interest, I will read you an excerpt from the December 30, 1911 issue of the *Wall Street Journal* in which Thomas Edison made the following comments:

"I was the first manufacturer in the United States to adopt the idea of dumping surplus goods upon the foreign market. Thirty years ago my balance sheet showed me that I was not making much money. My manufacturing plant was not running to its full capacity. I couldn't find a market for my products. Then I suggested that we undertake to run our plant at full capacity and sell the surplus products in foreign markets at less than cost of production. Every one of my associates opposed me. I had my experts figure out how much it would add to the cost of operating the plant if we increased this production 25 percent. The figures showed that we could increase the production 25 percent at an increased cost of

only about 2 percent. On this basis, I sent a man to Europe who sold lamps there at a price less than the cost of production in Europe."

Thomas Edison explains about as simply as possible why it is to the economic advantage of a European manufacturer to dump heavy power equipment in the United States. As long as he covers his out-of-pocket costs, and does not upset the pricing arrangement in his own country, he is ahead of the game on profits.

But we should ask, how do the European manufacturers have this excess capacity which they can fill up with orders priced below their full production costs? There are two reasons for this. Fluctuating demands by their own nationalized power systems cause excess capacity to exist at various times. Further, the European governments themselves have given these manufacturers financial grants to encourage them to expand capacity to obtain export business. These grants are as high as 30% of the cost of new plant and equipment.

Not only do the foreign governments subsidize the plant expansion of their domestic companies but they do a great deal more. They give credits or rebates of taxes because of export shipments. They suspend excise, value added or turnover taxes which would normally have to be paid on the materials these manufacturers use.

In France the remission of the value added tax allows a French circuit breaker manufacturer to sell a high voltage breaker in the U.S. at around \$200,000 while the French power system pays around \$350,000 to these same manufacturers for comparable breakers. I am advised that the price you would pay an American manufacturer is around \$300,000.

Foreign governments finance development programs. It seems likely that DeGaulle did this for the French manufacturer Delle so that Delle could develop the 735 KV circuit breakers for Hydro Quebec.

These same breakers have now been purchased by an American utility. I understand that the French government subsidized Delle originally to go after orders for the Russian power system.

So you can see that the American manufacturer is not competing just with foreign manufacturers for sales in the U.S. He is competing with foreign governments. We would have to say that's rough and dirty competition. And I regret to say that it is very successful for the foreign governments and manufacturers. In 1967 the orders for electrical equipment that were placed abroad by U.S. utilities exceeded the total volume placed abroad for such equipment in the prior 75-year history of the electrical equipment industry.

But what about the American power equipment manufacturers? Can they sell their products in European markets? You would think an enlightened trade policy on the part of the U.S. government should be one which somehow helped American manufacturers compete abroad. But, and here's the irony, the European market is tightly closed to American products. The nationalized power systems refuse to buy American products at any price. This is what is politely known as a "non tariff barrier", the rankest form of protectionism.

No matter what you call it, this means that international trade in heavy power equipment is strictly a one-way street, and it's going to remain so in the foreseeable future. The trade doors in the U.S. are increasingly open to foreign power equipment but the doors to American equipment in Europe are closed tight and locked.

In some lines American manufacturers could live very profitably at most European home market price levels, without dumping, but on a full cost recovery basis. Let me illustrate by an episode that is almost amusing

if it weren't so serious. One American circuit breaker manufacturer tried in 1967 to sell Electricite de France, the French state owned utility. In his quotation, he used as a base his U.S. list prices for 5 different ratings—in other words he started with a price level higher than his actual U.S. market prices. To these list prices he added ocean freight and French or Common Market tariffs of 13%. On top of that he added the French turnover tax which alone raised his landed cost in France by 25%. The French utility agreed that his product amply satisfied their technical specifications. They also told him his price offerings on 4 of the 5 ratings were lower than the prices Electricite de France normally paid to French manufacturers.

Did the American manufacturer get an order for a circuit breaker? Of course not.

What does all this mean? If you like, you can feel sad that American manufacturers can't sell in Europe. You can be amazed that American government trade representatives at Geneva further reduced American tariffs on heavy power equipment when they knew that the reduction of European tariffs was a meaningless gesture. They opened the American trade doors to European equipment even wider, and yet knowingly left the European trade doors still locked against us. This appears to be a knowing violation of Section 252 of the Trade Expansion Act of 1962 and the intent of the Congress.

Does this whole situation have any real meaning to the American utility industry? Perhaps it does. If it continues, it will obviously impair the ability of the American manufacturers to serve you in the way you want to be served. It will most certainly discourage American manufacturers from expanding their capacity.

We must be honest, however, in evaluating the near future. European manufacturers are currently supplying a small percent of the American market for heavy power equipment, though undoubtedly they have available capacity to supply much more. If they greatly expanded their facilities to handle the market in the U.S., they would not be able to sell a great deal of equipment at their dump prices because they probably would go bankrupt. That is, unless their own governments substantially increased their subsidies to these manufacturers. Of course, that is a probability.

Our Second Basic Verity was that you need lively competition among American manufacturers to insure good equipment at good prices. It has been stated that buying from foreign sources insures this competition. If it were fair competition, I would certainly agree; but when it is the kind of competition I have described, I can't believe it. One utility executive recently gave his reasons in the public press for buying turbine generators from Brown-Boveri and indicated there was little competition in this product area.

I am not here to support the pricing policies of General Electric or Westinghouse in the turbine generator area, but we all know this is a high risk business requiring high investment. It can be operated successfully only on a high volume level and I must observe that at one time in this country there were three manufacturers of turbine generators. Obviously the electric utility industry did not really need three manufacturers and in 1962 Allis-Chalmers was forced to withdraw from the market. I also recall reading the 1963 Westinghouse Annual Report. President Burnham wrote to his stockholders that Westinghouse suffered, and I quote, "A loss in 1963 in our Electric Utility Group, reflecting shipments of heavy equipment booked at severely depressed prices."

Just a few years back I recall that GE even published advertising which pleaded with the utilities to place orders for heavy equipment then, since their facilities were not being utilized enough to keep them busy.

And further, I understand that in 1966 one of the major American aero-space companies made a study of going into the turbine business in combination with a turbine manufacturer in Europe. This study proved that the return on investment was totally inadequate and the project was dropped. Times do change, however, and perhaps conditions are different today. If so, I wonder how long today's conditions will exist.

Whether two companies in a given industry provide the right amount of competition, I don't really know. In the automobile industry, 3½ seems to provide bitter competition. In the electrical industry—we have a minimum of two and in many lines five or six. Where there is a possibility of reasonable return on investment, there appears to be no hesitation on the part of other U.S. companies to enter markets now dominated by the present manufacturers.

In the turbine generator business the two remaining manufacturers in this country will never be able to compete with any system where the government, the government-owned power industry, and a large turbine manufacturer get together and agree to give American utilities prices below what the manufacturer should use to cover its full production costs and overhead. How can you compare these prices with what American manufacturers require to cover their costs and overhead?

Our Third and Fourth Verities proclaimed a need for adequate manufacturing capacity and a healthy industry, which receives a fair return on its investment. Like you, I have read in the papers of the new plant capacity which is now being built by most of the heavy equipment manufacturers. I'm sure this was based on information received from the American utilities on their requirements over the next 10 to 20 years. Is this capacity not now going to be used? What effect will these foreign purchases have on the profits of the American companies involved? What will be the effect on their future expansion plans?

The professional manager of a publicly owned company or the division of a large company must show a reasonable profit short-term. His stockholders demand it. He can not invest large amounts of capital for expansion unless he is quite sure this capacity will be used. In his position, would you? He must do some very careful market forecasting, and this in turn must be based on your forecasting.

Our First Verity was that you need resourceful American manufacturers who can work with you to develop the most reliable and the most economical equipment that can be devised. Now, let's be fair and agree that not all the engineering brains in the world live in the U.S.A. European designers have brilliant ideas just as American designers do. At any given moment a European machine might have some advantage over an American one. In this country there is a constant change in designs as one company or another comes out with a minor or major improvement. Then quickly the competitors catch up or forge ahead. This is the way it should be. It's healthy; it's competitive; and it's fair.

I can't help but feel that there are few areas in the heavy power equipment field where a European manufacturer has held a lead over American manufacturers for anything but a brief period. On the other hand, the overwhelming lead that American manufacturers have held over European companies for many years is spread on the record for all to see. Whether at that given instant when a European manufacturer is technologically ahead of an American manufacturer, the electric utilities should buy from Europe, I think depends on the variety of considerations I have mentioned previously. I believe, however, that there are few American manufacturers who would expect the utilities to "buy down" in quality. If one foreign product is really better, then most of us would say go ahead and buy it.

But the record of the American manufacturers in Research and Development is impressive. They have led in the development of large turbine generators for many years. New coal-fired power plants have costs in the \$100 per kilowatt area. Compare that to around \$145 per KW just five years ago.

Certainly American manufacturers have an undisputed leadership in nuclear power. The development of grain-oriented steels to reduce transformer losses and the new brushless exciters for turbine generators represent significant advances. New developments in underground distribution have made it a practical economic reality.

But all of these developments cost money. And I don't mean small money. Hundreds of millions of dollars a year are going into the development of new and improved products for your industry. In the final analysis, you pay for these in the cost of the products. But this partnership has paid handsome rewards to you in your continuing efforts to reduce costs of generation, transmission and distribution. If you are unwilling to buy the products this remarkable research and development produces, obviously the R & D is going to dry up. R & D is essential to your progress. If the manufacturers don't handle it, someone else must. Do you think the utilities should take on this risky function? Would you like the government to assume the responsibility?

In looking at our Fifth Verity, which cites the need for a growing economy and more jobs, I have a feeling that what we are doing with our right hand, we may be undoing with our left. Your business is heavily taxed by our federal government. That tax money is being used to stimulate the economy and provide jobs. Yet the more than 300 million dollars worth of heavy power equipment which was purchased from foreign sources in 1967 is the equivalent of a full year of employment for over 10,000 factory workers in electrical equipment companies alone. This does not count the people who are employed in making the steel, the wire, and all the other materials and services that go into heavy power equipment.

You may say we have full employment of skilled and semi-skilled people in the manufacturing industries. Probably true at the moment, but watch out for tomorrow if the present trend continues.

You have doubtless read much of what is being said by the steel industry these days about the effect of imports of steel. The statement they made that importing steel is the same as exporting American jobs, must have real validity to our electrical industry. We need jobs for America, and I can't help but feel that we don't really understand what we are doing when we casually export hundreds of thousands of American jobs with no possibility of developing other jobs because of the trade barriers working against us.

If electrical manufacturers could sell overseas, then the orders that were lost to foreign competition here could be balanced with orders from foreign sources; but alas, this is impossible. Our industry is different, however, from the steel industry. While basic steel cannot be exported, thousands of items of American equipment made of steel can and are being sold abroad. It just doesn't work that way with heavy electrical equipment.

Let us acknowledge the advantages that can accrue to all nations from the enlightened pursuit of the theories of freedom in trade, but do we have to adopt this whole doctrine blindly, with no qualifications or deviations whatever the circumstances?

We believe in Capitalism too, but the Capitalism of Adam Smith has been modified, hedged, regulated and controlled for what we hope is the good of America. A little regulation in the area of free trade would seem to be in order. We are all for motherhood but we even attempt to control this to a degree.

Our Sixth Verity recognizes certain advantages that can accrue to America by elimination of trade barriers throughout the world. But if we do not recognize what is to our own interest, we are foolish. If, by foreign purchases of the equipment you use in your generation and transmission systems, you weaken the incentives of the American companies to serve you, is this to your advantage?

The price advantage you enjoy by buying Japanese electrical porcelain is going to continue in the foreseeable future. There is a great deal of labor involved in porcelain manufacture. The labor rates in America are over 5 times those of Japan. The American-installed cost of domestic machinery used in making porcelain is estimated to be 2 to 3 times what that cost is in Japan. Raw materials cost less in Japan.

The quality of Japanese porcelain seems to be fairly good. It ought to be. We helped design their equipment and processes after World War II in the massive program to rehabilitate our former enemy.

Perhaps the question we now should raise is whether the utility industry wants any porcelain industry in America. If you do, you are going to have to support it through purchases of American products.

In porcelain the only thing the Japanese have given you is price, and perhaps a shorter delivery. They have merely copied American products and ideas. What about the design and development that have occurred in these last few years by the partnership of American insulator manufacturers and your companies? The manufacturers have worked with you in their high voltage laboratories to develop insulator-hardware systems that have made practical EHV transmission. Many of us can't recall it, but the conventional transmission suspension systems were developed by American manufacturers.

What about the recent V-string configuration of insulators and hardware by Ohio Brass Co. that saved one southern utility over one million dollars in right-of-way costs? The entire post insulator development, which includes line posts, station posts and distribution posts, was the work of one of your important domestic suppliers, Lapp Insulator. What about the development of lightning arresters that reduced the BIL-level on 345 KV systems from as high as 1550 KV a few years ago to an accepted 900 KV today?

In insulators and hardware cost less than 5% of the cost of a transmission line. Perhaps you can purchase insulators for 15% less from Japanese sources. This is peanuts in comparison with the millions of dollars saved by the imaginative developments of the American manufacturers! But their survival depends on your orders for the insulators that represent the 5% of your transmission line cost.

Paying them more is the price for this continued partnership which has meant so much to you in the past and can mean so much more to you in the future. Yes, you must decide whether you want the capacity, the test facilities, and the assistance from porcelain manufacturers in the U.S. The porcelain insulator industry sold less than 70 million dollars of products to you in 1966. Not a very big industry, is it? In 1966, the Japanese sold 15 million dollars, including duty and freight, to American utilities. That represents the loss of 600 factory jobs in America's rather modest utility porcelain industry.

During the past two years there has been more outcry about the shortage of porcelain than about any other type of utility equipment. It must be important to you that American manufacturers have ample capacity. Several plants have added plant capacity. In the face of Japanese competition, are the American companies going to face the future with any confidence in expanding further?

They know they cannot meet the Japanese prices. The cards are stacked against them. The Japanese have put American manufacturers largely out of the transistor radio business and also out of ceramic wall tile. Ceramic tile represents one of the most flagrant dumping cases the U.S. Treasury has ever seen. I've been told. But here were two industries where the American public, the unorganized millions of buyers, decided that present price was all they were interested in. Is this all you are interested in? As a group of utilities you have the absolute power to maintain or eliminate the American utility porcelain industry. It's your decision and yours alone.

I would like to take one moment to comment on the relative efficiency of American manufacturers. I have never visited Japan but I have been through many of the heavy power equipment factories in Europe. I am sure some of you have visited them too. There is no question in my mind that our American companies have far greater productivity. This is due to the greater effort put out by American factory workers and the better tooling we have in our plants. Even with a lower wage rate in Europe, we have seen it would be possible for American power equipment manufacturers to compete in Western Europe if the trade doors were not locked against them.

And let's not forget the crucial problem of our Balance of Payments. What kind of strange economic logic causes the Johnson Administration to tax travelers taking that inexpensive, once in a lifetime foreign vacation, when our government power agencies are pouring hundreds of millions of dollars out of our country to buy foreign power equipment. The government is restricting American companies from investing in foreign countries, yet utilities can invest millions in power equipment from foreign sources.

So now we have a broad picture. We all basically believe that there should be fair international trade; and that means from the utility standpoint, you should be able to buy foreign products freely, without difficulty, if the price and/or quality seems advantageous.

On the other hand, if you do this, you are involving yourselves in a one-way, dead-end program which would appear to be against your own best interests, short-term, and most certainly, long-term. It will destroy the Basic Verities you say you need.

Many of you believe you are on the horns of a dilemma. I submit that for all the reasons mentioned, it is no dilemma at all. You need the American electrical equipment industry as much as it needs you. It is as much a part of the opportunity for your future profitable growth, as it has been in your past.

The suppliers of power, and the suppliers of equipment to produce and distribute that power have made tremendous contributions to the growth and progress of America. I urge you to evaluate carefully, without emotion, whether this great team should be destroyed, or whether still greater success can be achieved by continuing to work together.

Tribute to Robert S. McNamara

HON. LUCIEN N. NEDZI

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 13, 1968

Mr. NEDZI. Mr. Speaker, there have been lengthy, well-deserved newspaper reviews of the record of former Secretary of Defense Robert S. McNamara.

But brief, succinct newspaper comments on his departure are also sometimes worthy of our attention.

For this reason, I place in the RECORD, under unanimous consent, the following editorial from the March 1, 1968, issue of the New York Daily News:

END OF THE McNAMARA ERA

President Lyndon B. Johnson handed out double portions of praise on Wednesday as he said goodbye to the most durable Secretary of Defense in the office's history—Robert Strange McNamara.

Mac fairly earned the medal he received, if for no other reason than his ability to stand up under the crushing load he has carried for seven-plus years.

The Pentagon is a tighter and tauter ship for his administration, although it is no secret that some generals and admirals felt no misting of the eyes at his leaving.

We have felt pangs of anguish over some of his decisions—such as settling for "parity" in nuclear weapons with the Soviet Union.

But on the whole he has been a hard-working and faithful public servant. We wish him well.

An Open Letter

HON. DONALD E. LUKENS

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 13, 1968

Mr. LUKENS. Mr. Speaker, the American Legion Post 218 and the Veterans of Foreign Wars Post 3809 recently joined in a letter to the editor of the Middletown Journal of Middletown, Ohio, my hometown. Their communication was in response to an earlier letter opposing our efforts in Vietnam.

Because I believe this letter expresses the sense of the overwhelming majority of Americans and because it is one of the best replies I have ever seen to the often-posed question of why we are in Vietnam, I include it in the RECORD in the Extensions of Remarks:

AN OPEN LETTER

No war is right, nor has any war ever been right, and strangely enough, in many instances those who wait sometimes suffer more than those who go. Like yourself, there seems to be some area for soul-searching. Let us pose to you five questions, that are more pointed, and perhaps give the average citizen an answer as to why we are in Vietnam.

1. Would you rather fight a planned war in Vietnam or in United States?
2. Would you be willing to go back again if it might mean a choice of freedom or slavery for your wife and children?
3. Should America go back on its commitments and allow a complete Communist take-over?
4. Do you believe that when the Vietnam War is over that all wars will end if we capitulate to the Communists in Vietnam?
5. Do you believe that any Country other than the United States is capable of stopping aggression in the world?

If only some country had had the guts to say "no" to Hitler in 1939, you and I probably would not have been involved. Nobody did—we were involved. For our part we represented service in every area of the world and we didn't enjoy a damn minute of it. But even now I think none of us ques-

tion why we were there. Just as our generation shouldered its burden, this generation is shouldering its burden. If there is any doubt as to why we can't leave Vietnam, there are 16,000 mothers who will give you the answer.

AMERICAN LEGION POST 218.

VETERANS OF FOREIGN WARS POST 3809.

The Most Stupid War

HON. THEODORE R. KUPFERMAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 13, 1968

Mr. KUPFERMAN. Mr. Speaker, since I came to Congress in February 1966, I have tried to compile for my colleagues and the public the various reasoned opinions from most respectable sources detailing opposition to the war in Vietnam.

The latest is from the Wall Street Journal and there follows an editorial from their issue of February 23, 1968, together with my concurring letter to the editor in the issue of March 4, 1968:

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

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 falling 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 falling, it should be stressed, is not in U.S. will or valor, but 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 objective?

March 13, 1968

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 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.

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.

[From the Wall Street Journal, Mar. 4, 1968]

MOST STUPID WAR

WASHINGTON, D.C.

EDITOR, THE WALL STREET JOURNAL:

I was very much pleased with your editorial.

When I first became a candidate for Congress over two years ago I expressed my opposition to this war. I then stated that you "don't take a firm stand in quicksand." I have been attacked on all sides. My first opponent said that I "wanted to turn tail and run."

The peace groups opposed me because I objected to flagburners and because I voted for the appropriations to arm our troops as I could not allow them to be present in a war zone without necessary weapons.

I have been maligned by those who are so blinded by their opposition to communism that they can't see through to the fact that a war which bleeds us white and lets the blood of our soldiers run red in mounting casualties can only help the Communists.

This is the most stupid war in United States History. I look for respected voices like yours to continue to help make it evident.

THEODORE R. KUPFERMAN,
U.S. Congress, 17th District, New York.

How To Succeed by Trying

HON. JOHN P. SAYLOR

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 13, 1968

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, W. R. "Pete" Yingst is a popular figure in the Leechburg, Pa., area, but the story of his career should not be confined to any locality nor to any particular era in American history. For this reason I believe it is important that a brief résumé appear in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

In 1924 a young man named Yingst was hired to work in the cold-roll mill of the Old West Leechburg Steel Co. He thought, though, that the job was to be temporary, but from the start he gave his best effort as though he were a part of the business. In consequence he advanced through the years and after a great career has finally retired as manager of the West Leechburg Works of Allegheny Ludlum Steel Corp.

Mr. Yingst's success is a tribute to hard work, imagination, initiative, and sincerity of purpose. It holds a pattern that could benefit young men of today and tomorrow.

To honor Pete Yingst, Editor Joe Wray, of the Leechburg Advance, published a special edition containing testimonials from admirers who came to know the Allegheny Ludlum official so well during his 44 years of service with the company.

Mr. Wray commented:

His personal involvement in many local activities has been a credit to the community generally and to Mr. Yingst individually.

A fellow worker wrote:

Above all, he demanded honesty, forthrightness and hard work. Why? Because he knew no other way to be himself. He demanded consideration for the other man for the very same reason.

For all the time and energy Mr. Yingst invested in his job, he always found it possible to take part in community affairs. He is a member and an elder of the Appleby Manor Presbyterian Church, he is director and was the first president of Kiski Valley United Fund, and director and vice president of Pioneer Trails Council, Boy Scouts of America. He is a member of the Southwestern Pennsylvania Planning Commission and director of the First National Bank of Leechburg.

Having enjoyed Pete Yingst's friendship for a long time, I could elaborate at length on his many accomplishments. What is most important for the young generation to understand, however, is the attitude demonstrated from the time that the young man entered the rolling mill in 1924.

Mr. Yingst believed in himself and in America's economic system. He appreciated the opportunities it offered. Through the difficult depression years, he never lost faith. He served his God and his church, and he lent a hand in activities designed to make better citizens of youngsters.

His job at the mill has been turned over to younger hands, but Mr. Yingst will continue to contribute to the best interest of the community, the State, and

the Nation—a most fortunate situation for all of us.

In Pete's vigor and strength I know he will continue to give all that one life can give to his fellow man.

Reporters Closest to Romney Were Among Most Surprised

HON. PHILIP E. RUPPE

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 13, 1968

Mr. RUPPE. Mr. Speaker, last week one of America's most respected political columnists, David S. Broder, published what I believe to be a forthright analysis of Governor Romney's withdrawal as a presidential candidate.

By way of foreword, I will explain that it probes beyond the fact that Mr. Romney was trailing in New Hampshire polls and strikes at the heart of democracy. I wholeheartedly supported Governor Romney in his presidential bid. I believe the Governor to be a political realist, and one of the most able public administrators in the Nation today. He is a man of great zest and energy with strong opinions on future directions for the American Nation in a troubled time. I believe the Governor's analysis of conditions in America are correct, and his solutions realistic. All the evidence—his record as Governor of Michigan; his very withdrawal from the presidential race—indicates that Governor Romney makes his decisions on the basis of hard facts and honest opinion available to him. While George Romney may never be President of the United States, I felt and still believe he is uniquely qualified for that high office. In withdrawing from the presidential race Governor Romney undoubtedly preserved his options to the maximum extent and will yet have a major influence on future directions of the Republican Party and, hopefully, U.S. Government policy.

I am inserting Mr. Broder's column in the RECORD, however, not because it is friendly to George Romney; not even because it is about George Romney. This article is a startling commentary on the relationship between the press, all presidential candidates, and the public, and is central to the American system of government. Certainly opinion of the national press weighs heavily on public thinking. Further, each of us in public life is, to a greater or lesser degree, a molder of public opinion. Mr. Broder seems to have come to the realization that, in projecting George Romney, there was little realism in measuring his capacity to perform under the pressures of the Presidency.

I will go one step further in saying that in his case, shallow clichés about the man's personality and capabilities became current, popular, and very "camp." These clichés fed on themselves and were projected by segments of the press and opinionmakers in public life. Few made a serious effort to scratch beneath the cliché-ridden surface to search the man's ability, based on his background and performance as

Governor, to function as President of the United States. Perhaps Romney's abrupt termination of his quest for the most powerful office on earth did more than anything to shatter this image. His grace, style, and realistic approach reflects what we would all like to see in Presidential decisionmaking—and was certainly in contradiction to the image. I visited with George Romney in his hotel room immediately following his withdrawal. He was not resentful, he was not regretful, he did not place blame. He looked only to the future.

Now a viable presidential candidate of great talent and ability has been lost to the Nation. Perhaps, however, the lesson will not be lost on all of us. Implicit in Mr. Broder's column is a warning to his own profession. We in public life also hold a public trust—we also have an impact on National political opinion—and we also should carefully weigh Mr. Broder's words.

Sometimes we talk, write, and act as though we were type casting for the lead in a Broadway play when we concern ourselves with presidential politics. We seem to forget that the man inaugurated President in January 1969 will have the welfare and fate of men and nations in his hands. When it comes to images and clichés about the men seeking the Presidency, Mr. Broder writes:

Let the reader beware.

Let each of us in public life also beware. Our presidential candidates deserve more, and so does the Nation.

The column referred to follows:

[From the Washington (D.C.) Post, Mar. 5, 1968]

REPORTERS CLOSEST TO ROMNEY WERE AMONG MOST SURPRISED

(By David S. Broder)

The news stories describing George Romney's withdrawal from the Republican presidential race as a stunning surprise were accurate, as far as they went, but they told only half of it. The reporters who had covered Romney—myself included—thought it was quite literally the last thing in the world he would do. Even those of us who had been "Romney-watching" since his first campaign for Governor of Michigan in 1962 believed he would carry his pursuit of the presidency to the bitter end—and then perhaps have to be dragged protesting from the arena.

That epic misjudgment is worth pondering for it is distinctly relevant to a larger process and problem. As Martin Nolan of The Reporter magazine has pointed out, the press has tried and sometimes succeeded in preempting the right to decide who has or does not have the credentials to be considered for the Presidency. In the light of experience, it is fair to question how good the press's judgment is.

Romney's decision was made quite calmly and dispassionately. Those involved say he simply examined the evidence of the impending failure of the most important enterprise of his life and decided without histrionics to step aside and give his party the opportunity to find another leader.

Not only was the decision stunning in its cool reasonableness but so was Romney's manner of announcing it. Indeed, his entire behavior during what must have been, for a proud man, a traumatic 72 hours was exemplary. Several of his intimates were anxious to shift the blame for the failure to others, but there was no bitterness or re-creation or evasion of responsibility in Romney's own words. Just a breathtakingly

practical decision to face the facts and do what they required.

What was there in the portrait of Romney that emerged from six years of intensive press coverage that prepared the public for this kind of performance? Damned little. This Romney was certainly not "brain-washed," i.e., incapable of distinguishing appearance from reality or of reasoning from evidence to a conclusion. Those who thought that one word epitomized the man missed the mark by a mile.

So, too, did those of us who saw him as a revivalist whose messianic streak would keep him running for President long after the quest had proved futile.

Even those of us who knew there was another dimension to Romney—that he had performed in Michigan, as William Shannon wrote, not as a mystic but as a "shrewd, hardheaded, reasonably pragmatic politician"—did not believe that in the crunch his pragmatism would override his missionary zeal. But we were wrong.

This is not intended as an apology to Romney. His language too frequently obscured his real meaning, and he contributed to his own defeat. No one can reasonably argue that failure in pre-convention tests augurs well for success as a President.

But on a crucial matter the press also failed. Everyone knows that no President can avoid error. But if we have learned anything from the expensive lessons of the Bay of Pigs and Vietnam, it is that crucial measure of a President is whether he can admit error and change course. From the flood of words written about George Romney, voters ought to have discovered that he was a man who would not let his pride dictate to his prudence. I do not think they learned that.

Nor is this an isolated case. I know of few reporters involved in covering the 1964 campaign who would claim now that they painted an accurate portrait of Barry Goldwater and Lyndon Johnson.

The temptation is to say that reporters should content themselves to set down the candidates' words and make no effort to appraise the men who utter them. But that is no answer. The words can be—and often are—artificial. The reality is inside the men who seek the office; the press abandons its responsibility if it abandons its effort to probe those men and measure their likely capacity to perform the pressures of the presidency.

But if the press is to continue in this effort, all of us in it ought to be aware of our own limitations and be skeptical of our own judgments. Understanding another human being is about as fearsome a task as one can set for himself. The men who seek the presidency are rarely simple, ordinary souls, of the kind every reporter grew up with or knows from his neighborhood poker game.

Is there any reason—to be specific—to think that Richard Nixon or Lyndon Johnson are easier cases to diagnose than George Romney? What is there in the background of Nelson Rockefeller that would make any newsman supremely confident that he could predict how Rockefeller would function in the White House?

Men will continue to run for President and reporters will go right on covering their campaigns. *Caveat lector.* Let the reader beware.

Education of Our Children a Top Priority

HON. HOWARD W. POLLOCK

OF ALASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 13, 1968

Mr. POLLOCK. Mr. Speaker, yesterday the other body passed H.R. 15399, the

urgent supplemental appropriations bill for fiscal 1968. The measure contains an additional \$91 million to fully fund Public Law 874 which provides assistance to schools in federally affected areas.

Since the cuts in this program were announced by the Office of Education the effect on school systems across the Nation has been tremendous. There is no State and few schools that have not suffered. The impact has, of course, been uneven. Areas with little Federal impact are not hurt while those which bear a heavy responsibility for educating the children of Federal employees have lost much. My own State has a high proportion of Federal employees in its work force. This, the \$2.4 million cut in Public Law 874 funds, is the 10th largest despite the fact that Alaska ranks 50th in school population.

The congressional support for this program is very strong. The Government must meet its obligations to the school districts under Public Law 874. I hope that the House conferees will accept the full amount voted by the other body. I have no doubt that the full House will then overwhelmingly accept this amendment. Such a move will be a clear declaration that the Congress feels that the education of our children must be accorded top priority.

Mrs. Frank Bodine, "Mother of the Year"—A Deserved Honor for a Great Woman

HON. THOMAS S. KLEPPE

OF NORTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 13, 1968

Mr. KLEPPE. Mr. Speaker, when Mrs. Frank Bodine of Velva, N. Dak., was selected as North Dakota's "Mother of the Year" it was front page news—in fact, the top story of the day—in the Minot Daily News of March 11, 1968, and well it should have been.

Her story is an inspiration for every American family. She and Mr. Bodine are a retired farm couple now living at Velva, N. Dak. They have 18 children, all of whom have made their own distinguished marks in such varied fields as education, business, medicine, law, religion, military, journalism, athletics, and homemaking. All 10 of the Bodine sons hold college degrees. Six of the eight daughters attended college.

This impressive record led Dr. C. P. Lura, former president of Minot State College, to observe at the 1965 commencement that—

Had this been done by the wealthiest family in the country, it would have been wonderful. Having been done in a family of modest farm folks, it is no less than spectacular.

This is truly a great American story. It shows what can be done in this country, if the will is there. The Bodines obviously have the will.

Mr. Speaker, I bring to the attention of the House the complete article from the Minot Daily News:

There are 18 primary reasons, plus 86 others, why judges in the North Dakota "Mother of the Year" contest awarded the title to Mrs. Frank Bodine of Velva.

Their names range from Audrey to William and among them are 10 sons and eight daughters—the 18 Bodine children who grew up on the family farm near Voltaire, attended colleges from California to Harvard, but mostly at Minot and went on to be successful in their chosen fields or as housewives.

It was accomplished, as one daughter explained some years back because "the folks set a standard of conduct we were expected to live up to. Their good example and the respect shown them by others made an impression on us. We had pride in our family and name."

Mrs. Bodine's selection as "Mother of the Year" was announced by a special committee in Bismarck over the weekend.

The committee noted that the Velva couple not only have 18 children, but are grandparents to 78 others and great-grandparents to 8 youngsters. They make it 104 living reasons for the choice of Mrs. Bodine.

Born in Poland in 1898, Mrs. Bodine came to the United States in 1913 with her parents and 10 brothers and sisters. They landed at Montreal, then went to Anamoose.

Three years later, she met Frank Bodine when she became the "hired girl" at his family's farm and a few months later they were married. They continued to actively operate the farm near Voltaire until recently retiring and moving to Velva.

At Minot State College the name Bodine has been almost legend. For 26 years and 19 summer sessions, at least one member of the family was in attendance. Thirteen of the sons and daughters attended the institution with the last receiving his degree in 1965, an occasion that prompted the state Board of Education to pay special tribute to the parents.

Both the husband and wife were on the platform as special guests at the commencement and were presented a plaque from the state board "for their interest in higher education."

Though both Mr. and Mrs. Bodine received only eighth-grade educations, they made it a goal in life to see that their children did better.

Their father explained that when reminiscing on the subject.

"People tried to tell me that no one could educate that many children . . . that I'd have to keep one of the boys home to help me. They were absolutely wrong."

All 10 of the Bodine sons received college degrees and six of the eight girls attended colleges. It prompted Dr. C. P. Lura, former president of Minot State College, to observe at the 1965 commencement that "had this been done by the wealthiest family in the country, it would have been wonderful. Having been done in a family of modest farm folk, it is no less than spectacular."

Daughters of the Velva couple include:

Mrs. Emanuel (Luella) Fix, teacher-housewife at Harvey; Mrs. Phil (Viola) Prescott, head nurse at a Poplar, Mont. health center; Mrs. Wesley (Jenette) Warlick, a nurse in Minneapolis; Mrs. Robert (Delores) Bernards, St. Paul housewife; Mrs. Gerald (Loretta) Effertz, Velva housewife; Mrs. Floyd (Monica) Goetze, Portland, Ore. housewife; Mrs. Thomas (Audrey) McLaughlin, Palo Alto, Calif. housewife and Sister M. (Patricia) Bernadette, a sub-prioress of the Benedictine Sacred Heart Priory at Rich-ardton.

The 10 sons include:

Francis, retired Air Force colonel living in Minneapolis; Paul, business manager for KXMC-TV in Minot; Charles, a teacher in Anaheim, Calif.; John, a technical editor in Minneapolis; Mark, Santa Barbara, Calif. lawyer; Robert, coach and principal at Sawyer and Frank at Voltaire; Ron, football

coach at Minot's Ryan High; Gerald, a Carson teacher; Dale, a Navy officer currently in South Vietnam and William, football coach at New Town.

Mr. and Mrs. Bodine are members of St. Cecilia Catholic church in Velva. Her name was submitted in the contest by the Velva Woman's Club.

Judges were Mrs. Earl Bucklin, Mandan; Mrs. Lionel Opgande, Dickinson; Rev. Harold Case, Bismarck; R. M. Leslie, Mandan and A. R. Bergesen, Fargo.

Other contestants included Mrs. John Bell, Ellendale; Mrs. Arthur Berg, Bisbee; Mrs. Henry Croteau, Belcourt; Mrs. Marie Hande, Rhame; Mrs. Harold Hegreberg, Grand Forks; Mrs. Lillian Engbrecht, Beulah; Mrs. John W. Lynch, Williston; Mrs. Archibald Meler, New Salem; Mrs. Carl Meyer, Flasher; Mrs. Grace Nelson, Almont; Mrs. Emil Banum, New Town; Mrs. E. Leland Rude, Devils Lake and Mrs. Stella K. Staven, Park River.

Mrs. Bodine and the other nominees are to be honored April 20 at the Bismarck Country Club. She will compete in the American Mother of the Year contest next May in New York City.

Great Difficulty in Wyoming

HON. WILLIAM HENRY HARRISON

OF WYOMING

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 13, 1968

Mr. HARRISON. Mr. Speaker, in the aftermath of the New Hampshire primary, reports in the press of a survey of voter sentiment in Wyoming by a pollster with an excellent history of accuracy are particularly illuminating.

The pollster is KTWO radio-television in Casper, Wyo., which in the past several years has been sending out inquiries via postcard to a carefully selected group of Wyomingites who are called on to comment on political issues and personalities.

In a poll of this sort a return of 12 to 14 percent is considered good. In his latest poll, KTWO general manager, Jack Rosenthal, reported a return of 27 percent on the 900 cards sent out.

Mr. Rosenthal asked the straightforward question:

Is the Johnson administration doing a good job of managing the Nation's affairs?

To which 74.5 percent of the people of Wyoming, which in 1964 gave its electoral votes to Lyndon Johnson, replied "No."

No less revealing is the fact that 52 percent considered the Vietnam war the greatest issue; and only 13.9 percent felt that the President could carry the State of Wyoming in the November election.

As further evidence of the traditional good judgment of the people of Wyoming it should be noted that 61.6 percent did feel the President would be a stronger candidate than the young pretender, Senator KENNEDY, of the "Commonwealth" of New York.

Mr. Speaker, I include an Associated Press dispatch discussing the KTWO poll with my remarks, as follows:

L. B. J. LOSES GROUND IN WYOMING POLL

CASPER, March 8.—A recent poll taken by KTWO radio-television of Casper has indicated the Johnson Administration is in political trouble in Wyoming.

The station sent 910 post cards to persons selected at random in Sheridan, Natrona, Carbon, Johnson and Sublette counties the week of March 2. A total of 251 persons, or 27 percent, responded.

In answer to the question: "Is the Johnson Administration doing a good job of managing the nation's affairs?" 75.4 percent answered "no."

Only 13.9 percent of the persons returning cards felt the President could carry the state of Wyoming in the general election in November, although 61.6 percent felt he would be a stronger candidate than Sen. Robert F. Kennedy.

Almost 40 percent of the people who approved of the performance of the Administration felt the President could carry Wyoming.

The station also asked the people to select one of four issues they felt would be the most vulnerable point for the Administration.

Fifty-two percent considered the Vietnam War the greatest issue; 20 percent considered crime in the streets the most vulnerable issue; 15 percent selected the war on poverty and 12 percent selected the possible income tax surcharge.

Congress Should Act Promptly on Monday Holiday Bill

HON. ROBERT MCCLORY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 13, 1968

Mr. MCCLORY. Mr. Speaker, a significant editorial was presented recently on WBBM-TV by my friend, Carter Davidson, editorial director of that Chicago station.

Carter Davidson notes the interest on the part of the Illinois State Legislature in enacting Monday holiday legislation and suggests the need for the Congress to act promptly to set a pattern for our States to follow.

Uniform Monday holidays can fulfill the aims of their sponsors only if there is a large measure of uniformity in the Nation. The importance of the Monday holiday bill and the need for early action by the Congress is emphasized in Mr. Davidson's timely editorial, which follows:

The real meaning of our national holidays is their purpose—not the dates set aside to observe them.

Observing most of our nonreligious holidays uniformly on Mondays would benefit you and our nation.

The main benefit to you from these 3-day-weekends would be more rest and relaxation—which midweek holidays don't always provide.

Industry would also gain from these long weekends. Costly stop-start interruptions in factories would be eliminated, and absenteeism, often a result of midweek holidays, would be reduced.

The U.S. Chamber of Commerce estimates that sales in everything from sporting goods to air travel would be substantially stimulated because of increased leisure time.

Some oppose changing the dates of our national holidays. The Daughters of the American Revolution resist—asserting that any changes would downgrade our national heroes.

The dates which the DAR so militantly protect are not, in fact, as traditional as they might believe.

The date for Thanksgiving, for example,

has been changed some 6 times in our country's history.

And, Washington's Birthday, originally celebrated on February 11 came to be celebrated on February 22 when the Gregorian Calendar was introduced in the colonies.

Other critics argue 3-day-weekends would increase traffic accidents. The National Safety Council says one-day-holidays are deadlier in terms of highway accidents than are long weekends.

Proposals to establish uniform Monday holidays are now being considered in Washington and several state capitals.

Logically, uniform Monday holidays should be established nationwide by the federal government.

If the federal government does not take action, we hope Illinois will do so on its own.

The Big Get Fatter

HON. CHARLES E. CHAMBERLAIN

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 13, 1968

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Mr. Speaker, in the President's recent message to Congress entitled "Prosperity and Progress for the Farmer and Rural America" it is suggested with great clarity the administration farm programs are the sole and direct cause of all plus factors in the farm economy while being in no way responsible for any and all negative factors, and further that these negative factors can be quickly eliminated merely by the adoption of similar programs.

After 7 years of such promises and in view of the fact that 1967 saw farm income dropped to 74 percent of parity, I question whether this view is shared by many of our farmers. I read, for example, with great interest an editorial appearing in the March 6, 1968, issue of the Ingham County News of Mason, Mich., which gave a decidedly different explanation of some of the important problems facing the American farmer. In view of the recent minority proposal to limit subsidy payments to \$10,000 per farmer I took particular note of the editorial's concern and judgment that—

Such subsidy programs not only make city dwellers suspicious of the farm program but they surely confuse the small farmer and they aren't doing him a bit of good. In fact these subsidy programs which fatten the fat actually hasten the demise of the family farm.

Continuation of such programs which aid the big boys does nothing but speed up the number of small farm owners into going out of business, selling to the big operations and moving to the city and attempting to make a living in an environment for which he is not equipped and which he does not understand.

I commend to the attention of my colleagues the entire editorial, which I insert at this point in the RECORD:

THE BIG GET FATTER

There is no doubt that the American farmer is in trouble. Being in trouble is not unique to the American these days and, through history, is not unique on the farming scene.

Farming, as it has been known, is practically dead. The family farm is becoming as

extinct as the pot bellied stove in the general store.

Each year fewer Americans make their living on farms. With every animal and equipment dispersal auction the family farm becomes more myth and less reality. Now it is more than the small family farm which is leaving the scene in ever-increasing numbers. The Big Business farms are doing the same.

One Ingham ex-farmer who operated one of the biggest dairy operations in the county is now selling real estate. In explaining his move last week he pointed out that right now the cost squeeze plus lack of labor was the main reason for leaving behind a big dairy operation. Five years from now when the full impact of synthetic dairy products is added to the cost-labor problem he didn't figure dairy farmers would be able to survive.

It is the same all through the farm industry. The picture is not bright. The agriculture-saving answers are not easy. Some farmers think the answer is collective bargaining. This is the approach to the problem being taken by the NFO. The less militant Farm Bureau has pushed co-operatives.

The federal government has been even more confused. Lacking clear direction the farm program has ridden off in all directions—and all at once.

New agricultural problems produced new programs which produced new problems which produced new programs and on and on this circle has run.

As is usually the trouble with bureaucracy, there is a great reluctance to dump old programs which do not work while piling on new programs.

Most of the federal effort in the farming picture has had one common result—Big farming operations reap the harvest and the small family farm operation continues to take it on the chin.

The farm subsidy bonanza has gone to the big.

Government figures for 1966 show that 9 "poverty farmers" received subsidies totaling over one million dollars each; 18 received more than half a million dollars each; 267 farmers received at least \$100,000 each; and 966 tapped the subsidy till for more than \$50,000 each.

Such subsidy programs not only make city dwellers suspicious of the farm program but they surely confuse the small farmer and they aren't doing him a bit of good. In fact these subsidy programs which fatten the fat actually hasten the demise of the family farm.

Continuation of such programs which aid the big boys does nothing but speed up the number of small farm owners into going out of business, selling to the big operations and moving to the city and attempting to make a living in an environment for which he is not equipped and which he does not understand.

Dollar Sickness: Causes and Cures

HON. GEORGE A. GOODLING

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 13, 1968

Mr. GOODLING. Mr. Speaker, inflation is a term often used and seldom understood, because it involves some subtle refinements of economics.

One of the best and clearest articles I have read explaining the nature, cause, and cure of inflation appeared in the January-February 1968 issue of the Chess Board. Because this article brings the light of understanding to inflation, I

insert it in the RECORD and recommend it to the attention of all those who would like to gain an insight into inflation, its causes, and cures:

DOLLAR SICKNESS: CAUSES AND CURES

If a learned medical man were to write of the sickness of our present U.S. dollar, the title above would probably be the way it would be expressed.

The dollar is now in a state of paradox; the unhappy state of being inflated to the largest size in history and, at the same time, the smallest in power to purchase in history.

How did the dollar in your wallet, handbag or pocket get into such a sad condition? Perhaps a few facts and figures will help depress us all a little further.

A dollar, for example, earned in 1940 would have bought twice as much then as now. This is no surprise to anyone except, possibly, those who are so fortunate as to be under 21 now. An education costing \$4,000 then would cost at least \$8,000 now; the same with a house, an automobile; and the same with, say, an insurance policy.

Prices have risen steadily since 1940 with value of the dollar correspondingly down so that by early 1962, the dollar then bought what 60 cents would buy in 1940. These are not guesses; these figures are based on U.S. Department of Labor, Bureau of Statistics, figures.

Everyone is adversely affected by this insidious inflation of price and loss of value of purchasing power of the dollar; producers, consumers, savers, creditors, retirees, and taxpayers; whether or not these are corporate or organizational beings or individuals such as any of us.

There are those who claim that all this can be taken care of by merely demanding more and more pay for everyone to keep up with the inflation. The fact that this happens to be one of the prime causes of the very inflation they are trying to overcome seems to be neatly overlooked. Yet most people are now aware of the truth of this simple economic fact. Happily, the late President Kennedy clarified the point about prices and earnings (salaries and wages) being both interconnected and to be subjected to restraint as far as increases were concerned. President Johnson has redeclared the same guidelines.

Between 1952 and 1962, alone, productivity increased 33.3% while the salaries and wages of employees increased 59.1%. So what? This resulted in higher prices, which resulted in more demands for higher salaries and wages, to cover the higher prices, which then resulted in higher prices to cover the higher costs, etc.—a vicious circle.

If anyone any longer cares, the experts all agree that something can be done to curb inflation and, at the same time, not prevent a progressively higher standard of living. Firstly, the U.S. Government should reduce expenses and lower the debt; tighten up the supply of bank credit via the Federal Reserve Banks. Secondly, industry can increase productivity as much as possible; can resist wage increases in excess of those justified by increased productivity; avoid price increases not justified by costs. Thirdly, you as an individual should live within your means as it is the demand for goods that tends to make prices higher; help produce more goods, as everything added to the total supply of goods, helps to keep prices down; save more money; oppose unearned wage increases—that is to say, those increases not based on more productivity, despite the reckless demands and boasts of those who must oppose these ideas in order to justify themselves; and urge congress to reduce the national debt.

We are all Americans; all free with loads of rights we don't bother to exercise; we all

have minds of our own sometimes, so let's see how some independent thinking will work on this rather dreary and tiresome subject which, like the unpleasant pill from the doctor, must sooner or later be swallowed before there is a cure!

Breakfast Costs Only a Nickel

HON. M. G. (GENE) SNYDER

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 13, 1968

Mr. SNYDER. Mr. Speaker, for the attention of Members, I am submitting a page 1 article from the Jefferson Reporter, a weekly newspaper in Jefferson County, Ky., regarding the "Federal Breakfast Subsidy." I might add, Mr. Speaker, that Fern Creek, Ky., in the Fourth District, is not floundering in poverty—not by a long shot.

We all want to help those who need financial assistance—especially for the essentials of life—but to promiscuously pass out tax dollars where there is virtually no need is—as a student said—"silly."

The article follows:

AT FERN CREEK HIGH: BREAKFAST COSTS ONLY A NICKEL

A federal program is providing breakfast practically free for Fern Creek High School students and, though most of the students welcome or are indifferent to the program, some are opposed to it.

The breakfast, which was served for the first time last Friday, costs a nickel per student, 20 cents per teacher.

W. K. Niman, principal at Fern Creek, said having the breakfast program does not indicate that the federal government considers Fern Creek students impoverished. Niman emphasized that the program is similar to the federal lunch program and is not limited to poor areas.

According to one student, some of the students feel the federal government is "getting too concerned with the school."

Some students feel the program hints of "socialism," others feel it is "silly," the students said.

Niman said applying for the program was his decision, and that he conferred with "the staff and the lunchroom people" before applying. He applied for the breakfast through the same Frankfort agency that handles federal lunch programs, he said.

SCHOOL WON'T PROFIT

Niman said some students are "leery of (the school) making money" from the breakfast. Niman pointed out that the school may lose money, but in no event will it make money.

A "number of students coming to school without breakfast" is the reason he initiated the program, Niman stated. He said students often skip breakfast because they "just don't have time," not because their families are poor.

The breakfast consists of whole milk, fruit or juice, and toast as the basis. A combination of eggs, bacon, rolls or sausage may be added.

REQUIRES EXTRA WORK

Niman said the program has been available to schools for some time. It requires "extra work" on the part of the school, and Niman thinks that is why other schools have not participated in the program.

"Some schools don't want to go to the trouble," he said.

According to the program, the federal government reimburses part of the cost of the breakfast, and the school tries to make up the rest of the cost by charging each student a nickel.

Niman said the school has had to hire extra people to work in the lunchroom during breakfast.

ON FIRST DAY, 210

Breakfast is served each morning from 7:30 until 8 a.m. Niman said a "goodly portion" of the students arrive before 8. Of more than 2300 students at Fern Creek, 210 took advantage of the breakfast on its first day. The following Monday there were 235 students who ate breakfast at school.

Senator Richard Russell Honored by VFW

REMARKS

OF

HON. OLIN E. TEAGUE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 13, 1968

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, last night, it was my great privilege to be present at the Congressional Awards Banquet sponsored by the Veterans of Foreign Wars. The highlight of the evening was the presentation of the Fifth Annual Congressional Award by the VFW to my good friend, Senator RICHARD B. RUSSELL of Georgia.

I am confident that you are aware of the great admiration I hold for Senator RUSSELL, for in the many years he has served as the chairman of the Senate Armed Forces Committee, I feel that he has contributed more to the national defense of this Nation than possibly any other man. The Senator's unquestioned dedication has made him truly worthy of the outstanding honor awarded him by the VFW. He is truly deserving of the plaudits that accompany this presentation.

His acceptance speech clearly defines his attitudes which have done so much for this Nation. I would like to insert his speech into the RECORD:

REMARKS OF SENATOR RICHARD B. RUSSELL, OF GEORGIA, ON RECEIVING THE FIFTH ANNUAL CONGRESSIONAL AWARD OF THE VETERANS OF FOREIGN WARS AT THE SHERATON-PARK HOTEL, WASHINGTON, D.C., MARCH 12, 1968

Commander-in-Chief Scerra; my distinguished colleagues of both Houses of the United States Congress; representatives of the Executive Branch; members of the Veterans of Foreign Wars; and guests.

It is indeed a high privilege to be with you this evening. I am especially honored to be the recipient of this coveted award. To have my name listed among the outstanding and distinguished Members of Congress who have been selected by the VFW for this honor brings a feeling of deep humility.

The character and purposes of your organization give this award special meaning to me. And I accept it in the knowledge that you recognize—as do I—that the truly outstanding public servants of 1968 are the brave young men who have responded to their country's call to arms as you did in by-gone days.

These young Americans have laid their lives on the line and regretfully, the English

language has not provided us with adequate words to render to these men the tribute of which they are deserving.

Those of you who make-up this great organization have known first-hand the harsh realities of war.

Because of your own experiences in other times and other places, your understanding for the circumstances confronting the brave young men who fight under the American flag this very hour is deep and abiding.

Of all the important issues of our day, the grave and tragic situation in Vietnam is foremost in the minds of the American people and most assuredly, foremost in the thoughts of this audience tonight.

In 1954, when it was first proposed that we send a small military contingency to Vietnam, I vigorously opposed the idea. The communists are probing all over the world and there are few places on earth where it would be more costly to support a United States military commitment than in Vietnam. In addition, it has always been my conviction that any military confrontation of communist aggression should be resolute and determined and involve the entire strength of our great land.

However, the time is now past to discuss the wisdom of our entrance in Vietnam. There is no place for hindsight under the present circumstances. We must deal with the situation as it exists at this moment.

Tonight we are confronted with a condition where over 500,000 of the finest of American manhood are in a distant corner of the world fighting aggression under the American flag.

We must now determine what must be done in order for these young men to return home under honorable circumstances in the shortest practical time at the lowest cost in U.S. and allied lives. I might add, parenthetically, that I, for one, am not afraid of the old-fashioned term, victory.

We have already paid the price of over nineteen thousand American lives, the value of which is incalculable, not to mention the cost in terms of national wealth, to convince the Communists that we will observe our every commitment to aid those who are really willing to fight against Communist aggression.

If we abandon that principle, we would abandon in the jungles and the rice paddies of Vietnam the heritage of greatness, freedom, and courage that has marked this country since its birth.

We have just experienced the bloodiest month in the course of this war during which we lost over 2,000 American lives. The Vietnam war has been depleting our financial resources at the rate of almost \$2½ billion per month and we have pitifully little to show for the price we have paid.

I have devoted most of my years in public service in trying to insure that we are militarily the most powerful nation in the world and I have had no more steadfast ally in this effort than the Veterans of Foreign Wars.

I, therefore, feel confident that you feel as I do that there are clear alternatives to remaining indefinitely submerged in a strategy of self-imposed restrictions with the rising casualties and the unending need for additional troops which accompany this strategy.

As for me, my fellow Americans, I shall never knowingly support a policy of sending even a single American boy overseas to risk his life in combat unless the entire civilian population and wealth of our country—all that we have and all that we are—is to bear a commensurate responsibility in giving him the fullest support and protection of which we are capable.

Under the basic policy on which our society rests, each American is, in his place and in his way, equally obligated to contribute to the defense of this nation. It is inconsis-

ent with our history, traditions and fundamental principles to commit American boys on far flung battlefields if we are to follow policies that deny him full support because we are afraid of increasing the risk of those who stay at home.

It is a confession of moral weakness on the part of this country not to take any steps that are necessary to diminish the fighting power of our enemies in Vietnam.

For three years, many of us, including many military leaders, have urged that we utilize our air and sea power to the fullest extent to prevent the flow of weapons and war material into the hands of our enemies to be used in the destruction of our youth.

If we are not willing to take this calculated risk, we should not still be increasing the half million men in Vietnam who are exposed to danger daily from weapons that might have been kept from the hands of our enemies.

We hear a great deal about limited wars, but I would point out that there is no such thing as a limit on the actual combat in which our men are engaged. While it is a sound policy to have limited objectives, we should not expose our men to unnecessary hazards to life and limb in pursuing them.

I shall continue to insist upon the employment of our air and sea power to stop the constantly increasing flow of weapons and equipment into North Vietnam. If we continue to fight this war according to the rules that are now dictated by our enemies, no end is foreseeable. It is, however, easy to foresee the constant loss of life and wealth and the sorrow visited upon many thousand more American homes.

Most of the steps that we have taken to bring this war to a conclusion have been some two or three years late. Time will no longer stand still for us, and we should move with dispatch to apply the military power available to us to convince Ho Chi Minh of the wisdom of desisting from his aggression and seeking a civilized solution.

Again, let me express to you my heartfelt appreciation for the honor you have bestowed upon me.

Thank you—Thank you from the bottom of my heart.

Protection for Postal Employees

HON. J. J. PICKLE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 13, 1968

Mr. PICKLE. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing a bill to cover a surprising gap in the Federal criminal statutes.

Federal law does not presently protect a postal employee from assaults or murder while engaged in or on account of the performance of his official duties.

On the other hand, local police and prosecutors are sometimes reluctant to investigate or prosecute assault cases when the incident concerns a Federal worker—such as a postal employee—and particularly when the mishap takes place on federally controlled property.

Existing Federal laws protect the safety of Government property from malicious mischief—18 United States Code 1361—it should also have equal concern for the physical safety of postal employees.

Our postal employees have a right to and deserve this assurance that any harassment of them in the performance of their official duties will be dealt with in a

manner fitting the seriousness of the incidence.

I think most Americans would feel a little guilty about the relative safety at their places of work if they knew that these public servants were not accorded this same right.

Judging solely from the upswing in the number of assaults on postal workers, this bill is justified. By the end of the first 6 months of fiscal 1967, the number of these assaults exceeded the total number for all of fiscal 1966. The records of these assaults by fiscal years are as follows:

Year:	Number
1964-----	35
1965-----	32
1966-----	60
1967 (first half)-----	72

The bill I am introducing today also embodies a provision to assure that the Postmaster General will have the power to exert disciplinary action against employees who assault other employees, and this is a provision which the postal unions have long supported.

To extend the protection of Federal law to all postal workers, the bill amends section 1114 of title 18, United States Code, so as to create a Federal crime for killing "any postal inspector, any postmaster, officer, or employee in the field service of the Post Office Department." At the same time, the persons protected by section 1114, title 18, are protected from assaults by section 111 of the same title.

The penalties for assaults are a fine of not more than \$5,000 or imprisonment for not more than 3 years, or both; or in the case of assault with a deadly weapon, fine of not more than \$10,000 or imprisonment for not more than 10 years, or both.

The penalties for killing range from death for murder in the first degree to \$1,000 or 3 years, or both, for involuntary manslaughter.

In light of the overall increase of crime throughout the country, I believe we need every reasonable protection. The bill I am introducing will give the U.S. attorney the tools he needs to cope with these problems. I hope it will receive quick and favorable consideration.

Junk the Junk Mail

HON. CHARLES H. WILSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 13, 1968

Mr. CHARLES H. WILSON. Mr. Speaker, during discussion of the postal rate bill, passed last year, there was considerable debate over the pros and cons of third-class mail in which continual reference was made to the term which critics of this type of mail have designated as "junk mail."

In the February 1 issue of Hardware Age, Mr. William A. Barbour, editor and publisher of this fine trade journal, wrote a very perceptive and worthwhile

editorial about junk mail which should be of interest to all Members of the House of Representatives. In this editorial he emphasizes the value of third-class mail provided it is intelligently and professionally presented to the public. I therefore insert this editorial by Mr. Barbour in the RECORD at this time:

JUNK THE JUNK MAIL

Direct mail advertising never was cheap. Now it's getting more expensive—much more expensive. Printing, list maintenance, addressing, labeling, and other mechanical costs go up each year. And the experts promise us that the new rates will cost most businessmen 20 to 25% more in postage bills this year, and even more next year.

In addition to the costs, there are increasing questions about the effectiveness of direct mail as a promotion vehicle. Junk mail, an unfortunate term in itself, has become the accepted label for third-class mail carrying an advertising message and bearing an "occupant" address.

Well, much of it is junk mail, and for the direct mail user it can be pretty expensive junk. But it doesn't have to be junk; and although there is no way you can do a good mail campaign inexpensively, chances are you can do a better job than you're now doing, for less money.

First you have to sell yourself on the value of direct mail; then you have to plan a program based on impact, cost savings, and continuity. The phrase "have to" is used here advisedly; there is hardly a good retailer in business today who doesn't feel he needs some kind of direct mail program.

Selling yourself on the value of direct mail is easy. Much of the medium's bad reputation is deserved; but the bad reputation comes through misuse rather than through use. Also, much of the bad reputation is undeserved.

A. C. Nielsen Co. did a survey several years back on the public reaction to so called junk mail. People will tell you that their mail boxes are flooded with the stuff. But the study showed that the average household receives less than one piece of advertising mail a day. Others will tell you that getting the mail into an occupant's letter box doesn't mean a thing; nobody reads the stuff. Nielsen proved that 75 to 81% of the recipients read all advertising mail they get.

The study went on to prove that more than half of the recipients occasionally purchase products or services offered through the mail.

So direct mail can be a powerful sales medium; but it must be used properly to be effective. You need a good mailing list; you need a budget; you need a program with an established frequency; you need a product or service campaign to fit your region, customer mix, and facilities; and you need professional (although not necessarily expensive) copy and art. All of these things are easy to come by.

Obviously direct mail should not be your only form of advertising; maybe it won't even be your most important. But it doesn't have to be junk either.

Jerry D. Worthy

HON. THOMAS M. REES

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 13, 1968

Mr. REES. Mr. Speaker, last Sunday, Jerry D. Worthy, the Director of the Federal Savings and Loan Insurance Corporation, died of a heart attack at the early age of 39.

As a member of the House Committee on Banking and Currency, I had the honor of working with Jerry Worthy on legislation affecting the savings and loan industry—not only was he an able counselor, but he was a close friend.

Mr. Worthy was born in Fyffe, Ala., on June 11, 1928. He was a graduate of the University of Alabama and the School of Banking of the South at Louisiana State University. He was a member of the State bar of Alabama and the bar of the Supreme Court of the United States. He was president of student government at the University of Alabama during 1950-51; was named "man of the year" by Civitan in 1961, and "young man of the year" by the Jaycees in 1962. Mr. Worthy also served with distinction in the U.S. Army.

From 1952 to 1956 he was engaged in the general practice of law in Sylacauga, Ala., and from 1957 to 1962, he was vice president and director of the City National Bank of Sylacauga. In 1962, Jerry Worthy entered public service as the Deputy Regional Director of the Small Business Administration for its southeastern region. In 1964, he moved to Washington, D.C., to serve as Assistant Deputy Administrator for Financial Assistance of the Small Business Administration. In 1965, he became Director of the Federal Savings and Loan Insurance Corporation of the Federal Home Loan Bank Board. He served in that capacity until his untimely passing.

Mr. Worthy was an outstanding public servant, possessing capacity to cope effectively with most complex, and often emotionally charged, problems. He steered the Insurance Corporation through its most difficult period in modern history, and he did it with remarkable calmness and gentleness. He performed services of lasting significance for my own State, California.

He is survived by his wife, Mary, and three children: Bill, 15; Mary Jo, 13; and Martha, 10.

Mr. Speaker, I am sure the entire House joins me in expressing profound sorrow over this great loss to his family and to our Government. Though his passing is tragic, there was nothing tragic about Jerry Worthy's life. He passed through it with grace, with brilliance, and with an abiding regard for his fellow man. Of this man it can truly be said that he gave the most priceless gift, a portion of himself.

Untouchables Unnerved

HON. JOHN R. RARICK

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 13, 1968

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, the spotlight continues to focus on a seemingly unending parade of "untouchables" in appointed positions in our Government.

Thanks to Frank Capell and his Herald of Freedom, Box 3, Zarephath, N.J., concerned mothers and dads are using his documentations and finding their own answers to what happened to our lost peace and who is responsible.

And as the "untouchables" wiggle while their friends try to cover up and dodge the clear-cut issues, the greater the illuminating impact of the people.

While the Communist enemy is throwing bullets at their sons, mothers and dads are not frightened away by barbed words nor their inquisitive attitudes pacified by big name assurances.

I include "Untouchables—Part IX," from the Herald of Freedom in the RECORD:

THE UNTOUCHABLES—PART IX

The foreign policy of the United States for a number of years has been conducted on a basis which has resulted in the continuing growth of the admitted enemy of the "Free World," the International Communist Conspiracy. We have carried on trade with Communist countries and even given them "Favored Nation" status. This has been done in spite of their determined goal of world conquest through subversion and aggression. Billions of dollars of foreign aid have gone to countries which are unfriendly to the United States, and Americans no longer are protected properly overseas. Not even U.S. servicemen operating under direct government orders can feel that their government stands behind them as was made clear in the "Incidents" of the U.S.S. Liberty and the U.S.S. Pueblo.

Working behind the scenes and unknown to most Americans is a large group of security risks who indicate by their past and present actions a divided loyalty. They never take any action unfavorable to the Soviet Union and, while openly claiming to oppose Communism, they actually aid the Communist Conspiracy which could never survive except for the help it gets from its agents and friends in the United States. These security risks work closely together and have been operating thus for a long period of time. They are "The Untouchables" and all efforts to remove them seem to fail.

In the Department of State there is a group which has the official title, "The Policy Planning Council." The U.S. Government Organization Manual, in describing this group, states: "The Policy Planning Council advises and assists the Secretary (of State) and other senior officials in evaluating current foreign policy, in the formulation of long-range policies, and in the coordination of planning activities within the Department and with other interested departments and agencies."

Chairman of the Policy Planning Council is Henry David Owen, a 47-year-old Harvard graduate whose first job was as an economist with the New Deal, Office of Price Administration (OPA). He came into the State Department in 1946 and for a number of years worked in the Intelligence and Research Department. This department has harbored the largest percentage of security risks and pro-Soviet individuals in the whole State Department, including large numbers of left-wingers who were transferred over from the O.S.S.

The Executive Secretary of the Policy Planning Council, and one of its key figures, is Robert Nathaniel Magill. Magill was born in Kirin, Manchuria, Oct. 6, 1916, of parents who were U.S. citizens. His father was Orrin Rankin Magill and his mother, the former Ellen Bell. Magill graduated from the University of North Carolina with an A.B. degree in 1938 and for two years after graduation was Director of the Student Union at the same university, a salaried position. The Student Union had affiliations with the American Student Union which has been cited by the Special Committee on Un-American Activities (Dies Committee) as a communist front which resulted from a "united-front" gathering of young Socialists and Communists. It was also cited as subversive and un-American by a special sub-committee of the House

Committee on Appropriations in a report dated April 21, 1943. Magill was reportedly a dues-paying member of this subversive group.

Magill's biography in Who's Who in America (1966-7) lists him as having been employed as Special Assistant to the Director of the United China Relief, Inc. The Senate Internal Security Sub-Committee Index (1951-5), page 749 shows that the United China Relief is also known as INDUSCO. The Guide to Subversive Publications, Page 19, states American Committee in Aid of Chinese Industrial Cooperatives "cited as a Communist controlled organization also known as Indusco."

Magill's biography also shows that he was an "Intern" for the "National Institute of Public Affairs," in 1940 just before going with the United China Relief. One of the key people employed by the National Institute of Public Affairs which placed people in strategic posts, was Luke Woodward Wilson. Wilson and his wife were reported as Communists and Wilson took the Fifth Amendment before the Senate Internal Security Sub-Committee as to his Communist activities and also as to the plan for getting confidential information from the FBI files through Communist John Abt. These details may be found in the Senate Internal Security Committee Hearings on Interlocking Subversion in Government Departments, Part 20.

Magill was a dues-paying member of the Washington, D.C. branch of the Institute of Pacific Relations, a cited subversive organization, and was a close associate of Phillip C. Jessup, Robert Barnett, William Lockwood and others with varying degrees of affiliation with Communist and subversive organizations and individuals.

Magill was employed by the Far Eastern Division of the Office of Strategic Services (OSS) 1942-45. The O.S.S. was thoroughly infiltrated by Communists and subversives and many of these security risks found their way into other government departments eventually. Magill came into the State Department in 1945 as an economist and by 1947 he had become a political economist in the Far Eastern Bureau, remaining in this position until 1950.

This was the period when the Far Eastern Bureau of the State Department was co-operating with the Institute of Pacific Relations in a program to turn China over to the Communists. Director of the Office of Far Eastern Affairs from 1947-49 was Walton Butterworth who had previously worked at Nanking and Chungking, China, and was reported as strongly pro-Chinese Communist and anti-Chiang Kai-shek. U.S. Intelligence authorities were supplied with information by a confessed Soviet spy who admitted that Butterworth was one of the Americans who gave him the secret information to be passed on to Soviet Intelligence. The spy implicated Butterworth, the reports stated, giving all the details before he was executed. Butterworth became Assistant Secretary of State for Far Eastern Affairs from 1949-50 and, after a few more promotions, is now U.S. Ambassador to Canada.

Working with Magill under Butterworth, as chief of the Division of Chinese Affairs, was Phillip D. Sproue who was also "an old China-hand." Sproue had served in the U.S. Diplomatic Service in China and was so outspokenly pro-Chinese Communist that Major General Patrick Hurley, then U.S. Ambassador to China, ordered that he be sent back to the United States. While in China, Sproue was reported as associating with known Communists. When Solomon Adler was identified as a Communist and Soviet Intelligence agent by Mrs. Elizabeth Bentley and Whitaker Chambers, Sproue supplied an affidavit on behalf of Adler for use at loyalty hearings.

Also working with Magill as Assistant Chief of the Division of Chinese Affairs was

Fulton Freeman, an often reported security risk. Freeman, while stationed in China, was observed by Intelligence officers meeting with Anna Louise Strong, an identified Communist agent who worked for Soviet Intelligence. Freeman was a friend and close contact of John Stewart Service, a State Department official indicted in the "Amerasia Case," and the subject of extensive loyalty hearings. Freeman's conduct, while serving as a U.S. diplomat in China, came officially to the attention of the U.S. authorities when he was reported as having a Chinese mistress. She was Yun Ju Chao, a Chinese actress also known as Valentine Chalo. The affair broke out into an open scandal when she became pregnant. Intelligence officers reported that a physician was contacted and that he performed an abortion on the actress. Freeman, in spite of his association with pro-Soviets, was given numerous promotions and is now Ambassador to Mexico.

This nest of security risks, subversives and pro-Soviets operating in the Far Eastern Affairs Office in the State Department made possible many recommendations and courses of action which resulted in the United States withdrawing support from the Nationalist Chinese and thereby allowing the Communists to take over China.

Another member (until recently) of the State Department Policy Planning Council is Zbigniew K. Brzezinski (hereinafter designated as Mr. B), who was born in Warsaw, Poland, on March 28, 1928, the son of Tadeusz Brzezinski and Leonia Roman. He came to the United States in 1938 but did not become a U.S. citizen until 1958, twenty years later, according to his biography in *Who's Who in America*.

Mr. B graduated from McGill University in Canada in 1949, having majored in Economics and Political Science. He next attended Harvard, obtaining an M.A. in Political Science in 1950 and a Ph. D. in 1953. He married Miss Emilie Ann Benes on June 11, 1955.

Mr. B manifested an interest in Russian affairs from the beginning of his career. Right out of Harvard with his new Ph. D. he went to work for the Russian Research Center, 1953-6, first as an instructor and research fellow and then as a consultant on research programs. From 1956 to 1960 he was an assistant professor and government research associate at the Center for International Affairs at Harvard University where he became affiliated with the C.I.A. In 1960 Mr. B switched over, presumably at the request of the C.I.A., to the Russian Institute at Columbia University which appeared to employ Communists according to the Senate Internal Security Committee Hearings entitled, "Communist Underground Printing and Illegal Propaganda" (1953).

During 1962 Mr. B became a consultant to the State Department and the Rand Corporation. During part of 1961 and 1962 he was a member of a joint committee on contemporary China for the extremely left Social Science Research Council. Mr. B is a dues-paying member of the NAACP and a member of the Council of Foreign Relations. In 1964 he was made an honorary member of the steering committee of the Young Citizens for Johnson. In July 1966 Mr. B was appointed to the State Department with a rating of R-1 and was made a member of the Policy Planning Council. He has recently left the State Dept. to become director of the Research Institute on Communist Affairs at Columbia University.

Also on the Policy Planning Council is Ernest Kidder Lindley, a journalist who was made a special assistant to the Secretary of State and a member of the PPC in 1961. He was at that time 62 years of age and had no previous State Department experience. He was born in Richmond, Indiana, July 14,

1899, the son of Ernest Hiram Lindley and Elisabeth Kidder. After graduating from Bloomington (Ind.) high school, he went to the University of Idaho and graduated with an A.B. degree in 1920. He later obtained a BA and MA degree from Oxford University in England as a Rhodes Scholar. He married Miss Betty Grimes on October 5, 1929.

Lindley worked as a reporter and political writer for the *Wichita Beacon* 1924, *N.Y. World* 1924-31, *N.Y. Herald Tribune* 1931-7, and then went to the liberal *Newsweek* and *Washington Post* where he remained until 1961. He was also active in broadcasting with N.B.C. and B.B.C. Lindley wrote a number of books and articles praising Franklin D. Roosevelt and the New Deal.

He came into government as a special assistant to Dean Rusk and, without diplomatic experience, was a member of the U.S. Delegation at Ministerial Meetings of NATO, SEATO, CENTO and ANZUS. In 1963 he edited and wrote the introduction for Dean Rusk's book, "The Winds of Freedom." Lindley is a member of the Council on Foreign Relations (secret government of the U.S.). He was a member of the Washington branch of the subversive Institute of Pacific Relations and page 3609 of the Senate Internal Security Sub-Committee hearings on the IPR shows that he wrote a column indicating that he was strongly pro-Chinese Communist.

Fisher Howe, a former thread salesman, is another member of the Policy Planning Council. He was born in Winnetka, Illinois, on May 17, 1914, the son of Lawrence Howe and Hester Davis. He graduated from Harvard University in 1935 and was married to Miss Deborah Froehlich on June 4, 1945. From 1935 to 1945 Howe worked as a thread salesman for Patson & Baldwin Ltd. of Yorkshire, England, and Coats & Clark Thread Co. In 1941 he was appointed a member of the staff and special assistant in the Office of the Director of the Office of Strategic Services.

Howe came to the attention of Intelligence Services when they were conducting an intensive investigation of a group of individuals who were engaged in espionage or co-operating with espionage agents. Howe was observed visiting the residence of several of these persons on a number of occasions. One of the persons whom Howe visited frequently was Major Duncan Lee. Lee had been commissioned as a Major in the Armed Forces during World War II and had previously worked in the law offices of William Donovan in New York City. Donovan was made head of the OSS. Major Lee was identified as a member of a Communist espionage group by Mrs. Elizabeth Bentley. Members of the group were introduced to Mrs. Bentley in 1944 in the home of John Abt in New York City. The group became known as the Victor Perlo espionage group.

Victor Perlo, now a columnist for the Communist paper, the *Worker*, was also identified by Whittaker Chambers as a Communist and espionage unit head. Perlo worked for the U.S. Government in the WPB, NRA, HOLC, and Commerce Department. Also in this Communist cell was Charles Kramer, alias Krivitsky, who worked in the AAA, NLRB and several Senate Committees. Other members of this cell also worked in U.S. Government positions. It was while conducting investigations of Communist espionage involving these persons and OSS people that it was learned that Fisher Howe was a contact of these people and often visited their homes.

Howe was assigned to special missions in London, Washington, the Mediterranean and the Far East. In 1945 he came into the State Department as a special assistant to the Assistant Secretary of State for Economic Affairs. On December 1, 1946 he was made Executive Secretary of the Board of Foreign

Service and from 1947 to 1948 was at the National War College. In 1950 Howe, a serious security risk, was made Deputy Special Assistant for Intelligence in the State Department and in 1954 he was made a member of the Board of Examiners for Foreign Service. After assignments in Norway and the Netherlands, Howe was made an Intelligence Research Specialist (July 17, 1966), in Washington, D.C. Howe was on the list of serious security risks prepared by the late Scott McLeod in 1956.

Henry Joseph Kellerman is an advisor on Foreign Affairs assigned to the Policy Planning Council. He was born in Berlin, Germany on January 12, 1910. He studied at the University of Heidelberg 1929-30, the University of Berlin 1930-32. He was a freelance writer for European papers from 1933 to 1937 and director of a youth organization in Berlin from 1934 to 1936. He was with the National Refugee Service from 1938 to 1939 and a research assistant at the N.Y. School of Social Work, Columbia University in 1940. He became a U.S. citizen in 1941 and was study director of the Welfare Council of New York 1941-42. He is married to the former Mignon Lunt Paul.

In 1942 Kellerman became propaganda analyst for the Foreign Broadcast Intelligence Service in Washington, D.C. where he remained until he went with the O.S.S. as a research analyst in 1944. In 1945 he became chief of research and consultant in the Office of U.S. Chief for Prosecution of Axis Criminality, Nuremberg, 1945 and in the same year switched over to that hospitality house for leftwingers, the Office of Research and Intelligence of the State Department. Among his various positions have been U.S. Permanent Representative to UNESCO and Counselor in the U.S. Embassy in Paris (1956-61), advisor to the Assistant Secretary of State for European Affairs and Counselor and Deputy Chief of Mission at the American Embassy in Berne, Switzerland.

Kellerman's subversive background was described in *Treason Is the Reason* and is as follows:

While working on a project with the Voice of America he was reported as handling administrative matters in such a way as to have caused the delay in the erection and operation of Radio Munich. This resulted in an adverse effect on the promotion of American policy. In 1945 confidential Intelligence sources reported that Kellerman was the owner of property in Communist East Berlin. He was reported as being a close associate of individuals known to be pro-Soviet and who were in close association with Communists and Soviet agents. On one occasion the automobile owned by Kellerman's wife was used by an individual making a contact with a Soviet Intelligence agent.

The Policy Planning Council depends to a large extent on information received from the State Department Bureau of Intelligence and Research. Within this Bureau are Offices specializing in geographical areas. Head of the Southeast Asia Division is Evelyn Speyer Colbert. Mrs. Colbert, now almost fifty years of age, is a graduate of Barnard College and Columbia University. She was employed by the O.S.S. 1943-5 and then moved into the State Department where she was assigned to the Intelligence and Research Office. For years she has been a "specialist" in Far Eastern and South East Asian Affairs. Mrs. Colbert was one of the serious security risks reported by Scott McLeod on his famous list which the State Department first claimed did not exist, then tried to destroy and, of course, did little about.

Evelyn Colbert had been reported to security officers by a U.S. Intelligence Service as an individual who was a close friend

and associate of individuals known to be strongly pro-Soviet. Her husband was reported as a close associate of Philip C. Jessup and both Mrs. Colbert and her husband had among their friends a number of persons who were Communists or pro-Communists. Through her employment in the O.S.S. and in the State Department Mrs. Colbert has been working in close association with a group of security risks and a number of subversives.

Now when concerned Americans read about all these "untouchables" the Herald of Freedom they wonder why nothing can be done to correct the situation. They write to their representatives in Washington and try to get the answer. The answer is usually something like the following letter from the State Department to a Senator when he inquired about one of the Untouchables for a constituent.

"DEAR SENATOR ———: I have received your communication. . . . requesting information concerning Mr. David Henry Popper, a Deputy Assistant Secretary for International Organization Affairs.

"You are aware, I am sure, that all personnel employed by the Department of State, both Civil Service and Foreign Service, in sensitive positions have been accorded security clearances as provided for by Executive Order 10450. Further, the Department has a continuing security updating program whereby the security investigation is periodically updated and the security file is re-evaluated.

"Mr. Popper has been investigated by the Department's Office of Security and the Federal Bureau of Investigation under the provisions of Executive Orders 9835 and 10450 and by the Federal Bureau of Investigation under the provisions of the Atomic Energy Act. He currently holds a Top Secret security clearance with the Department and a Class 'Q' clearance issued by the Atomic Energy Commission. As set out above, Mr. Popper's security investigation has been updated recently and his security file has been re-evaluated.

"I hope the foregoing information will be helpful to you in replying. . . .

"Sincerely yours,

"WILLIAM B. MACOMBER, JR.,

"Assistant Secretary for Congressional Relations."

This mumbo-jumbo of doubletalk is supposed to reassure John Q. Public and keep him quiet. However, Congressman John Ashbrook has different ideas on the subject of State Department Security which he presented in the Congressional Record of Feb. 21, 1968. He stated:

"Mr. Speaker, not since the infamous Dreyfus case rocked high-level bureaucratic France, has there been a case of cover-up and duplicity by government to equal the Otto Otepka ordeal.

"This courageous public servant has been subjected to official State Department intimidation, harassment, and character assassination . . .

"His case gives a penetrating insight into questionable State Department policies which have found lax security, favoritism, subversion, immorality, and dishonesty tolerated if not fostered, while at the same time honest public servants are given the kangaroo court or official cold-shoulder treatment. When you study the Otto Otepka matter, you are inclined to exclaim, 'No wonder we are losing.' . . .

"Otto Otepka illustrates the torturous ordeal that good government employees must go through when they challenge the officialdom in Washington, particularly in the State Department. His case stands as an indictment of the State Department and its policies."

The Poppers and other untouchables stay and the Otepkas go—why?

Newspaper Editorials Reflect Wide Range of Views on Report of President's Commission on Civil Disorders

HON. JOE L. EVINS

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 13, 1968

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I have read with great interest and concern the report of the President's Commission on Civil Disorders together with the editorial comment and interpretation by many of our leading newspapers throughout the country. The thrust of a large body of editorial comment is that the report is a landmark study and that many of its recommendations should be implemented forthwith—and at the other extreme there is strong criticism of the report for what is described as the omissions and overemphasis in certain recommendations.

In this connection, because of the great interest of my colleagues and the American people in this report, I am placing in the RECORD three editorials which reflect this broad variance of reaction. These editorials are from the Cookeville Citizen of Cookeville, Tenn.; the Tullahoma News and Guardian of Tullahoma, Tenn.; and the Washington Evening Star, in a column by Mr. David Lawrence. The editorials follow:

[From the Cookeville (Tenn.) Citizen, Mar. 5, 1968]

WHICH WAY, AMERICA?

The National Advisory Commission on Civil Disorders has made a disturbing report to the American people on the critical nature of our racial problems and has proposed strong measures to solve them.

The great majority of persons in positions of authority and influence who have commented upon it, acknowledge its accurate findings and logical proposals.

The gist of the report is that racism and riots will split the nation "into two societies, one black, one white—separate and unequal"—unless massive and costly remedies are begun at once.

Mayor Ivan Allen, of Atlanta, speaks with special clarity in light of his long endeavor to achieve peace and understanding in the Georgia capital. He says:

"We (the white people) are responsible for the condition that the Negro citizen is in today. The time has come when we should do something about it, and it is a matter of first priority that we do what this commission reports . . . within a reasonable length of time."

In the light of his statement it is interesting to read the views of Dr. Stephen J. Wright, former president of Fisk University, who is now president of the United Negro College Fund. Dr. Wright made these points in an address in Nashville last week:

1. Violence must and will be dealt with by the law.

2. Negroes have placed too little emphasis on the effectiveness of education and have substituted "vituperation heaped on whites for clearly-defined objectives and well-organized programs."

3. The white community has weakened moderate Negro leadership by failing to recognize and deal with basic Negro complaints on unemployment, housing, ghetto schools and "involvement of Negroes in policy-making boards."

Those who always oppose change have

pounced on estimated cost of the commission's proposals, saying the country could not stand it. We do not claim to know what the country could stand in costs but we are convinced it cannot tolerate the alternative of perpetuating our cities' slums, with their crime, ignorance, disease and economic waste.

We have come too far in understanding and cooperation to permit the rioters and the do-nothings to plunge us into a long night of hatred and violence, robbing America and mankind of the brightest beacon of freedom the world has ever seen.

[From the Tullahoma (Tenn.) News and Guardian, Mar. 6, 1968]

A WARNING TO CONSIDER

Americans have been given an unpleasant, but timely and realistic, warning in the report by the National Advisory Commission on Civil Disorders, released this past week-end.

This commission, made up of Republicans and Democrats, both northerners and southerners, came up with one compelling picture of the United States in 1968: that it is fast becoming a divided society made up on the one hand of a group largely black and mostly poor and on the other hand of a segment largely white and generally affluent.

And, said the commission, unless urgent steps are taken on a national level, the split will widen and can lead to continued internal strife.

It is hard to see how the commission could have reached any other general observation. Despite years of sectional finger-pointing, the American race problem has been a national one, manifesting itself in various forms depending on the location—such as white primaries and separate schools in the South, and job bias and overt housing discrimination in northern cities.

These are the things which laid the foundation for the divided society which is fast growing despite much progress in breaking down barriers by the integration movement. The things that concern the commission and which should concern everyone is that the separatism which is being urged and exploited by the fanatic black nationalists and their ambitious allies is the very opposite of integration.

It takes no special prescience to be alarmed at the consequences of such a division, since we all should know of the Biblical warning that a house divided against itself cannot stand or of Abraham Lincoln's assertion that a nation cannot endure half-slave and half-free.

The remedies the commission prescribes to cure this massive social ill cannot realistically be expected to be accepted wholesale, particularly at the cost they will entail. The concept of a guaranteed annual income will be hard for most of us to swallow, since there are serious doubts as to its help in getting jobs for the unemployed. Some of the other proposals, such as tax credits for businesses to encourage them to expand and build in poverty areas, are not new and seem to be workable.

Although the commission was instructed to inquire into the root social causes of the 1967 riots, it apparently did not devote much of its energies to the problem of dealing with those who have been major contributors to disorders by deliberately exploiting the hopelessness and misery of many Americans and by thus creating a deeper gulf than already existed between them and other Americans. This deliberate encouragement of lawlessness is something with which we will have to deal along with wider reaching social action.

As important a benefit as any from the commission report, we suspect, is its shock effect upon a large segment of the American public who have deluded themselves into thinking they can isolate themselves from the unpleasantness of life merely because

they live in the world's wealthiest nation. Vice President Hubert Humphrey spoke correctly in a speech Monday when he said that if the dark picture depicted for the future by the commission comes to pass, it will be because Americans collectively and individually do not care.

The advisory commission's report also is important as a reminder that Americans do care and that the American system can still work.

[From the Washington Evening Star]

RIOT REPORT REFLECTS PANEL MAKEUP

(By David Lawrence)

Although the report of the President's Commission on Civil Disorder contain 200,000 words, not a single sentence in it recommends the arrest and imprisonment of the persons who have incited violence and the riots of 1967.

This is not surprising. For out of the 11-member commission, six hold elected office, one is running for the U.S. Senate this year, one is the leader of a big labor union, and one is the executive director of the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People, who calls the report "excellent."

Politicians and others who are responsive to the Negro vote in big cities are so involved in the racial controversies of today that they are not likely to take impartial positions on the subject of law enforcement. This could be expected only from a panel consisting solely of judges or former members of the judiciary.

While the commission said that it found no evidence that "all or any of the disorders, or the incidents that led to them, were planned or directed by any organization or group, international, national or local," the next paragraph was seemingly contradictory and read as follows:

"Militant organizations, local and national, and individual agitators, who repeatedly forecast and called for violence, were active in the spring and summer of 1967. We believe that they sought to encourage violence, and that they helped to create an atmosphere that contributed to the outbreak of disorder."

Then why weren't they prosecuted? This question arises again and again, as details of the incidents and riots are portrayed in the commission's report.

Dr. Martin Luther King Jr. is enthusiastic about the commission's document. He says the recommendations confirm what he has been saying all along—namely, that the United States faces "chaos and disintegration" if something isn't done to bring the Negro into the mainstream of American social and economic life.

The commission advocates the expenditure of many billions of dollars in programs to improve community life and the economic position of the underprivileged, but it blames the terrorism and the encouragement to violence on the white people of America. The report says:

"A climate that tends toward approval and encouragement of violence as a form of protest has been created by white terrorism directed against nonviolent protest; by the open defiance of law and federal authority by state and local officials resisting desegregation; and by some protest groups engaging in civil disobedience who turn their backs on nonviolence, go beyond the constitutionally protected rights of petition and free assembly, and resort to violence to attempt to compel alteration of laws and policies with which they disagree."

In the main, the report attempts to show why Negroes have risen up in protest in many cities, and declares:

"The civil disorders of 1967 involved Negroes acting against local symbols of white American society, authority and property in Negro neighborhoods—rather than against white persons."

But then the commission goes on to say that "white racism is essentially responsible for the explosive mixture which has been accumulating in our cities since the end of World War II." It adds, "To some Negroes, police have come to symbolize white power, white racism and white repression."

Nobody doubts that "racism" exists in America. But who has been intensifying it and inflaming both sides in the last five years? This is the central fact which is avoided entirely by the commission. It fails to note that speakers for militant Negro organizations have preached violence and have threatened more and more riots unless Congress grants the demands of Mobocracy.

Every public issue can be debated in an orderly manner. There are plenty of auditoriums, convention halls and stadiums where people can gather and hear addresses and debates on controversial questions. But when the streets are used for provocative "demonstrations," it means that many persons either join in or resent the manifestations of rebellion and the disregard for public order.

The commission's report is not going to help produce that spirit of reconciliation and friendly association between the races which alone can, in the long run, bring peace inside America.

Can Our States Survive With Antiquated State Legislatures?

HON. THOMAS B. CURTIS

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 13, 1968

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, one of the key problems faced by virtually all legislatures in this country, whether it be the Congress, the legislatures of the individual States, or the legislatures of local governments, is that of keeping their methods and procedures up to date to enable them to efficiently and effectively carry out their responsibilities. Missouri State Representative George W. Parker, who represents Boone County, Mo., discussed the current plight of many State legislatures in a speech before the Society of American Medical Technologists meeting in Kansas City last October.

In his address, which he titled "Can Our States Survive With Antiquated State Legislatures?" Representative Parker reviewed with a good deal of insight the conditions which exist in all too many of our State legislatures today. He concluded by outlining the major reforms urgently needed in most States. These deserve the attention of all who are concerned about good government.

In the interest of furthering the dialog in this area, I am inserting the full text of Representative Parker's remarks at this point in the RECORD, along with a brief biographical statement:

CAN OUR STATES SURVIVE WITH ANTIQUATED STATE LEGISLATURES?

(An address by Representative George W. Parker, 120th district, Republican, Boone County, Mo., House of Representatives, before the Society of American Medical Technologists, Kansas City, Mo., October 28, 1967)

At this moment in our nation's history, we have a national sickness that is eroding a vital link in our free government.

This sickness is at the very base of our free system. Certainly, at a point where we should be strong and vigorous.

This point is your state legislature.

Despite the fact that most of our state governments today have budgets larger than the federal budget of Teddy Roosevelt's time, we are still operating the state legislatures with part-time members, most of whom lack the bare essentials of facilities and assistance to accomplish their task. They are no longer the co-equal branch intended.

Is there little wonder that the federal government is taking us over in leaps and bounds? One proof of this is the grant-in-aid programs. In 1950, there were only twelve. Today, there are over 200. The states are being by-passed in one federal program after another with accompanying controls reaching down to the city level.

Perhaps the prime example is the poverty program, which funnels tax money directly into cities. This procedure, if continued, will cause the states to become mere administrative units, and we will find ourselves with a centralized government that was never intended.

The lack of updating our state legislatures, I submit, is one of the main causes for this tremendous increase in direct federal activity into fields previously thought to be the province of our state and local governments.

This condition of state legislatures have been recognized by several national groups. The Council of State Governments, a joint agency of all the states, has been actively urging improvements since 1959 when the National Conference of State Legislative Leaders was organized under their wing. The National Municipal League is pursuing a five year project aimed at legislative improvements. The U.S. Chamber of Commerce had held workshops. The Citizens Conference on State Legislatures with headquarters in Kansas City has been active in the field. And, in July 1967, the respected Committee on Economic Development (CED), a private, non-partisan organization of 200 businessmen and educators, released a study calling for a "sweeping renovation" of the states' outmoded machinery. "The 50 state legislatures are beset by crucial issues," the Committee said, "but few are organized, equipped, qualified or even empowered to perform their policy functions."

Every American has a stake in curing this illness—the very survival of the federal system is involved.

To understand the problem more fully, let's look briefly at the background of the state legislatures, then review their conditions today, and conclude with a list of needed reforms that you and I can help provide.

BACKGROUND

In the beginning of our states, the legislatures were all powerful. Our people feared kings and dictatorial power.

You could find the leading citizens of the day in the legislatures.

The governors were for the most part puppets—they were weak and ineffective with a lack of power.

Over the years the governors obtained more power, which they needed to be effective executives. And, gradually power was taken from the legislatures by one constitutional restriction after another.

Mr. W. Brooke Graves in his book, "American State Government," summed up the early state legislatures thusly:

"The two houses elected the principal state officers, including judges, and determined all salaries. The governor was pitifully weak, and could not even call the legislature without his council's consent. These conditions were general, but for reasons that will presently be indicated, the legislatures began to forfeit the right to this confidence, and in the course of time drastic limitations were imposed."

"During the period of reconstruction the legislatures of the southern states, through the influence of carpetbaggers from the

North and scalawags from the South, sank to almost unbelievable depths of degradation. The membership—black and white—was for the most part of the lowest type. Gambling, drunkenness, and vice characterized the private lives of a majority of members: graft, fraud, and corruption, their public life. It is difficult to exaggerate the extent to which these conditions prevailed, and they were common to all the southern states.

"Conditions in the South were abnormal, but there was little about the conduct of the legislatures in other states to inspire confidence.

"There spread through the states a move to impose vigorous constitutional restrictions upon the powers of the legislatures. State constitutions were revised at this time, as in Illinois in 1870 and Pennsylvania in 1873. These states are still suffering from the effects of the unwisdom limitations they imposed."

CONDITIONS OF LEGISLATURES TODAY

What then are the restrictions or conditions of the legislatures today?

James N. Miller, in an article entitled, "Hamstrung Legislatures," published in the National Civic Review, April 1965, and in the May 1965 Reader's Digest, said that there were three areas of restriction causing the most damage to legislative functioning: "Not enough pay," "Not enough time," and "Not enough help."

He added that present conditions "are merely visible symptoms of a deep and dangerous paralysis that is sapping the strength of state legislatures—and in process weakening the very basis of state government in the United States today."

To elaborate:

Inadequate pay. The pay is so low for most legislators that this limits the categories of those who can serve to only a few. Primarily—lawyers, certain businessmen who can spare the time, retirees, and a few others. The annual compensation is \$5,000 or less in 35 states—under \$2,000 in 18 of these. CED found that "some members are paid less than legislative doorkeepers or capitol janitors." New Hampshire at the low end, pays \$200 for the two year term. California is highest with \$16,000 per year. (Most of the data used here is as of January 1, 1967).

At least 3/4 of the states are still operating their highest legislative body on a part-time basis. This is the case in spite of the fact mentioned earlier, that most state budgets are larger than the federal government's budget of the early 1900s. State governments have grown to the point where it just doesn't make sense to attempt to operate with part-time legislators, with the possible exception of a few of the smaller states.

The CED report of last July concluded that low pay was one factor which has led to "low esteem for legislators and loss of confidence in the resulting product."

The Missouri Legislator's pay was raised this year from \$4,800 to \$3,400 per year effective in January 1969. This salary will permit a change in concept from a part-time member to be a more nearly full-time one.

One result of the part-time, low paid legislature is the failure to develop "watchdogs" in the public interest, and the failure of legislative committee investigations.

Reflect for a moment upon Congress for a comparison.

It's easy to recall examples of outstanding public servants such as Senator Harry Byrd of Virginia, who was known as an expert in fiscal matters; and Senator John Williams of Delaware who in his pursuits of government waste uncovered the Bobby Baker case.

And we are aware of the power of congressional investigating committees and their effectiveness.

But who can recall a "watchdog" for the public among his state legislators or an effective state legislative investigating committee?

The part-time, low pay system simply does not produce much effectiveness.

Lack of time. The great majority of our state legislatures are restricted by not being able to meet in regular sessions, except once every two years.

In a booklet entitled "American State Legislatures: Their Structures and Procedures," published in March 1967 by the Council of State Governments, this condition was reported as follows:

"As recently as World War II, the overwhelming majority of our state legislatures—all except four—met in regular session only once every two years. The trend toward annual sessions since that time has been so pronounced that today at least twenty-one legislatures meet annually."

Only eight states—Alaska, California, Massachusetts, Michigan, New Jersey, New York, Oklahoma, and South Carolina—now permit annual sessions without time restrictions. Some sample restrictions are: Louisiana limits its legislature to meet only 90 calendar days in two years; same for New Mexico; Washington is limited to 60 calendar days every two years. Several states, like Missouri, meet six months every two years.

Why should our legislatures be restricted in their meetings?

Your legislature is the only branch that is directly and entirely accountable to you—the state's citizens. It is commonly referred to as "people's branch." It is the only branch authorized to pass laws that may affect the lives of every citizen.

Likewise, our city councils are the legislative body for our cities. They pass city laws. Would anyone suggest that our city councils be restricted to meet only a few days every two years to govern our cities?

These restrictions on our legislatures places our states in the position of having to react to situations that have occurred as much as one and a half years earlier. A new federal law may be passed this month that requires a state law to implement. But, with our legislatures not able to meet, instead of having aggressive leadership in legislative action and in our relationships with the federal government, we find ourselves being wagged like the tail of a dog.

One opponent to annual sessions argued that what we need is less government not more. And, that if the legislatures met more often, "they would just pass more silly laws."

Perhaps most of us would agree with Thomas Jefferson that the least government to get the job done is best. We also realize that it is a fact of history that as we become more thickly populated it is usually necessary to have more rules and laws, and thus we have to give more regulatory powers to our government. "The end of law," said John Locke, "is not to restrain or abolish but to further and enlarge freedom."

The people's remedy is to see that qualified legislators are elected and provide them the time and facilities to do their job.

Lack of help. Secretarial help for lawmakers is lacking in most states. Only nine provide individual secretaries. Thirty-three states provide secretarial pools or some shared arrangements, which I would judge are more often than not inadequate. Eight states provide no help at all.

Let me describe what I found as a freshman member of the Missouri Legislature:

Except for the Legislative Research Office, which has a staff of twenty, and primarily was able to assist the 197 members of both Houses by drafting bills, the only other help I found was a part of a secretary's time. I shared one secretary with five members. Thus, most of my mail was answered with a ball point pen.

Like many states, our constitution restricts the number of employees that can be hired for the legislature. The House is allowed 125 employees—the Senate 75. No other state agency is thus restricted.

The committees of the legislature had little to no help. To understand the many complex bills we need research assistance or staff members, at least for the committees, to gather facts and assist in analyzing the measures. In most states this assistance is practically non-existent, although it is commonplace in the national Congress.

In discussing these working conditions with one of my constituents, he replied, "Gosh, that's like sending you over there to the capitol to do some digging for us and when you get there discover that you don't have a shovel."

He was right. Most state legislators lack the shovel!

In conducting their business the lawmakers must use the desk in their legislative chamber, use the corridors or perhaps some makeshift space. In only seventeen states are all the legislators provided with either individual or shared office space. Six of these provide individual offices.

The lack of pay, time and help makes it practically impossible for your legislator to do an effective job.

MAJOR REFORMS NEEDED

These restrictions bogging down our legislatures must be lifted. Here are some of the major reforms urgently needed in most states:

1. Abolish the constitutional restrictions that prohibit annual regular sessions.
2. Provide adequate salary. One that will enable your lawmaker to work at the job.
3. Provide reasonable secretarial help, office space and facilities.
4. Reduce the number of members to a more manageable total. Various authorities and the CED Study have recommended 100 as a maximum for a state legislature. Only ten states now have 100 or less.
5. Provide an adequate research staff, including year-round staffing of at least some of the major committees.
6. Provide for legislative review of administrative rules and regulations to determine whether they carry out the intent of the laws enacted. The responsibility of your legislature extends beyond the passage of new laws. Congress performs this function at the national level. Only eight states—Alaska, Connecticut, Iowa, Kansas, Michigan, Nebraska, Virginia, and Wisconsin—as of 1963, had statutory provisions for such review.
7. Provide some expenses for the legislator's work within his district. Most states provide nothing in this area. Texas has recently authorized \$200 per month for each member to use in his district for a part-time secretary and other necessary expenses.

What effort is being made to update your state legislature? What part will you play? Here in Missouri, although our state administration had had no program for these reforms, our House of Representatives this year passed several reform measures including a provision for annual sessions. For the most part, these measures were defeated or died in our State Senate.

Would these reforms cost too much?

At present, most states are spending a very small portion of their state budget on the legislative branch. For example, Missouri with a budget of one billion dollars annually spends the following on the three branches:

Branch	Approximate percent of total budget	Amount
Legislative.....	1/4 of 1	\$2,000,000
Judicial.....	1/2 of 1	4,700,000
Executive.....	2	16,300,000

Thus, the total cost for operating or managing our three branches of state government is nearly 3% of the state budget. Private firms of large size would spend a con-

siderably greater percent for management. The money spent on good management means savings through better plans, programs, and utilization of resources. Does it seem reasonable to spend only 1/4 of 1% of a state budget for operating the entire legislative branch?

The cost of operating all of the 50 state legislatures is less than that of the total operating cost of Congress.

Former Governor Terry Sanford of North Carolina recently put our problem in perspective when he said, "No state can be strong with a weak legislature . . ."

CONCLUSION

The eradication of this national sickness—weak state legislatures—is in the hands of the people themselves. You and I.

If you and I are determined to have a co-equal branch—one responsive to our will and vigorous in pursuing its function—we will act to improve the conditions of our legislatures.

We will see that candidates are serious about making these needed reforms. We will inform others of these needs realizing that public opinion is powerful and a needed ally. We will participate in the political activity of our choice, but at least some.

The future of the states are worth saving. Our forefathers purposely divided the power among sovereign states so that no one could grab enough power in America to become a tyrant. And, the old maxim still rings a message to each of us when we hear the words: "In America, we get the government we deserve, not the one we wish for."

Governor Daniel J. Evans of Washington placed this thought in another light in his second inaugural address of January 1967 when he said: "State governments are unquestionably on trial today. If we are not willing to pay the price, if we cannot change where change is required, then we have only one recourse. And that is to prepare for an orderly transfer of our remaining responsibilities to the federal government."

ACTION NOTES

You can help obtain these needed legislative reforms:

1. Write the Governor and ask him to appoint a state-wide advisory committee to tackle this problem.
2. Write your state senator and state representative. Tell them what you think about these reforms.
3. Tell your program chairman in the groups you belong to, to consider a program on this topic. Give him a copy of this talk. And, tell your friends and others you talk with about this subject and urge them to act with you in doing some of these things.

REPRESENTATIVE GEORGE W. PARKER, BOONE COUNTY, MO.

Mr. Parker was reared in Missouri, enlisted in the Army Air Corps upon graduation from high school in 1940. He flew 62 combat missions in Europe as a B-26 bomber pilot and was awarded the Distinguished Flying Cross. An intelligence staff officer, squadron commander, and jet fighter pilot after World War II, he left the Air Force in January 1961 after serving for three years as associate professor of air science at the University of Missouri to begin a career in politics.

Active in civic affairs in various communities, Parker has served twice as chairman of his church board, chairman of a United Fund drive, president of two PTA units, and as a state officer in the Jaycees. He received The Distinguished Service Award from The U.S. Junior Chamber of Commerce in 1957 in recognition of his civic endeavors.

He holds a BS degree from the University of Maryland. For four years (1963-66) he held the position of executive director for his political party's state headquarters. During this period he engaged in political writ-

ings and traveled the State speaking at political meetings.

In 1960 he broke a century-old tradition by being the first member of his party ever elected in Boone County, Missouri. Since that time he has been active in crusading for the updating of state legislatures and county government. Rep. Parker is the Minority Caucus Secretary, and serves on the Federal-State Relations and the Fees and Salaries Committees of the Missouri House of Representatives.

Marriner Eccles Comments on Economic Consequences of Vietnam

HON. WILLIAM F. RYAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 13, 1968

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Speaker, there is no shortage of telling criticism of the Vietnam war on political, military, and moral grounds. Another cost of the war, which seems to be less prominently mentioned, is economic. At a time when surtaxes, travel taxes, and cutbacks of domestic programs are upon us, it is important to draw the connection between the war and its economic consequences.

An interview with former Federal Reserve Chairman Marriner Eccles published in *Forbes* magazine portrays the effect of the Vietnam war on the economy in an acute analysis of the relationship of the war to our economic difficulties. The interview, entitled "As I See It," from the February 1, 1968, issue of *Forbes*, follows:

[From *Forbes* magazine, Feb. 1, 1968]

AS I SEE IT

(An interview with Marriner S. Eccles)

(NOTE.—His name and his face were once as familiar to the business public as those of his successor today, William McChesney Martin, but Marriner S. Eccles has been out of the public eye since he retired from the Federal Reserve Board in 1951. Now 77, and still hale and hearty (see Side Lines, p. 7), the blunt, outspoken Salt Lake City Mormon remains a full-time working businessman. He is chairman of the big San Francisco-based Utah Construction & Mining Co., a firm of which his father was co-founder. He is also chairman of First Security Corp., a Salt Lake City bank holding company, and director of several Utah firms.)

Eccles first came to Washington early in the New Deal of Franklin Delano Roosevelt to serve briefly as Assistant Secretary of the Treasury. A few months later, in 1934, the President appointed Eccles to the Federal Reserve Board. In 1936 Roosevelt moved the then 47-year-old Eccles up to chairmanship of the revamped Fed. He remained in that post until 1948 when Harry Truman demoted him. Stubbornly, however, Eccles clung to his board membership for three more years before returning home. He has maintained a keen interest in national, financial and political affairs; in 1964 he was an active contributor and campaigner for Lyndon Johnson.)

You've been in business and in policymaking government roles under all sorts of conditions: wars, depressions, times of prosperity, inflation, deflation. How do you read present economic conditions?

ECCLES: I believe that our country today is confronted by the most serious economic, social and political problems, both domestically and abroad, in its history.

We've got rising prices, high interest rates and a balance-of-payments deficit. But these are only effects. They are not causes. You must look for the causes, and—today especially—that means examining economic problems in a broad context.

Just list some of our national problems—the very large and continuing budget deficit, the inflationary pressures, the balance-of-payments deficit, the lack of confidence abroad in our dollar, the riots in our cities, the unrest on our campuses, the split among all classes of our populace and within our political parties. I believe that all of these can be traced to a common cause.

Which is?

ECCLES: Which is the war in Vietnam. I believe very strongly that by ending or greatly reducing the Vietnam war, many of these national problems would be brought a long way toward solution. By greatly reducing, I mean discontinuing the bombing, bringing about a cease-fire and submitting to binding negotiations.

We know you oppose our involvement in Vietnam on moral and political grounds. Evidently, though, you oppose the war on economic and financial grounds as well.

ECCLES: Most certainly. Let me explain the economic predicament that the Vietnam war has gotten us into. Because of the war we now have a defense budget of around \$75 billion. This has produced a huge federal budget deficit that will run at an estimated \$28 billion for this year. Now, all this spending has come at a time when our economy was already fully utilized. There are no surpluses of manpower and production, as was the condition at the start of World War II. So we are getting inflation in our prices and we are getting inflation in our wages and production costs. We are also experiencing steady increases in our interest rates as business seeks capital to accommodate the high levels of both government and consumer spending. Now this has had an international effect. . . .

Before you go on, aren't you ignoring the steps the Johnson Administration has taken to trim this deficit and control inflation with the proposed income-tax surcharge and budget cuts for the next fiscal year?

ECCLES: The tax surcharge, if it passes Congress, may bring in additional revenues of \$10 billion and slow down consumer spending a bit. The budget cuts the President is talking about may reduce federal expenditures by around \$3 billion or so. But that will still leave a very large, war-inspired budget deficit of between \$12 billion and \$15 billion.

You're saying that compared with the magnitude of the Vietnam thing, these measures are chicken feed?

ECCLES: That's right. I don't think inflation can be adequately reduced with a deficit of that size in a wartime economy. Nor, to get on with my discussion of the international effects, do I believe the Administration's moves are adequate to bolster the sagging confidence abroad in the value of our dollar. This is another major crisis brought on by our involvement in Vietnam.

That's due to Vietnam, too?

ECCLES: Well, to begin with, we have run a deficit in our international balance of payments in 17 out of the past 18 years. This means the amount of dollars we have spent and invested in other countries is in excess of what other countries have spent or invested here. As a result there has been built up \$30 billion of obligations we owe to other countries due in one year or less.

Recently this payments deficit has been rising in rather alarming fashion. In the last quarter of 1967 this deficiency ran to \$1.8 billion; for the entire year it was approximately \$4 billion. This deficiency has greatly shaken the confidence of the world in our

dollars, which, as you know, many nations hold as the reserve for their own currencies. Now, our huge federal deficit and resulting inflation at home have further aggravated this lack of confidence. Our friends abroad are rightfully concerned about the purchasing power of their dollars.

They are especially concerned about the value of the dollars they own when they see that our inflation is caused by a nonproductive military venture in Vietnam which shows no indication of quick termination. The inevitable result has been a run on our gold to the extent that our national gold supply has been reduced by nearly \$1 billion since the British pound was devalued late in November.

What about the President's recent measures to reduce the balance-of-payments deficiency?

ECCLES: You are referring to the cutbacks in foreign lending of banks by \$500 million, the reduction of the tourism deficit by \$500 million, the \$1 billion reduction in foreign investment by U.S. capital and the \$500 million reduction in government spending abroad.

This is the program where the Government is expecting the private sector to absorb \$2 million of the cut while it proposes to absorb only \$500 million. How could they do less?

Don't you think, though, that these measures tend to bolster confidence in the dollar?

ECCLES: Johnson had little choice. I'm sure our friends abroad put the "bee" on him. Certainly these measures will have a direct effect on our balance of payments. But these are strictly emergency measures; they will only temporarily ease the situation. They do not really get to the heart of the matter—our large budget deficit and inflationary pressure at home and the lack of confidence both at home and abroad in a country at war. These, I believe, will continue to erode the value of the dollar as the world's reserve currency.

Even if these measures are made in concert with a tax increase and cuts in non-defense spending?

ECCLES: Yes, because in my opinion the tax increase and the budget cuts will be too small to make a truly significant reduction in the inflationary pressures and psychology brought about in a country at war.

How about sharp cuts in the budget?

ECCLES: That's whistling in the dark. You simply cannot make big enough cuts in non-defense spending to counter the effects of the war. In the first place, no party in power would think of making nondefense reductions of the size that would be required—especially in an election year.

Actually, there is a growing need to increase nondefense spending to take care of problems of our cities, schools, transportation and foreign economic aid—especially in Latin America, to prevent the spread of communism. We are way behind on some of these needs already, and the war is preventing us from catching up.

How about eliminating some of the strictly pork-barrel appropriations with which congressmen and senators favor one another?

ECCLES: They are chicken feed; they don't amount to very much. Besides, some of those expenditures for rivers and harbors are justified by real need. And you can't accomplish much by chopping away at things like Medicare and the poverty program. They may be badly administered, but even now the amount of money being spent on them is a pittance compared with what we are spending in Vietnam.

How about putting on traditional wartime measures like wage and price controls to combat inflation? Or perhaps reviving the excess-profits tax?

ECCLES: Well, you could do these things, but they would be impossible to administer under present conditions and politically im-

possible to legislate. And they would not be a solution to the problems I have enumerated before.

Can't the Federal Reserve do something about inflation by tightening the money supply?

ECCLES: There really isn't very much the Fed can do in the present instance. It is obligated, as an arm of the Federal Government, to keep enough reserves in the banking system so the Treasury can finance the war as well as refund the tens of billions of dollars of its obligations falling due each year. This, of course, only tends to fuel the inflationary fires. Now, if the budget were balanced and the debt were not so high, perhaps the Fed would be free to tighten credit under inflationary conditions. But that is not the case right now.

This did not prevent the Fed from clamping down hard on the money supply in 1966, when our Vietnam involvement and military budget were already quite large.

ECCLES: But that was two years ago. The budget deficit, even then, hadn't reached nearly the size it has now. Nor was inflation so evident then. You didn't have one huge wage increase after another producing a cost-push type of inflation. You didn't have rising prices throughout the economy. Nor was our balance-of-payments deficiency as acute as it is now. It's a new ball game for the Fed today.

You are saying, then, that the Fed is powerless under present conditions to combat inflation. Could the Fed have done anything, say, three or five years ago to prevent the current outbreak of inflation?

ECCLES: No, no, no. The Fed couldn't have done a solitary thing that would have affected the situation today. The Fed has been doing a good job. Now this war has upset the whole show.

You don't paint a very hopeful picture.

ECCLES: Not if we stay in Vietnam. As I mentioned earlier, the problems are not just economic. As long as the federal budget deficit is so high there is little our Government can do to combat the causes of violence, riots and crime in our country, especially in the cities. It can make little progress toward solving problems of education, housing, transportation, air and water pollution and the like.

Already we have had to cut back on our foreign-aid program, in no small measure because of our war expenditures. I believe that foreign economic aid should be increased in backward countries, not decreased. The best way to fight the spread of communism is through foreign aid, not through aggression.

In addition, we have this great split among our populace over the war, disenchantment among our youth, serious divisions within our political parties and a growing lack of confidence in our Government both at home and especially abroad—as witness the run on the dollar.

As I said earlier, all of this broad spectrum of problems can only ultimately be solved by our getting out of Vietnam. Consider what that would mean. Vietnam is the cause for the deficit in our federal budget, the need for a tax increase, the heavy spending that is causing inflation. These problems, in turn, are behind the deficiency in our balance of payments, the lack of confidence in the dollar, the run on our gold supply. The war is the main cause of unrest in our colleges, the inability to cope adequately with the causes of violence in the cities and the splits in our populace and our political parties.

You certainly blame a great deal on this one factor. Is the war there all bad?

ECCLES: In my opinion there is every reason to get out of Vietnam and no good reason to stay there. But one of the most compelling reasons to get out is so that this country can maintain its world leadership. Losing that position would tend to bring about a very

disruptive economic condition in our own country and throughout the western world.

The world needs a smoothly operating monetary system to support a rapidly growing world trade which would result in a world at peace. The basis for such a system must be gold and the dollar, plus adjustable drawing rights from the International Monetary Fund.

Now, the supply of gold is limited, so a strong dollar is of paramount importance. Even if the dollar should be devalued, in which case all other countries would quickly follow suit, the world could not live without the dollar to carry on an expanding world trade. The dollar is needed as the connecting link between all other currencies, so the threat to our world leadership caused by our involvement in Vietnam is critical.

Do you think the President will pull out or pull back in Vietnam?

ECCLES: Not in the near future. Mr. Johnson, Mr. Rusk and their Administration have gotten themselves so committed and deeply involved in Vietnam that they must save face. Therefore it would take a change in administration to get us out.

So you believe that a change in administration is the only realistic solution to our present economic problems?

ECCLES: Let me put it this way: As long as we are in Vietnam and are spending so heavily to remain there, I do not believe we can cope successfully with our economic situation. Now, getting out of Vietnam will not suddenly clear away all our national problems. There will still be plenty of them left. But we would not be in the same dilemma we are in now.

We would not be wasting our economic resources in a nonproductive enterprise that we cannot win. And make no mistake about it, even if we are victorious militarily, we will still lose. Russia and China are only too happy to have us wasting our money and manpower over there and damaging our relations with the rest of the world.

A quick end to the Vietnam war would play hob with the defense industry and its supporting industries. Do you feel that some of the support for this war is from vested interests?

ECCLES: I think one of the real great dangers in our country today is the influence of the defense establishment. Let's face it. The defense industries like the business. As individuals I'm sure these men want peace. But in running their companies they want peace with a \$75-billion defense budget, too. These companies have a powerful voice in the Government and with the Congress. Now if these companies are to get the full benefit of their superior technology, for our own people as well as others, we must have peace in the world. We have the strength, we have the power and we have the capacity—if directed in our own enlightened self-interest—to win acceptance as a world leader for good.

If we were to pull out of Vietnam, what would happen? Wouldn't there be a swift diversion of military funds into domestic programs—with little actual reduction in inflation and the budget deficit?

ECCLES: It would take time to divert the larger military expenditures into domestic programs, and I would expect a leveling out more than an inflation. Johnson couldn't get Congress to appropriate funds that quickly or easily, nor would he probably wish to. But with the war it is different. Congress has no choice but to agree to the President's requests for money. Our boys are already over there, the defense contracts have been signed, the national commitment must be supported.

In other words, you think that some of the Vietnam money would go into nondefense spending, but not all of it. But you don't favor giving all of the saving back to the public as a tax cut.

ECCLES: I'm a very substantial capitalist. If there weren't more and more federal money going to fill domestic needs, I would

lose confidence in my investments. I am very much opposed to inflation as well as deflation. I favor government fiscal and monetary policy as the way to maintain production and employment at satisfactory levels on the basis of a stable currency.

And if the war goes on...?

ECCLES: It would depend on whether it was a continued escalation or merely a holding position. In the case of escalation, our economic problems would go from bad to worse. Increased controls, war taxation and a much larger military establishment would be necessary. But if we discontinued our bombing and our search-and-destroy ground action and adopted a holding position, negotiations bringing about a peaceful settlement would in my opinion ultimately develop. In that case a tax increase would not be necessary, and sufficient budget cuts could be made to curb inflationary developments.

Under Secretary of Commerce Samuels Warns of Increasing Threat of Inflation

HON. RICHARD D. MCCARTHY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 13, 1968

Mr. MCCARTHY. Mr. Speaker, Under Secretary of Commerce Howard J. Samuels, speaking in Buffalo, N.Y., warned of the increasing threat of inflation.

Secretary Samuels noted that growing prosperity also brought with it the growing need for self-discipline in our society.

Mr. Speaker, I recommend strongly to the House that it heed Mr. Samuels' timely and forthright arguments, and I insert the following excerpts of his remarks at the 13th Annual Convocation of the Labor-Management College of the Diocese of Buffalo, N.Y., at this point in the RECORD:

Under Secretary of Commerce Howard J. Samuels warned today that America could be headed for a dangerous inflation, possibly as high as 5 percent.

"This inflation," Samuels continued, "would seriously hinder the orderly growth of the economy and be disastrous for the growing number of working and retired Americans who are living on fixed incomes."

This inflation is a major reason why a tax increase is needed now.

Samuels was speaking before the Thirteenth Annual Convocation of the Labor-Management College of the Diocese of Buffalo, New York, at the Hotel Statler Hilton, at 7 p.m. He was there to receive "The Bishop's Plaque" for his effort in promoting peaceful relations between labor and management.

Samuels also warned that the U.S. must not become a "grab bag of pressure groups, each greedily clutching and holding to its own narrow interest. The national interest should not be pushed aside and replaced by selfish interests," he said.

Samuels said that this selfishness is demonstrated in many levels of our society.

"A selfish society can never become a Great Society," Samuels said, "America's wealth and abundance has created great opportunities, but it has also created great problems—not the least of which is over-indulgence. Too often our possessions begin to possess us; our increased desires become compulsive needs and demands."

Samuels noted that the selfish society is not what America was meant to be. "Authoritarian governments," he said, "are held together by compulsion and fear. A democ-

racy is held together by a set of commonly accepted values. That is the glue of any democracy. If the passion of the moment, or narrow self interest is allowed to overcome the national or public interest—we risk dissolving the glue that holds our Nation together." Samuels warned that "inflation is perhaps our most serious economic problem. An inflation which approaches 5 percent could be disastrous."

Samuels urged the audience to support President Johnson's call for a tax increase as an immediate way to control inflation.

Samuels pointed to some "disturbing" economic indicators:

Wage increases averaged 5.2 percent in 1967 compared to 4.1 percent in 1966, and could be over 6 percent in 1968. Yet, at the same time, we have had but a small increase in productivity.

Consumer prices accelerated in the last nine months of 1967.

Prices of many critical raw materials have gone up considerably.

"Americans must look beyond their noses, and look at the broader public interest. The issue is frighteningly simple: Americans and their institutions must either voluntarily control their selfish impulses and demands or risk those controls common to authoritarian government," Samuels said.

Public Opinion Poll

HON. ROBERT J. CORBETT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 13, 1968

Mr. CORBETT. Mr. Speaker, we have completed another poll of public opinion in the 18th Congressional District of Pennsylvania, which embraces most of Allegheny County north of the city of Pittsburgh. Though basically residential and industrial, the district does have some agriculture and such a widespread variety of ethnic, social, and economic groups that it is almost a microcosm of the entire United States.

We have noted in the past that—except for issues of local impact—the results of our polls fairly closely parallel those of national surveys in reflecting voter attitudes. Every voter in the district was afforded an opportunity to participate in the poll. Over 21,000 responded, so that the results were sufficiently large enough to represent a valid referendum of each issue.

The questions and their tabulated results, along with some commentary of my own, are included below. I sincerely hope that many will find them both interesting and enlightening:

TABULATED RESULTS FOR POLL CONDUCTED FEBRUARY 1968

[Results in percent]

1. Do you believe that we should halt our bombing of North Vietnam?

Yes ----- 21
No ----- 79

This result came as no surprise. Regardless of whether people are "hawks" or "doves," an increasing number seems to agree that we should not make it easier for the enemy to supply those who are killing or wounding our soldiers in South Vietnam.

2. Do you think that we should enact a surtax on personal and corporate incomes?

Yes ----- 27
No ----- 73

Most people believe that we should cut expenditures, not raise taxes. They disagree

with the notion that we can have guns and butter. Likewise, the majority holds that the growing cost of government at all levels is draining off too much of our income, be it personal or corporate.

3. Do you feel that inflation is hurting you?

Yes ----- 83
No ----- 17

There are those who think that some inflation helps them, but the vast majority agrees that inflation is the cruelest tax of all. Regardless of our beliefs, if current fiscal policies are not changed promptly and decisively we can expect more inflation this year, perhaps as much as 5 percent.

4. Do you favor any of the proposed restrictions or taxes on tourist travel outside of the western hemisphere?

Yes ----- 60
No ----- 40

Most Americans resent restrictions on their proper personal rights and pleasures. However, many are seriously alarmed about the outflow of our gold and dollars, and want every possible remedy applied. If such restrictions are voted, it is safe to predict that exceptions will be made for business trips, visits to close relatives, and travel to study in educational institutions.

5. Do you think that the American dollar will have to be devalued in the foreseeable future?

Yes ----- 37
No ----- 67

The devaluation of the British Pound and our continued gold hemorrhage last year struck deeply into international confidence that the dollar is as good as gold. Unless we restore this confidence by some belt tightening in the federal government and slow down our ever mounting deficits, the dollar will be in deep trouble.

6. Should the Congress make a determined effort to cut the President's proposed budget by approximately \$10 billion?

Yes ----- 89
No ----- 11

You can be sure that a sizeable bloc in the House will make a determined effort to cut almost every appropriation bill that comes to the Floor. There will be budget cuts, but they may not reach \$10 billion. Last year the cuts totaled \$5.1 billion below Administration requests.

7. Do you believe that the U.S. has over-extended itself for foreign commitments?

Yes ----- 88
No ----- 12

The U.S. is committed to help defend 40 countries if they are attacked. Few believe we have the men or the money to successfully carry on if we become militarily involved on several different fronts.

8. Should we impose quotas on the amount of foreign steel that may be imported?

Yes ----- 72
No ----- 28

The affirmative vote may well reflect local alarm about imports of steel that have caused unemployment and loss of orders for our basic industry.

9. Do you agree that a national crime law is necessary to help our cities combat crime in the streets?

Yes ----- 70
No ----- 30

Crime in our streets has become a national disgrace. While many agree that crime is primarily a state and local matter, a majority feels that the national government should put up money for training police and conducting meaningful research in techniques of criminal prevention and detection.

10. President Johnson wants money to start building 300,000 dwelling units for middle and low income families. Would you so vote?

Yes ----- 32
No ----- 68

It seems here that we have a reflection of the public's opposition to starting any new

(or enlarging any current) spending programs. Many, however, feel that housing programs are part of the answer to preventing riots.

11. Would you vote for increased funds to fight the "War on Poverty"?

Yes 27
No 73

There is widespread belief that the agencies engaged in the War on Poverty have wasted large sums of money and that too much of the funds have gone for administrative costs instead of helping the poor.

12. Do you think that we should impose compulsory wage and price controls?

Yes 42
No 58

Most everybody dislikes wage and price controls, but fear of inflation makes many willing to put up with them, particularly while we are in a costly war and a shortage of capable employables is growing.

13. Do you favor rigid Federal supervision of the interstate sale of firearms?

Yes 65
No 35

While no one wants to deprive sportsmen and others with legitimate needs for firearms from having them, a sizeable majority would like to make it harder for criminals to secure deadly weapons. It is impossible to predict what the outcome of this issue will be in the Congress.

14. Currently do you rate President Johnson's handling of his office as—

Good 13
Fair 43
Bad 44

In June 1967 the results were:

Good 11
Fair 53
Bad 36

In February 1967 the results were:

Good 10
Fair 53
Bad 37

Here I should not comment, but simply report the other findings for comparison.

Milwaukee Common Council Urges Federal Action Against the Alewife

HON. CLEMENT J. ZABLOCKI

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 13, 1968

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Speaker, on February 20 the Milwaukee Common Council passed a resolution memorializing Congress for Federal legislation and appropriations to combat the alewife problem.

This action by the council reflects the serious concern of the people of Milwaukee about the likely inundation of local beaches and harbors with tons of dead fish bodies this summer, as was the case last summer.

Although a special Federal task force on the alewife problem was formed in the wake of last summer's mess and reported that the Federal Government bears an important responsibility in remedying the situation, the Department of the Interior thus far has failed to act effectively.

For example, the fiscal 1969 budget contains only a modest increase in funds for alewife control in the Great Lakes. It is only a token compared to the sustained and massive effort which Secretary of the Interior Udall has admitted

will be necessary to eradicate the alewife nuisance.

Unless something is done—and soon—next summer may well bring another alewife inundation, with its estimated cost of \$100 million to the localities, private businesses, and individuals.

I wish to take this opportunity once again to urge that hearings be scheduled at the earliest possible date on my bill, H.R. 4793, which would provide \$5 million in matching Federal funds to the States in alewife control and cleanup programs.

H.R. 4793 now has received the endorsement of many groups deeply interested in the alewife problem. Among them is the Michigan Department of Conservation.

In its proposed program for "Alewife Cleanup, 1968," submitted to the Governor, the department said:

We therefore believe that the problem becomes one of nationwide concern and recommend that bill H.R. 4793 now before the United States Congress be enacted which would allow for the funding for this program. Funds could be allotted to the various states based on beach area and magnitude of the problem. In each case the state should be the organizing agency. In Michigan, the Conservation Department. It could draw the resource people into an action group to put such a program into effect.

This endorsement by the Michigan Department of Conservation for H.R. 4793 and similar bills is most welcome and, hopefully, will assist in convincing the House Fisheries and Wildlife Subcommittee that hearings should be held soon on the proposal.

The time is growing short. Action must be taken now if we are to avoid repeating the mess and losses which plagued the Great Lakes in the summer of 1967.

The resolution follows:

CERTIFIED COPY OF RESOLUTION

Resolution memorializing the Congress for federal legislation and appropriations to solve alewife nuisance problem

Whereas, There has occurred in the Great Lakes a proliferation of a nuisance species of fish called the "alewife"; which has concentrated in Lake Michigan in numbers almost beyond calculation, the species dying in almost incredible numbers during the spring and early summer spawning runs, creating for Lake Michigan cities, beaches and resort areas an unprecedented problem of odor and unsightliness, with vast numbers of dead fish littering tributary streams and the open waters of Lake Michigan, to the detriment of recreation, and polluting these waters; and

Whereas, This fish species has migrated into the Great Lakes from the Atlantic Ocean and has adapted to fresh water; and the problem thrust upon Great Lakes cities is thus totally beyond their control, and the infestation of the entire Great Lakes is interstate in character and in geography; and

Whereas, The U.S. Bureau of Fisheries estimates that there may be as many as one billion of this species in Lake Michigan alone, posing a serious and unmanageable threat, beyond the capacity of any single community to cope with; and

Whereas, The federal government has scientific and financial resources to cope with such a problem, far more effectively than the limited resources of any single Great Lakes community or area; and

Whereas, In the case of the lamprey eel infestation of the Great Lakes it was necessary to apply financial and scientific resources on

a large scale, through a federal program, with an ultimate successful conclusion, for which the Great Lakes region is indebted to our federal government; and

Whereas, The continuation and threatened enlargement of the alewife nuisance constitutes a grave emergency to the health, the well-being and the economy of the Great Lakes region, and of Lake Michigan in particular; now, therefore, be it

Resolved, By the Common Council of the City of Milwaukee, that said Common Council does respectfully memorialize the Congress of the United States and the President to enact appropriate legislation; appropriate adequate funds; undertake additional research on a crash basis; encourage and underwrite commercial harvesting; and do all other things necessary and possible to relieve the cities, the beaches, the resorts and the boating interests of Lake Michigan of this grave threat to the public health, regional welfare and regional economy; and be it

Further Resolved, That copies of this memorial be transmitted by the City Clerk to the President of the United States, to the Secretary of the Interior, to the U.S. Bureau of Fisheries, to Senators and Representatives from the States of Wisconsin, Michigan, Illinois and Indiana, with a request for their interest and support in achieving a solution; and be it

Further Resolved, That copies of this resolution be similarly forwarded to his Excellency the Governor of Wisconsin and to the Governors of Michigan, Illinois and Indiana for their information; and that copies be forwarded to the Wisconsin Department of Resource Development, and to the Wisconsin Director of Conservation, with the urgent request of this Common Council for fullest possible support from our state government, to bring about a regional solution of this intensifying problem; and be it

Further Resolved, That the City Department of Fiscal Liaison be assigned to press for enactment of such a program before the Congress and before appropriate federal agencies, with the assistance of the Board of Harbor Commissioners, the Department of Public Works, the Health Department, the Sewerage Commission and County of Milwaukee agencies, having jurisdiction.

Kipling Disproved by East-West Center in Hawaii

HON. SPARK M. MATSUNAGA

OF HAWAII

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 13, 1968

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Speaker, it has been 7 years since the founding of the Center for Cultural and Technical Interchange Between East and West on the campus of the University of Hawaii. The East-West Center's record of achievement, and the respect it has won for the success of its international educational experiment linking America and the Asia-Pacific peoples, have grown with each passing year.

More than 11,000 men and women have participated directly in the Center's study program or other activities, and more than half of them have come from Asia and the Pacific Islands. At present, there are 608 students from 29 countries working on programs at the University of Hawaii under scholarship grants awarded by the East-West Center.

East-West Center goals were well summed up recently by Chancellor How-

ard P. Jones, who stated that the center is "a unique experiment in a two-way teaching, learning, and living relationship aimed at fostering world peace through mutual understanding." My colleagues would need only to meet and talk with students from nations such as Indonesia, Nepal, and Japan, as I have, to see how effectively these goals are being attained.

The placement of Hawaii—a geographical link between East and West in the world's largest ocean—emphasizes our State's meaningful role in performing academic, economic, and social service functions in the Pacific basin. This is nowhere more in evidence than through the developing programs at the East-West Center.

Recognition of the East-West Center's progress by the Honolulu Advertiser in its special "Hawaii Growth '68" edition is a tribute to the vision of the U.S. Congress, our State government and to the University of Hawaii. It is also a tribute to the students and teachers of the East-West Center whose dedicated efforts have turned that vision into a practical reality.

I commend the article, "Education Is Linking Peoples" from the February 20, 1968, issue of the Honolulu Advertiser, for the attention of my colleagues in Congress:

EDUCATION IS LINKING PEOPLES

Kipling was wrong when he wrote a century ago that "East is East and West is West, and never the twain shall meet." It is happening right here in Hawaii, where the East-West Center is forging a successful international education experiment linking America and the Asia-Pacific peoples.

In the seven years since the founding of the East-West Center on the University of Hawaii campus, more than 11,000 men and women have participated directly in study programs or other activities aimed at achieving mutual understanding through cultural and technical interchange.

More than half of these "alumni" have come from Asia and the Pacific islands.

They have ranged from top professors in Korean and Indian universities to Fiji agricultural extension workers and Japanese businessmen introducing supermarket techniques into their country.

KNOW-HOW TRADED

Japanese scientists in such fields as electronic microscopes have traded know-how with American counterparts.

Experts from all around the Pacific Basin have pooled their skills and knowledge on such down-to-earth problems as controlling weeds in rice fields and curbing crop-destroying rats.

The majority of the Americans have been university graduate students, taking required courses in Asian languages and studying for advanced degrees to prepare them for careers in teaching, business, the diplomatic service, and other professions.

NO HIPPIES

You will find a sprinkling of long-haired males and mini-skirted girls among the younger Americans and Asians working, studying and playing together at the East-West Center—but no hippies or beatniks.

Those who have survived the competition in the various countries for the East-West Center scholarships are—with occasional isolated exceptions—dedicated young men and women who give promise of becoming leaders in their fields of the future.

Chancellor Howard P. Jones, who became directing head of the East-West Center in

1965 after serving for seven years as U.S. Ambassador to Indonesia, says the Center is "a unique experiment in a two-way teaching, learning and living relationship aimed at fostering world peace through mutual understanding."

PRACTICAL ASPECTS

In a recent speech to a Honolulu business group he said that cultural interchange has definite practical aspects in promoting peace and stability.

"I would say the chances are high that some of you men sitting here today will in 10 years be talking business with some of the men and women now working and studying at the East-West Center. By that time some of them will be holding key posts in various ministries of the developing nations of Asia and the Pacific," Jones said.

"Some of the American graduate students now studying Chinese or Japanese language, along with other subjects bearing on Asia, will be working for you, or advising you on how to operate more effectively in the area."

"In the science of human relations lies a new dimension essential to success in international affairs—your affairs, government affairs, issues of peace and war," he said.

FEDERAL FUNDS

The Center was established by an act of Congress in 1960 and is supported by Federal funds, administered under an agreement with the University of Hawaii.

Hawaii was selected as the site for the East-West Center, with vigorous sponsorship by the University of Hawaii and the State government.

Its geographical location and harmonious racial mixture provide an ideal spot for a venture in Pacific Basin cooperation and cultural interchange.

An East-West Center student from Okinawa expressed the feeling this way:

"So far in my experience this is the only state where people completely intermingle or intermix without racial prejudice. So I find living here comfortable."

TOGETHERNESS

Asians coming to the East-West Center find another bonus. There is no other place or institution in the world which provides so congenial an opportunity for Asians of varying nationalities to live and work closely together and learn to know more about each other.

This developing Asian-to-Asian relationship has important long-range aspects because American goals to foster world peace and stability are served by stimulating regional cooperation as well as by improving understanding between East and West.

NEW APPOINTMENT

Increased emphasis on coordinated programs to heighten cultural interchange by study and research on specific problems of common interest to East and West was demonstrated last year by the appointment of Dr. Everett Kleinjans, an educator with long experience in Japan, to the newly-created post of Deputy Chancellor for Academic Affairs.

Dr. Kleinjans is a former vice president for academic affairs and dean of the division of languages, College of Liberal Arts at the International Christian University in Tokyo.

He is charged with tightening integration of the Center's three main institutes and coordination of Center activities with those of the University of Hawaii.

The Institute for Student Interchange (ISI), headed by Dr. Robert G. Zumwinkle, is the main collegiate educational body of the Center.

HAS 608 STUDENTS

At present, there are 608 students from 29 countries working on programs at the University of Hawaii under scholarship grants

awarded by the East-West Center. Of that total, 177 graduate students are Americans.

East-West Center students live in Center dormitories on the University campus and engage in both Center-sponsored intercultural activities and regular university courses.

The Institute for Technical Interchange (ITI) conducts a broad series of specialized courses in technical subjects ranging from health and medical technology to development of economic resources.

ITI is headed by Vice Chancellor Y. Baron Goto, who joined the Center after serving as director of the Hawaii Cooperative Extension Service. He is widely known throughout Asia as a result of some 20 years as a consultant for various organizations in the area.

Director of the international conference program is Dr. George Kanahale, a graduate of Kamehameha Schools. He received his doctoral degree in political science from Cornell University after research in Japan and Indonesia.

Address of Ambassador of Israel

HON. ROBERT L. F. SIKES

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 13, 1968

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, the new Ambassador of Israel, Maj. Gen. Yitzhak Rabin, delivered an outstanding speech on the current Arab-Israel conflict before the Ninth Annual Policy Conference of the American Israel Public Affairs Committee at the Sheraton Park Hotel in Washington, D.C., on March 11, 1968. It is a privilege for me to submit His Excellency General Rabin's speech for reprinting in the RECORD, as follows:

ADDRESS BY HIS EXCELLENCY MAJ. GEN. YITZHAK RABIN, AMBASSADOR OF ISRAEL, BEFORE THE NINTH ANNUAL POLICY CONFERENCE, AMERICAN ISRAEL PUBLIC AFFAIRS COMMITTEE, AT WASHINGTON, D.C., MARCH 11, 1968

I would try to describe to you tonight the main problems of the Arab-Israel conflict. The day-to-day events reported in the headlines of the press don't necessarily reflect the real problems. An explosion in a Jerusalem building, artillery fire exchanges along the Jordan River, a terrorist gang captured in the vicinity of Nablus—these are the by-products of the disease, not their underlying causes. As with every disease, it is far more important to get at its roots, than to treat its external symptoms. The Arab-Israel conflict goes back many years. It has been played upon and influenced by emotional factors, by baser instincts fed by religious and national prejudices.

It isn't easy to distinguish between the significant and the trivial in the Middle East—unless one has an intimate knowledge of the region—unless one follows closely the course of events there, day by day and even hour by hour. The striking characteristic of the conflict is that the opponents are totally dissimilar in their final aims. Each of the two parties to the conflict seeks entirely different goals. The aim of the Arab States is Israel's destruction. Israel's aim is peaceful accommodation of itself in the Middle East. One side strives towards a situation in which the other side is to be eliminated; and the other side seeks to secure its mere existence, in peace and tranquility. In this respect, I know of no other conflict in the world comparable with the Arab-Israel conflict. There are a great number of conflicts and wars going on in the world today. Some of these arise from

territorial disputes, others from disputes over forms of government and regime. Some arise from the will of one people to conquer and dominate its neighbors. But a situation in which one nation or group of nations seeks to wipe out entirely its adversary is unique to the Arab-Israel conflict. The ultimate aim of the Arabs is extermination. Therefore, as long as this aim has not been achieved, they have to decide about an intermediate policy. They choose the policy of non-acceptance and non-recognition of Israel. Recognition, acceptance of Israel would be fundamentally in contradiction with their declared ultimate aim. Some of their leaders still believe that this is the stage of laying the necessary groundwork for the future. For the past twenty years we have witnessed an Arab policy of deliberately ignoring Israel's existence. Some of you may consider what I have been saying at best as exaggerated, at worst as biased, subjective propaganda. You might ask, is it possible today, in the mid-20th century, to destroy a nation? How is it possible that any state in our day and age could harbor so reckless a purpose?

Ladies and gentlemen, the experience of Jewish history has previously shown us how such a thing is possible: it is only thirty years since the Jewish people witnessed what was perhaps the most awful tragedy even in our long history. We saw how a demented dictator came to power in a great European nation, with its historic culture and traditions, and harbored just such a purpose—and carried it out. Some here tonight may remember the voices saying then that such a thing could never happen. Many, many people, Jew and Gentile alike, would not believe the reports when they first began to trickle through, of the elaborate machinery of systematic genocide set in motion. The reality turned out to be even more terrible than the reports. Six million were destroyed, methodically. Why? Because they were Jews; because as their luck had it, they didn't even have the chance to stand and fight back effectively.

It might be said that this could only happen under a Hitler, in the demented regime of Nazi Germany, that it could never happen again. I shan't go as far back as 1948, only back to the second half of May 1967. The armed forces of Egypt, Jordan, Syria and Iraq had concentrated along the length and breadth of Israel's borders. Hundreds of thousands of Arab troops were ready for battle, armed with the latest military equipment, tanks, planes, artillery and all the other weapons of destruction. The noose around our necks tightened. The plan was perfect, but the victim refused to cooperate, was determined to survive, to prevent his own destruction. Do we need to apologize for foiling our intended assassins? Can there be any doubt about what would have been our fate if the Arab armies had triumphed?—about what would have happened to us if we had been defeated? There is no need to cite the Egyptian President's statements of May 26, 28 and 30. What he said was quite clear and unequivocal. It was said to the world at large, over radio and television. This was only nine months ago, and I am sure that you all remember it well. We all recall the wave of sympathy and compassion for the Jewish people which swept the civilized world after the holocaust of World War II. We don't want any more postmortem sympathies. We came to Israel to reestablish an Israel society based on traditional Jewish values and progressive Western civilization. Our national and cultural self-determination have afforded us the conditions, the opportunity and the means of self-defense. We have demonstrated that we are as capable as any other people in this world of defending ourselves.

The developments leading up to the Six-Day War were sudden and dramatic. I doubt whether anyone at the end of April 1967

could have foreseen an outbreak at the beginning of June like that of the Six-Day War. We might well ask ourselves how so sudden a development was possible, and how it came about? Its origin lies in the reality with which we have lived for the past twenty years, since our Independence. The very same developments which led up to the Six-Day War can repeat themselves at any time, at any moment—as long as the policy of the Arab States remains belligerency, and as long as they remain unreconciled to the fact of Israel's existence, as long as their declared aim will be the destruction of Israel.

Any real and sincere effort to prevent war in the Middle East must first of all address itself to this problem. Israel seeks peace, with all her heart, but the basic condition for a real peace is mutual recognition and a common understanding. These are the guiding lines of Israel's every action and policy. When we affirm our policy of direct negotiations to settle all the problems at issue, this isn't some stubborn insistence on one particular course or tactic. Our insistence is that negotiations must be direct, between our neighbors and ourselves, whether it be in the presence or under the auspices of the U.N. representative. And this is no pointless obstinacy. How can real or lasting arrangements be concluded in any other way? The whole root of the evil is the Arab policy of non-reconciliation and non-recognition.

Any international approach acknowledging this Arab policy can only frustrate every possibility of getting at the roots of the Arab-Israel conflict. Any approach intimating international approval or endorsement of Arab refusal to recognize us, or allowing them to evade the basic necessity of reaching agreement with us directly—any such approach will fail to solve the tensions in the Middle East. It is not the right of a victor that we are claiming. All we ask, and claim is recognition as an equal party, in any solution. We have had our experience of arrangements made without direct negotiation. In 1957, the I.D.F. evacuated the Sinai Peninsula, on the strength of inadequate international arrangements. An international emergency force was established, and thirteen Maritime Powers guaranteed free passage in the Straits of Tiran. It took two days for that emergency force to vanish away. It is better to pass over in silence what became of the guarantee of the Maritime Powers. All who really and sincerely want peace must first and foremost do nothing to enable the Arabs to evade the basic essentials. Basic essentials mean Arab settlement with Israel of their outstanding differences.

We are well aware of the fact that the Arab-Israel conflict is intricate and complex. But we have had to fight three wars in the last twenty years. While we may have come out on the winning side, it isn't wars we want but peace. I have been a soldier all my life. I know how cruel and harsh war is, with its tragedy and bloodshed. The Six-Day War may appear to have been "a famous victory", and indeed it was. Our 830 dead and about 3,000 wounded may appear to have been a small price to pay. In proportion to the dimensions of the war and the forces involved, it wasn't a high price to pay for our survival. But this is not true in terms of any national calculation. 830 dead is a high proportion of our population. Our casualties in the Six-Day War were higher than the proportionate total of United States casualties in the Korean and Viet Nam War put together. And this was all in six days, not fifteen years. We do not seek wars, even if we know that we aren't going to be the losers. What we want is to prevent war, to deter our enemies from aggression against us, in the absence of peace.

Bitter experience has taught us that the only way to prevent war is through military, economic and political strength. We don't

want anyone else to fight our wars for us. Our citizens are ready, able and prepared to defend their lives and protect our national existence. The fact that the Arabs are 60 million and we 2½ million doesn't alarm us. The only thing that we ask of our friends throughout the world is to let us have the means, the equipment to defend ourselves.

The Arab States have the backing of a Great Power. This power has no inhibitions, moral or otherwise, in its unlimited support of the Arab States. It is pouring an abundance of weaponry, of very high quality, into the Arab States. They have thousands of their military advisors, instructors, and technicians in the Arab States. The Egyptian President has told the editor of LOOK Magazine that there are barely one thousand. This is far from the true figure, one of many inaccurate statements in the interview. The true figure is double and even triple that. The military presence of that World Power in the Middle East is an established fact. If Alexandria and Port Said are not described as military bases of that power, it is a mere matter of semantics. The permanent presence of that power's naval vessels in those harbors makes them bases in fact if not in name.

The question which the world must answer is whether to support the cause of war or the cause of peace, the cause of negotiation and settlement or the cause of non-recognition of a nation's right of very existence.

I should like to take this opportunity of expressing the appreciation of my country for the understanding and help we have had from the United States. I say so especially in regard of the United States Government's efforts to achieve a just and lasting peace in the Middle East, a policy set forward by President Johnson in his statement of June 19, 1967.

After twenty years of statehood, Israel's struggle is still for her very existence. But, we hope and believe that peace will come to the Middle East. The road to it might be a long one. We know that it would entail sacrifice, suffering and heavy burdens on us. We have no other choice. It is our belief that our cause is deserving of the support of the nations of the free world.

The New York Times Election Handbook

HON. RICHARD L. OTTINGER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 13, 1968

Mr. OTTINGER. Mr. Speaker, I have just read the New York Times Election Handbook for 1968 and enthusiastically commend it to the attention of my colleagues and the general public.

Once again, the New York Times has performed a genuine public service by presenting in concise, eminently readable form the issues, personalities, strategies and statistics that will be crucial in this election year.

Edited by Harold Faber, the Election Handbook opens with a cogent analysis of the political landscape by James Reston and progresses through sections on the candidates, the issues, party strategy, new political movements, polls, television, the role of computers, new voters, past elections and conventions, and State-by-State returns of previous elections. Contributing to these chapters are New York Times reporters Tom Wicker, Max Frankel, A. H. Raskin, Warren Weaver, Jr., Alvin Shuster, Edwin L. Dale,

Jr., Gene Roberts, Joseph Loftus, Eileen Shanahan, Ben A. Franklin, Richard Madden and Lee Kanner.

This little book, published by Signet at a price well within the reach of everyone, is a significant contribution to the continuing effort to better inform the American people about the issues and candidates. I hope it will be widely read.

Israel Today

REMARKS

OF

HON. L. MENDEL RIVERS

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 13, 1968

Mr. RIVERS. Mr. Speaker, the following speech by Anthony Harrigan, the distinguished associate editor of the Charleston, S.C., News and Courier needs no preface from me. It is as lucid a statement as I have ever heard. I hope the Congress will take his remarks under consideration, for they set forth wise guidelines for us to follow:

SPEECH BY ANTHONY HARRIGAN, ASSOCIATE EDITOR OF THE CHARLESTON, S.C., NEWS & COURIER, AT THE JEWISH COMMUNITY CENTER, FEBRUARY 4, 1968, ON THE OCCASION OF THE 23D ANNUAL MEETING OF THE CHARLESTON JEWISH WELFARE FUND

Distinguished guests, ladies and gentlemen: It is a pleasure to be here this evening.

I won't present a travelogue covering my recent trip to Israel and the new territories. Instead, I prefer to explore with you the situation facing Israel now and in the months ahead and to discuss some of the possibilities. It is, I am sure you realize, a very critical situation.

To begin, let me say that the founders of Israel—the people who from the 1880's onward had a vision of a Jewish homeland in historic Palestine—had a goal toward which they could work. Zionism set an objective for the pioneers of Israel. But Zionism does not, today, tell the Israelis how they can keep their nation. Year by year, indeed day by day, the Israelis are discovering for themselves what they must do to protect the nation that has behind it 20 years of political sovereignty and thousands of years of religious belief.

Nationhood is a remarkable thing, as we Americans know. It is a continual unfolding of danger and opportunity, of challenge, crisis and the necessity for decision-making. No set of rules covers all the situations a country encounters. It is necessary to make up many of the rules as one goes along.

This statement is especially applicable to Israel's situation today. Before last June, Israel was a narrow sliver of land at the eastern end of the Mediterranean with an extension reaching through desertland to the Gulf of Aqaba. Today, Israel occupies the Sinai Desert, the west bank of the Jordan and the Syrian Heights. It is a country with greatly extended borders.

Israel, as we know, did not acquire these new borders through any militancy of its own. The outline of Israel today is the result of the Arab attack. The Arabs who hoped to drive the Israelis into the sea have had to yield large territories.

First of all, the new territories serve as a buffer against surprise attack. No longer

are Israeli cities under the gun. But Israel is paying a high price for the security that buffer zones provide. It faces the danger of war from within, especially in the Gaza Strip and on the west bank of the Jordan. There has been an upsurge of sabotage in the Gaza Strip in the last month with terrorist grenade throwing in the city of Gaza. It was necessary last month for Israeli authorities to reimpose a curfew in Gaza.

The sabotage groups in Gaza have three aims: to frighten Gazaites into boycotting the Israelis, to revive cells of the Palestine Liberation Organization which disintegrated after the Six Day War, and to inflict damage on the Israeli army units.

On the Jordan, fire incidents are frequent. Tanks, artillery and even aircraft are engaged. In short, the Arab-Israeli war continues, albeit at a lower level than last June. In mid-January, eight guerrilla groups met in Cairo and formed a joint command to direct operations against Israel. In Egypt, the military authorities are dispersing air defenses and building new airfields. The Soviets have a reported 7,000 advisers with the Egyptian army, compared with 500 to 600 last June. Eighty percent of the Egyptian aircraft losses have been replaced with new Russian planes.

Nor is this the limit of Israel's danger. France, which formerly supplied Israel with the jet aircraft that provided the margin for swift victory, has refused to sell planes Israel ordered and paid for. President De Gaulle has made a very anti-Israel and anti-Semitic public statement, terming Israel "a warlike state determined to expand." He reportedly may sell the jets, which Israel ordered, to Iraq, thereby further upsetting the power balance in the Middle East. Lastly, the Russians have a powerful naval task force tied up at Egyptian ports. Meanwhile, Israel is exposed to pressure from the United Nations to withdraw to pre-June frontiers where it again would be vulnerable to surprise attack by its Arab neighbors.

Because of this grim situation, Israel this year will have to spend \$600 million on defense. Expenditures for national security will consume two-thirds of all the taxes paid by Israelis—a terrible burden. Little is left for the internal development work that needs to be done. The human price is equally high. Thousands of young Israelis have to remain mobilized when, otherwise, they would be studying or engaged in industry or agriculture. It is well to bear these facts in mind and dwell less on the spectacular victories of last summer. The struggle exists now and will continue far into the future. Certainly, it should not be spoken of in the past tense.

If the military pressures against Israel are intense and growing sharper, the diplomatic and ideological pressures are equally great. The Arab states have learned something from their defeat, and that is that they must be more sophisticated in their political offensives against Israel. They don't speak now of pushing the Israelis into the sea. Instead they ask for the de-Zionization of Israel.

King Hussein of Jordan adopted the new, sophisticated stance in a speech this winter at Georgetown University. He said that the Arab countries "have no Jewish problem, only a Zionist problem." He urged what he called a de-racism of Israel and the assimilation of Jews as citizens into a strictly Eastern society. "If Jews and Arabs are to live in peace," he said, "The alien quality of Israel must be diminished."

This approach, which conceals the real objective of obliteration of Israel, is used by commentators who are Arabist in outlook. Thus Robert Stephens of the *London Observer* recently stated: "If there ever was a serious idea of liquidating Israel in the sense of physical extermination or expulsions of

the 2,250,000 Israeli Jews, it has now been dropped. So has the idea of ending the separate existence of Israel as a state by war." One would have to be very naive to accept that statement.

Mr. Stephens, a rather typical left of center British commentator, reveals his real outline in another dispatch from the Middle East. He spoke of the "pathological ruthlessness" of the Israelis and described the country's mood as a "kind of mixture of Joshua and Kipling."

Mr. Stephens also argued for a new partition of historic Palestine to give Israel an even smaller territory than it had when the state was formed.

What the Arab states and their apologists now propose, in arguing for "de-Zionization," sounds gentler than liquidation. But as a matter of fact it would amount almost to the same thing. At best, the Israelis simply would be given an opportunity to occupy a kind of extended Jewish quarter in Palestine, to live as a tolerated minority in an Arab-dominated Middle East. This is the supposedly generous offer of co-existence that the Arab states hold out to Israel. It is nothing more than a semantic trick, a play upon words.

It is unthinkable that Israel would accept permanent peace in the Middle East on such terms, for it would be the peace of surrender. Yet one can be sure that acceptance of such terms will be—indeed are—being urged on Israel. If Israel will only give up territory, the line goes, it can have its existence accepted. If it will only become another Middle East state, and reject a role as a refuge, the pro-Arabists say—it will be tolerated.

Yet Israel could seek territorial acceptance on such terms only by turning its back on its origins and on its continuing purpose as a homeland for the dispersed and homeless. It could undergo de-Zionization, as King Hussein urged, only at the price of becoming a state with no more of a moral objective than, let us say, Syria. Neither the moral convictions of Israelis nor the logic of the country's development will permit such a betrayal of its historic role.

The logic of Israel's development, I suspect, lies with retention of its new territories, or at least a large part of them. The Syrian Heights, for example, are essential to Israel's security. To ask Israelis to give them up, after the epochal winning of them in the Six Day War, would be like asking Americans to give Bunker Hill back to the British or turning Texas back to the Mexicans.

As for the lands west of the Jordan, much of that must be retained for strategic reasons. The former Jordanian bulge into Israel exposed the State of Israel to a sudden Arab breakthrough. The population problem west of the Jordan is indeed a vexing one with tangled rights that will require long and careful study. One of the most difficult problems Israel has to resolve is the question of the Arab population within. The Arab birthrate is higher than the Israeli birthrate, and Israel has to bear this factor in mind in determining which territories to retain. The nation cannot be rendered unstable by embodying a large, hostile population. But it is possible that a semi-autonomous state may be created west of the Jordan that would be a successful solution to the problem. Ultimately, if Egyptian pressure were to die down, all of Jordan might become part of a commonwealth system under Israeli leadership. But such a plan lies far in the future. For the time being, Israel has to concentrate on achieving reasonable physical security.

In determining policy on border questions, Israel has to look to the country's total needs—to its role as a refuge. Two waves of refugees have found a haven in Israel—leaving aside original pioneers, there was a wave of settlers who came from Europe after World

War II, and the wave of Jews from North Africa and the Yemen—the so-called Oriental Jews. There is yet another wave on the horizon—the Jews of Russia.

The three million Jews of Russia one day may be permitted to leave for Israel. Indeed they may be compelled to depart the Soviet Union in one of the periodic outbreaks of anti-Jewish feeling that characterizes that nation. Israel must prepare for their coming. It must have the space that they will require for settlement. This is one reason why the extended frontiers of Israel must, in the main, be regarded as permanent frontiers. Three million additional Israelis could not be crowded into the space of Israel as it existed prior to June 5, 1967.

The Arabs, for their part, undoubtedly will argue that refugees from abroad have no right to additional lands in the Middle East. Yet that assertion should not be allowed to stand unexamined. In the first place, the Arabs are newcomers to historic Palestine compared to the Jewish people. The Arabs did not enter Palestine until the 7th century of the Christian era when they swept out of the Arabian desert. The west bank of the Jordan, for example, is part of the land that was promised to the Jews at the dawn of human history. Moreover, much of the land on the west bank and in Sinai is empty land, ruined by centuries of bad management under Arab rule. The Arab population is nomadic and does not occupy land or improve it. The Israelis, on the other hand—to use that cliché which also is a great truth—have made the desert bloom. They have settled the land—the unused land—and given it new life. Much more of the unused land of the area could serve as homes for those who are dispersed in Russia and elsewhere.

Indeed, depressing as is the thought, who is so rash as to predict that persecution has ended elsewhere for all time? French Jews reportedly are deeply concerned over Gen. De Gaulle's attitude. Around the turn of the century anti-Semitism was a terrible force in France. It is not inconceivable that the half million French Jews one day will want and need a refuge. This contingency cannot be ignored, given the history of persecution. In this connection, I call to your attention an article by Prof. Harold Kaplan in the January 1 *New Leader* in which he mentions the possible danger of French missiles being directed at Israel.

Now let us turn to the most critical element in the immediate situation facing Israel. This is the question of aerial rearmament. No one questions Israel's continuing will to win and military qualities if a French-Arab-Israeli war breaks out. But what will be the state of its Air Force that proved so decisive last June? Israel's air force has not improved since last June. Forty aircraft were lost by the Israelis in that war. Several have been lost since that time in accidents and incidents on the Jordanian frontier and around Suez. Israel's most important task, as defined by the *Jewish Observer* and *Middle East Review*—is resupply of sophisticated jet fighters. Israel simply must have new jets if it is to defeat another Arab assault. The Arabs have the finest Russian MIG-21s in good supply. However, Israel thus far has been unable to purchase any jets. France has refused to deliver the ordered planes. Britain hasn't any truly modern planes that could be sold to Israel. Neither Japan nor South Africa produce aircraft that are suitable. The Swedes refuse to sell their excellent fighters. Only one free world nation has the planes that spell security to the Israelis: the United States.

The United States has agreed to deliver 40 or more Skyhawk fighter-bombers. But these are older model aircraft that need fast interceptors for protecting.

What Israel needs to deal with the MIG-21 threat is the American-built Phantom F-4 fighter—the finest fighter in the world. But

the U.S. has not yet agreed to do more than to continually appraise Israel's military situation.

I suggest that the sale of Phantoms to Israel is the key to the success of Israel if there is another round of war in 1968. I also suggest that the sale could be made too late. Putting an advanced jet into operational service with an air force is not like stepping into a new automobile at the dealer's and driving away. Even if the Israeli air force gets the Phantoms, it will take time to teach the Israeli pilots to fly them—to "transition" them as the fliers say. Crewman will have to master the specialized electronic and hydraulic systems of the Phantom. Thus Israel can't afford to wait endlessly for the aircraft. Every week of delay in getting the Phantoms increases the danger to Israel—reduces its margin of safety.

The resourcefulness of the Israelis is remarkable, of course. I cite one example. With the sale of new military aircraft restricted under government orders, Israeli military representatives in the United States recently carried out an extraordinary operation. It was lawful but wholly unexpected. What happened is that Israel sent three aircraft technicians to the U.S. to buy junked airplane parts. From the parts they bought, they assembled four C-97 Stratocruisers. Volunteer aircrews were obtained, and the planes were flown to Israel. The planes had Boeing wheels, Pratt-Whitney engines, Douglas propellers, Lockheed fuel tanks and parts from dozens of different manufacturers. Almost anyone would have said that the planes could not have been put together, couldn't stay in the air and certainly couldn't cross the Atlantic. But they were assembled and flown to Israel, where today they are transports serving the Israeli armed forces. The impossible was achieved through skill and determination. I might mention here that this kind of foraging through junk piles for aircraft is a vital necessity for the Six Day war cost Israel \$700 million.

Israel's defense, of course, is not simply a matter of improved military hardware. The country is deeply involved in the complexities of the cold war. The Soviet Union regards Israel as an outpost of the West in the Middle East, or Western Asia as that region is more accurately described. Israel, to be sure, is such an outpost. Its society is light years away from the societies that exist elsewhere in that region, whether in revolutionary Egypt or Saudi Arabia with its absolute monarchy.

We have to bear in mind that the Russians intend to make a very deep penetration of the Middle East, fulfilling a dream of the Czars. In the past, they were prevented from moving into the Middle East because the British were dominant there. Now the British have abandoned the great base at Aden at the mouth of the Red Sea. By 1971 or earlier, the British will withdraw their forces from the Persian Gulf. Unless the United States fills the power vacuum in that region, the Russians surely will step in.

And if that happens, Israel will be encircled by much more dangerous power than is found today in the Arab states. So I repeat: what the United States does to increase its power and influence in the Persian Gulf and the Arabian Sea will have a vital bearing on the safety of Israel.

A journalist would be foolish to attempt to predict when the next blow-up will take place, but every sign indicates that it is coming. Late last month, the Egyptians tried—unsuccessfully—to reopen the Suez Canal unilaterally for navigation. The Israelis resisted this try, but it may be attempted again. And what if next time the Egyptians try to open the canal with direct Russian assistance?

Meanwhile, the propaganda war against Israel is being heated up. We don't detect

this in the United States, but anyone who follows the British papers discovers the extent to which the Israelis are subjected to criticism from sources sympathetic to the Egyptians. The left-wing British press is full of stories charging the Israelis with repression. Israel is accused of ordering reprisals and collective punishments in the Gaza Strip, for example. But what these Arab-line articles omit is the terrorism directed against the Israeli forces—the minings and grenade-throwing. The Israelis have been subjected to countless acts of provocation, but they have not ordered the death penalty for bomb-throwers, which they certainly would be justified in doing.

The British left-wing press continually harps on the subject of Arabs being driven out of their lands. But nothing is said about the Jews who lived in the Arabs Middle East and who have been murdered, jailed and stripped of all property. The Jewish Community in Libya, which goes back to Phoenician times, has dwindled to fewer than 100 persons. Egypt, which had 80,000 Jews two decades ago, now reportedly has less than 700 Jews. Of these, virtually all the males are in jail. Consider the situation in Iraq: 20 years ago there were 120,000 Jews in the country.

Today there are about 2,500.

The remaining Jews face terrible hardships. They are imprisoned, reportedly tortured and otherwise abused. When the June war broke out, Jews in North African Arab countries were terrorized by mobs. Jewish-owned businesses were sacked. In Iraq, Jews may not sell their property or engage in business. The same situation reportedly prevails in Syria. Yet this story isn't fully told; instead the world gets a picture of Arab misery and dislocation.

It is a very grim situation that Israel faces. The founders of the State of Israel knew they would face adversity. But they hoped for a land that would be peaceful and a center of learning and culture. The learning exists in Israel, but the country as a whole is compelled to lead a garrison existence. The talents that Israel possesses and that would be made available for the largely talentless Middle Eastern countries has to be devoted to survival needs. Manpower and brainpower has to be devoted to the skills of defense, to piloting jets, driving tanks and other military operations. The Zionist pioneers could not have foreseen that Israel's security would depend on superior aerial tactics, on missile defenses, and on secret naval operations. Yet such are the tasks of this page of Israel's history. Before it can fulfill its founders' highest dreams, it must again and again demonstrate its will to survive. The Arabs mistakenly believe that the Israelis are like some of the military adventurers of the past. They hold that the Arab world has only to be adamant, and, finally, the Israelis will return across the seas whence they came. But the Arabs forget one thing: they forget that the Israelis aren't colonists. The Israelis will never leave, one can be sure, because they are at home. It is as simple as that, nevertheless, the Arabs remain intransigent. Only time and successful Israeli resistance will force them to face reality. Here in the United States we should understand that peace cannot be secured by outside forces trying to work out a so-called compromise solution.

The Arabs won't be satisfied with a border adjustment. They seek the liquidation of Israel, nothing less, no matter what guarded terms they use to describe this liquidation. And the United States would ill-serve the cause of peace if it advocated a settlement that encouraged the revolutionary Arab states in the belief that they can triumph over the Israelis on a step-by-step basis, nullifying the Israeli military victory through political extortion.

Israel has gone through a great triumph and is moving toward a fresh ordeal. That ordeal may be prevented, and certainly would be eased, if the Israelis get the equipment they need for defense. To marshal understanding of Israel's critical defense situation, this is the most important task to be accomplished in the months ahead in order to preserve peace in the Middle East.

Pennsylvania Mourns Loss of Edward H. Litchfield

HON. WILLIAM S. MOORHEAD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 13, 1968

Mr. MOORHEAD. Mr. Speaker, the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, and particularly my home city of Pittsburgh, suffered a severe loss March 8 when Edward H. Litchfield, an inventive businessman and a former chancellor of the University of Pittsburgh, died with his wife, two children and mother in the crash of their plane.

Dr. Litchfield had a brilliant career in business and political administration, but Pennsylvanians and Pittsburghers, myself among them, came to know and admire him best during his decade of service as chancellor of the University of Pittsburgh.

As the Pittsburgh Post-Gazette pointed out in its March 12 editorial, Dr. Litchfield was "an idealistic and imaginative educator" who "strove tirelessly to raise the academic standards and improve the facilities of the university."

Under leave to extend my remarks, I insert the Post-Gazette editorial at this point in the RECORD and commend it to the attention of my colleagues as a fitting tribute to Dr. Litchfield, whose life was devoted to a tireless pursuit of excellence.

The editorial follows:

[From the Pittsburgh (Pa.) Post-Gazette, Mar. 12, 1968]

EDWARD H. LITCHFIELD

Edward H. Litchfield, former chancellor of the University of Pittsburgh, has been termed a controversial figure. This is another way of saying that he was a man of positive convictions which he attempted to translate into positive action. His death in a plane crash on March 8 deprives the world of a vigorous creative spirit.

The academic and business career of Dr. Litchfield was a stunning refutation of the barren maxim "those who can do, those who can't, teach." His reserved manner did not suggest the surging energies which carried him to triumphs in the fields of education, business and political administration. His brilliant service as director of civil affairs in post-war West Germany elicited rare praise from the sagacious General Lucius D. Clay. His counsels were equally prized by hardheaded business executives. But Edward H. Litchfield will be chiefly remembered as an idealistic and imaginative educator.

The decade during which Dr. Litchfield served as chancellor of the University of Pittsburgh was a fruitful era of solid achievement and educational innovation. He strove tirelessly to raise the academic standards and improve the facilities of the university. He expanded the faculty and increased salaries in order to improve the quality of instruction. If Dr. Litchfield had a fault as an

administrator, it was his over-vaulting ambition to raise Pitt to a new eminence in the academic firmament. His expansion program was perhaps unrealistic for the operating costs of the university soared far beyond its financial resources.

Dr. Litchfield resigned a disappointed man. Death restores a perspective often lost in the turbulence of events. His reach unquestionably exceeded his grasp, but none will deny that his pursuit of excellence has enriched the University of Pittsburgh. Those aware of his devotion to the cause of higher education will honor his memory.

News and Freedom

HON. JAMES H. (JIMMY) QUILLEN

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 13, 1968

Mr. QUILLEN. Mr. Speaker, the following editorial, which recently appeared in the Johnson City, Tenn., Press-Chronicle presents some very interesting and thought-provoking remarks on the recent controversial ruling of the American Bar Association on the distribution of crime news.

Because I believe so strongly in the freedom of the press, I wish to call this editorial to the attention of my colleagues and the readers of the RECORD:

NEWS AND FREEDOM

Is it up to the American Bar Association to decide what information should or should not be released about pending criminal cases?

The bar's ruling clique thinks it is, but we firmly believe the people of America think otherwise.

Adverse reaction has come swiftly to the bar's presumptuous proposals (the Reardon Report) to act as self-appointed censor of the press. Typical is a comment by Sen. John L. McClellan of Arkansas, himself a former prosecuting attorney.

"I believe," Mr. McClellan told the U.S. Senate last week, "that such restrictions amount to a serious and unwarranted erosion of a vital freedom and would only invite future restrictions that could shackle the press severely and deny the public the free flow on information to which it is entitled. A defendant's right to a fair trial need not overlap another basic freedom—freedom of the press."

"Both these rights are basic and very rarely come into conflict. This is because the news media have generally been alert to their responsibilities and have many times demonstrated an interest in protecting a defendant's right—especially in cases of sensational crimes."

"All rights are largely dependent upon free dissemination of news. We cannot have a free country if citizens are not free to find out and if they are not free to know."

We couldn't have said it better ourselves, Senator!

Additional Appropriation for the Office of Economic Opportunity

HON. RICHARD L. OTTINGER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 13, 1968

Mr. OTTINGER. Mr. Speaker, I regret that I was not in Washington when this

legislation was first introduced and thus I was not able to be among the original cosponsors of legislation to make an additional appropriation of \$200 million available to the Office of Economic Opportunity to support badly needed summer recreation, education, employment, and other projects.

This summer may well be a critical time in our fight against poverty and deprivation in this Nation. The glaring deficiencies revealed by the Report of the National Advisory Commission on Civil Disorders cry out for positive action. Yet, at this time of crisis, the Office of Economic Opportunity is faced with cutbacks that require curtailment of the very—established—program that can reach people effectively and help them to help themselves.

According to OEO, the estimated nationwide impact of these budget cuts are as follows:

Headstart will accommodate 13,000 fewer children in its all-year program this year than it did in the past year. The all-year total is about 200,000.

Legal services will provide 60,000 fewer cases.

The rural loan program will give assistance to 3,000 fewer families this year than had been originally planned.

The number of Job Corps trainees will be cut from 41,000 to 37,000. Four thousand trainees will be put on administrative leave with the privilege of reentry when space is available. The plan is to eventually cut the Corps to 32,000 through attrition.

Neighborhood Youth Corps will operate at a level of 400,000 members, a cut of 170,000.

Health services will continue to be offered at 41 centers, which is the current level; but nine centers scheduled for operation this year will not be opened.

Programs for the elderly, the rural poor, and family planning and housing will not be expanded.

It would be pennywise and pound foolish to frustrate expectation, deny hope, and destroy confidence by permitting these cuts to stand at this crucial moment.

The \$200 million that this legislation would make available is not extra funding. It is merely bringing the appropriation for these programs up to the level which this Congress authorized for OEO in fiscal 1968.

I am proud to join in sponsoring this bill and I urge all my colleagues to join in this modest effort to help alleviate the misery of the poor and start in correcting longstanding ills that, if uncorrected, will threaten the very fabric of our lives.

The text of this bill follows:

H.R. 15946

A bill making a supplemental appropriation to carry out the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964 during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1968

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That there is hereby appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of \$200,000,000 to supply supple-

mental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1968, to carry out the provisions of the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964.

Utah Voice of Democracy Winner

HON. LAURENCE J. BURTON

OF UTAH

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 13, 1968

Mr. BURTON of Utah. Mr. Speaker, I commend the Veterans of Foreign Wars on the public service they render in sponsoring each year the Voice of Democracy contest, and I submit the fine essay by Ted Dunn Adams, of Layton, Utah, this year's contest winner, from the State of Utah. Ted is one of my constituents, and I am proud of him. His essay reflects the clear thinking of a young American who recognizes his future and present responsibilities, and is preparing himself to meet them. In an age of dissension, rebellion, and doubt, Ted's essay is very refreshing.

The essay follows:

FREEDOM'S CHALLENGE

(By Ted Dunn Adams)

Three Americans were out sightseeing in a Soviet city two years ago. One was Senator Henry M. Jackson, the second was a U.S. Army officer, and the third a Russian-speaking official of the U.S. Embassy. It was a unique day for them. In their tour of the U.S.S.R., they'd managed for once to shake off their Kremlin-appointed guide.

As they walked down the street, a young man suddenly accosted them. He was about thirty years old, quite well-dressed for a Russian, with the look of a professional person.

"Are you Englishmen?" the young man said in Russian.

The Embassy man replied, "No we're Americans."

"Americans! That's even better," the young man said excitedly. "I've wanted so long to talk to an American."

"Why?" the Embassy man asked.

"Because you Americans are such lucky people. You can read what you want, hear what you want, say what you want. We can't."

The young man peered nervously over his shoulder to see if anyone was listening. He knew he was risking his life to speak like that. "Always remember," he went on, "They aren't fooling us about you Americans. We want this to be your kind of world." Then he walked away, fast.¹

You and I, each are American citizens—to most of us this blessing of living in a democratic land was given us by birth. Many members of our family, and those before us had to face great difficulties for this blessing, even to the point of death! It seems that we are merely the youth of this country—the inheritors of the past.

But in a sense, don't we also face great responsibilities? Don't we, the inheritors of this great democracy, face the task of preserving that of the future? Will we not soon be facing the same responsibilities, and perhaps more, than our people have faced for 190 years?

Will it not soon be our voices that will ring out from the Senate and House—our Courts—and Churches?

And, will it not soon be our names that will appear on the ballots on election day?

¹"The Man in the Street," an experience of Senator Jackson's as written in the book, "The Day I Was Proudest To Be an American," re-revised by Janice Woelfle.

Will we not soon be the teachers and educators of our universities and schools?

Will it not be we who will manage our countries large industries and be asked to defend our country against Communism and other aggression?

Will we not be the great generals and commanders defending this land of heritage?

And, will we not soon have the job of sitting in on trials and giving fair justice to the man being tried?

Will we not be the builders of our roads, our towns and communities—the policeman, the mailman, the farmer, the bishop, and many more?

And, last, will we not be the parents of our children?

Freedom is our challenge. Will we be able to teach our children of their great inheritance of freedom that we have fought for in order that they might be born in a country of freedom built through the guidance of God?

Will not each of these responsibilities and more be ours for the preservation of the future?

And if a person asks, "True, these responsibilities may be ours, but just what will I gain from the struggle? Is the price of freedom worth paying?" Simply reply to this person by asking him if he knew freedom was:

An education for everyone, a land of less want and misery, a land where men are given unconquerable right of religion, a land of freedom and opportunity beyond that of any other. But even more than this—ask him if he knew freedom was the smile on a small boy's face when his little league team wins the championship, and of the drive through the beautiful country at any time one pleases in his own automobile.

Ask if he knew it was being able to decide for yourself the profession you enjoy and the opportunity to advance in it, or that Sunday journey to the church or the annual Thanksgiving dinner and even that warm handshake of the President as he wades through the cheerful crowds.

Ask him if he knew freedom is America!!! And I'm sure this person would reply that there is no greater price to be paid for than that of our freedom.

America is in a perplexing period of change. We seem to be running in all directions at once—but we are running.

How will Americans act and react to a new set of circumstances? We know from our past some of the things we will do. We will make mistakes; we always have. But from our beginning, in hindsight at least our social direction is clear. We have moved to become one people out of many. We have failed sometimes, taken wrong paths, paused for renewal, filled our bellies and licked our wounds; but we have never slipped back. And I maintain America never will slip back as long as I, and millions of other young Americans like me, take pride in the statement: "I am an American."

The Civil Service Retirement and Disability Fund Should Be Placed on a Sound Financial Basis

HON. JOE L. EVINS

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 13, 1968

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, the Subcommittee on Independent Offices and Department of Housing and Urban Development Appropriations, which I am honored to serve as chairman, has for a number of years urged

that appropriate action should be taken by the Congress to strengthen the civil service retirement and disability fund. This fund has now accumulated deficiencies or unfunded liabilities estimated to be in excess of \$50 billion. This deficiency has grown by \$32.4 billion in the last 10 years, and the rate is increasing. The growing deficit in the fund is a cause for serious concern.

There are some 2,697,200 employees of the Federal Government who are members of and regularly pay into the civil service retirement system. Currently, more than 825,000 retired employees and survivors receive benefits totaling over \$1.8 billion annually from the fund.

The balance in the fund as of June 1, 1967, was \$17.7 billion. Annual receipts currently are \$2.8 billion and annual disbursements are about \$1.9 billion.

While receipts into the fund are greater than current disbursements, unless corrective measures are taken the fund will be paying out more in future years than is being taken in—by 1974, which is only 6 years away.

During fiscal year 1968, it is estimated that the deficiency or unfunded liability will increase by approximately \$3 billion to \$51,708,022,000 on June 30, 1968. The rate of growth of the unfunded liability of the retirement fund requires that the Congress develop a sounder plan of the financing system.

The current deficiencies are caused primarily by the rate of payment which is considered insufficient by both Federal employees and the Federal Government.

Certainly, it seems to be in the best interest of our Federal employees and the Federal Government to require a higher level of contribution from both to the fund—and thus insure the future soundness of the fund.

The House Post Office and Civil Service Committee is currently considering proposals to provide more adequate financing for retirement benefits to arrest and control this growth of unfunded liabilities.

It is in the best interest of the Congress, the Federal Government, and the more than 3 million active and retired Federal employees and survivors that steps be taken to place the civil service retirement fund on a sound financial basis.

President Johnson's Attack on Noise Pollution

HON. FRANK M. CLARK

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 13, 1968

Mr. CLARK. Mr. Speaker, the President's conservation message is the first of its kind to place the problem of noise abatement in context as a major element of the American environment.

Millions of Americans have become so conditioned to a background of surface and air traffic sounds that they hardly notice them. Perhaps this is to the good; it represents an adjustment to an in-

creasingly stressful part of our lives. But these noises are, in many areas, more than a lulling background sound, more than even a mere annoyance. People who live near jet airports and immediately adjoining heavily traveled truck routes are complaining that the enjoyment of an evening at home has become a seldom thing. Conversations must be suspended, music cannot be appreciated, outdoor entertaining is out of the question.

In certain areas where sonic boom is a particular problem, structural damage to dwellings and even to geologic formations has become an all too common phenomenon.

By recognizing noise as a rising threat to the quality of life for Americans in all kinds of neighborhoods and at all levels of the economic social ladder, President Johnson has given hope to those of us who believe this is not an unavoidable price of advanced civilizations. In fact, it is controllable by man, and we must press further to develop the institutions that can bring it under human control.

Mass Transportation Problems

HON. EDWARD J. PATTEN

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 13, 1968

Mr. PATTEN. Mr. Speaker, the President, in a recent message to Congress, recommended a reorganization plan that would transfer mass transit activities from the Department of Housing and Urban Development—HUD—to the Department of Transportation—DOT.

If Congress does not reject the plan by about April 27, 1968, the transfer will become official without requiring passage of legislation. I support the plan, because it is necessary, sound, and practical, and would improve and intensify the attack against mounting mass transportation problems facing our cities.

One of the reasons this attack has not made the expected progress is because mass transit programs are not concentrated in one Federal department. Creation of the new Department of Transportation should have included all transportation activities. By excluding mass transit programs, a really concentrated and effective attack becomes almost impossible to achieve.

If the recommended switch is made from HUD to DOT, only a few mass transit functions would remain in HUD, such as some planning and research. Ideally, even these functions should be transferred to DOT, but HUD officials feel they are a necessary part of city planning.

For years—especially in the postwar period—cities have been plagued with serious mass transportation problems. Some progress has been made, but a great deal more remains to be done. And it must be done before the crisis stage is reached—and some believe that it has reached such a stage.

Passenger train runs have been drastically reduced, fares have increased con-

siderably, and traffic congestion in cities and on highways, has reached appalling levels. Despite this dark picture, there is hope for the future, and eventually, resolution of urban transportation problems.

Today, approximately 70 percent of the American people live in cities and the percentage will increase in the future. But unless we succeed in providing fast, convenient and economical transportation in urban areas—as well as resolving other serious urban problems—the shocking decline of the cities will continue until they are virtually abandoned.

Northwest Committee for Democracy in Greece

HON. BROCK ADAMS

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 13, 1968

Mr. ADAMS. Mr. Speaker, I wish to enter into the RECORD the remarks of the Northwest Committee for Democracy in Greece:

NORTHWEST COMMITTEE FOR DEMOCRACY IN GREECE

On March 12, 1947, at a joint session of Congress, President Harry S. Truman used the following phrases in proposing United States aid to Greece.

"At the present moment in world history nearly every nation must choose between alternative ways of life. . . . One way of life is based upon the will of the majority, and is distinguished by free institutions, representative government, free elections, guarantees of individual liberty, freedom of speech and religion, and freedom from political oppression. The second way of life is based upon the will of a minority forcibly imposed upon the majority. It relies upon terror and oppression, a controlled press and radio, fixed elections, and the suppression of personal freedoms."

On March 12, 1968, the description of Greece is all too close to what Truman called the second way of life. The present military regime is obviously the will of a minority forcibly imposed upon the majority. Perhaps it does not yet rely on extremes of terror, but it proclaims jauntily its readiness to rely upon oppression. The regime has arrested, imprisoned or driven from Greece, every journalist who showed the slightest independence of mind. It controls the remaining puppet press absolutely. It has not given itself the trouble of fixing elections; it finds it simpler to do without them. It taps telephone lines, opens correspondence, invades private gatherings, and by arbitrary arrest and imprisonment, it makes meaningless even the concept of personal freedom.

This is Greece today. No amount of talk about a possible constitution in the ever more distant future can change these present facts. The well-publicized release of three or four well-known figures must not make us forget that a thousand times as many remain without trial—often without even the formality of an accusation—crowded together on waterless islands in the Aegean Sea, at the pleasure of the regime.

It is deplorable that the United States has given such support as we already have to this band of military adventurers, but why should we continue to add to it? There is no grave external threat now as there was in 1947. The present threat to the freedom, to the economic development, to the very life of Greece is internal: it is the military regime

itself. Let the United States renew the spirit of the Truman doctrine, and end all military support to these clear examples of the totalitarian way of life.

VASILIKI DWYER,
Chairman, Northwest Committee for Democracy in Greece.

Kinuta Church Appeal for Peace in Vietnam

HON. ROBERT W. KASTENMEIER

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 13, 1968

Mr. KASTENMEIER. Mr. Speaker, from time to time we in Congress receive memorable letters from others than our constituents. I recently received a letter from a church group in Tokyo, Japan, with a request that it be brought to the attention of the President and officials of our Government. This letter was signed by Reverend Asano, along with 61 members of the Kinuta Church congregation. I was most happy to forward this letter to the President and now include my letter to the President along with the text of the statement of the church group and its transmittal letter in the RECORD:

MARCH 12, 1968.

The PRESIDENT,
The White House,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: I am enclosing a letter I have received from the Pastor and Members of the Kinuta Church in Tokyo, Japan with a request from Katsuo Mitsui that I bring it to your attention.

In view of the many opinions tendered you from day to day, it might be difficult to give these comments special consideration. Yet, America in the past has derived its strength and vitality from the fact that we trace our heritage to peoples of many lands. Today, America's policies reach into the lives of these peoples and many from other nations have felt the need to express their thoughts to us over what they view as the consequences of our policies.

In this spirit, recognizing the common bond between our heritage and the peoples of the world and the great implications of our present policies for all mankind, I respectfully urge you to read and reflect on the opinions contained in the letter from Pastor Junichi Asano and the members of the Kinuta Christian Church. The effect of our Vietnam policies as seen by our Asian friends who have known the ravages of war and who are immediately affected by developments on the Asian continent deserve your personal and careful evaluation.

I appreciate your consideration of the comments and any reply you can provide will be greatly appreciated.

Sincerely,

ROBERT W. KASTENMEIER,
Member of Congress.

[Enclosure.]

TOKYO, March 4, 1968.

Mr. ROBERT W. KASTENMEIER,
Arlington, Va.

DEAR Mr. KASTENMEIER: Mrs. Reiko Kitadai in Washington, D.C. wrote to us that we could send our appeal for peace in Vietnam to you and that you would be kind enough to deliver it to President Johnson or leaders in the U.S. government.

I am enclosing Rev. Asano's appeal along with the signatures of the members of Kinuta Church. For the past two years since

the bombing of North Vietnam Rev. Asano has been appealing to the American people for peace in Vietnam so that our prayer for peace will filter into the minds of the American people and by that they will be encouraged. Now he is very grateful that a chance is given through you to appeal to President Johnson directly, or to leaders in the government.

We hope that your effort and ours will bear some fruit. Thank you indeed for your very kind offer.

Sincerely yours,

KATSUO MITSUI.

TOKYO, JAPAN,
February 19, 1968.

President LYNDON JOHNSON,
The White House,
Washington, D.C.

MY DEAR PRESIDENT JOHNSON: As an Asian and as a Christian who believes that God who is ruling this world will never permit a war for whatever purpose it may be, I want to sincerely appeal to you, President Johnson, and leaders in the government of the United States of America.

I. The United States has declared that it will continue the Vietnamese war to give freedom and peace to the Vietnamese people. But in my view what the Vietnamese people are truly seeking is that this war will end as soon as possible and that they will live freely and peacefully without any interference from foreign countries, but with independence and self-determination. I cannot see how the Vietnamese people can be "free" when thousands of children and women are being killed with highly developed scientific weapons.

We Japanese learned from the painful experience during World War II, how miserable and cruel it was that the lives of thousands of people were taken away by the bombs that were rained on us and by the atomic bombs which were dropped in Hiroshima and Nagasaki. But your people have not yet gone through such a dreadfully miserable experience.

II. Is it not true that the desperate fighting of the North Vietnamese and Viet Cong is not motivated by their ideology, but because they know how miserable and tragic it is to be subject to foreign countries from their bitter experience based on historical facts since the Chinese rule over Vietnam? I can hardly believe that disregarding such national and racial peculiarities and pressing confrontation by force one-sidedly in order to eliminate the threat of communism is a policy the United States, a great country in the world and a democratic one, would take. Through this event the U.S. policies in Asia have aroused a deep doubt and uneasiness in a great number of Asians.

III. Isn't America a Christian country both in name and in reality? I sincerely hope you will muster up your courage to return to the words of Jesus Christ, "Love your enemies," now. Stop the bombing of North Vietnam, begin peace negotiations including the Viet Cong and withdraw troops and bases as soon as possible. These are the things I heartily pray you will put into action.

Sincerely,

JUNICHI ASANO,

Pastor of Kinuta Church, the Japan Christian Association, Professor in the Department of Theology, Aoyama Gakuin University.

Fly U.S. Airlines

HON. RICHARD L. ROUDEBUSH

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 13, 1968

Mr. ROUDEBUSH. Mr. Speaker, it seems to me that a call to patriotism is

in order in connection with the crucial balance-of-payments situation in this country. With part of this deficit due to international travel, it would seem logical that more Americans should make use of U.S. airlines when taking trips.

The sad story is, that while three out of four people flying from the United States across the North Atlantic to Europe are American residents, only 41 percent of these transatlantic passengers utilize U.S. airplanes.

Certainly the clarion call should be sounded; Americans should be made aware of the fact that they can help erase the red ink in their country's international ledgers by making an effort to travel on U.S. air carriers.

Freedom's Challenge

HON. JOHN B. ANDERSON

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 13, 1968

Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, a young man from my congressional district, Mr. David M. Swanson, of Rockford, Ill., won the Illinois State Voice of Democracy contest for his speech on the subject of "Freedom's Challenge." Last night, a second honor came to him as he was declared to be the second-place winner in the national Voice of Democracy competition.

Believing his remarks to be particularly pertinent in these critical times, I call the Members' attention to his address:

FREEDOM'S CHALLENGE

Freedom . . . Oh, the images conjured up before our minds' eye at the mere mention of that word! We see the faces and hear the names of men like Hale, Henry, John Paul Jones, Washington, Jefferson, Adams, Hamilton; men who pledged their lives, their fortunes, and their sacred honor for that word.

We see the Liberty Bell, cracked in the jubilant ringing which welcomed the Declaration of freedom and Independence from a tyrannical mother country.

Then, we glimpse a vision of an eagle, our national symbol, majestically soaring, now hanging suspended in the air, now plummeting to the earth, but all the time as free as the wind in body and spirit.

But the picture isn't always so glorious, for as we gaze, a mist shrouds the sun and our eyes scan the bloody landscape of a battlefield. We see the broken bodies in the twisted heaps of death where they fell. We hear the dirges and the haunting strains of "Taps" . . . feel the grief of bereaved relatives for fallen warriors. And yet, beneath it all, we sense a feeling of deep pride and dogged determination to carry on. For though these men have died, the heritage and freedom for which they fought lives on.

But what, actually, is freedom? Is it an often used but rarely understood cliché, uttered from the idle lip of pseudophilosophers and fantastical idealists? Or is it a word that symbolizes a way of thinking and a way of life?

Freedom can be likened to money . . . worthless if hoarded and not put to use. It can be like food . . . void of nourishment unless partaken; like a life . . . wasted if saved and not perpetuated.

On the other hand, it is unlike anything else known to man, for, contrary to all the laws of purchase and possession, freedom cannot be bought once for all time. Free-

dom must be redeemed by each generation for its succeeding generation.

It is with this uniqueness that we are concerned, for it brings to mind two questions: "What does freedom mean to me?" and, "What do I mean to freedom?"

The first question, no doubt, is the easiest to answer. It is not hard to realize that freedom provides us with the right to work in our chosen profession, limited only by our own talents and ambitions; the right to choose those who would govern us; the right to worship the Divine Giver of Life and Liberty, and on and on.

To answer the second question, we would do well to recall those who have gone before us, and have answered in such a way as to stamp their names indelibly upon the pages of time. We can think of men like Webster, Lincoln, Bryan, Edison, and Von Braun; women like Julia Ward Howe, Susan B. Anthony, Carrie Nation, and Helen Keller.

Others have answered in such a way that, were they to try for a million years, they could never remove the stigma that surrounds their names.

How you answer may mean the difference between a soldier-statesman MacArthur, and a deranged dictator like Hitler; Eichmann, the killer, and Salk, the healer; or a Catherine de Medici and a Clara Barton. What you make of freedom today will determine what it will be tomorrow.

But answer we must. To answer truthfully, unquestioningly, unflinchingly, and unselfishly, and having answered in word, to answer in deed, is to answer and accept the "Challenge of Freedom!"

Maryland Marines Die in Vietnam

HON. CLARENCE D. LONG

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 13, 1968

Mr. LONG of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, Cpl. Arnold D. Kirk and Cpl. Jan F. Wilson, two young marines from Maryland, were killed recently in Vietnam. I wish to commend their bravery and honor their memories by including the following article in the RECORD:

TWO MARINES DIE IN COMBAT—KIRK, WILSON ARE KILLED ON OPERATIONS IN VIETNAM

Two more Marylanders, a Baltimorean and a Brandywine man, have been killed in Vietnam, the Defense Department announced yesterday.

Reported dead were:

Marine Cpl. Arnold D. Kirk, 22, son of Mr. and Mrs. Marion Kirk, of 5076 Orville avenue.

Marine Cpl. Jan F. Wilson, son of Mr. and Mrs. James B. Wilson, of Floral Park road, Brandywine, Prince Georges county.

Corporal Kirk, who had been stationed in Vietnam since November, was killed by rifle fire while on an operation near Da Nang. For several months, he was stationed at an outpost on Hill 65 in Quang Nam, South of Da Nang.

A native of Baltimore, Corporal Kirk was a graduate of Poly, where he played varsity baseball for two years. He worked at the Bethlehem Steel Corporation before he was drafted into the marines in November 1965.

In letters to his parents from Vietnam, he said things "were a little rough" but that "I am glad to be over here." His father, Marion Kirk, said his son was "a good marine and proud of the corps."

Besides his parents, he is survived by two brothers, Marion Kirk, Jr., and Stanley Kirk, both of Baltimore.

Corporal Wilson died March 7 after he was shot during a patrol in Quang Tri province. He had been serving in Vietnam since Novem-

ber of 1967 and was assigned to the 3d Marine Division.

SERVED ON DESTROYER

A graduate of Gwynn Park High School, he enlisted in the Marines in August 1967, and served aboard the destroyer U.S.S. Cambria in the Mediterranean before being sent to Vietnam.

His mother, Mrs. Pauline Wilson, said his letters home were "always cheerful" and that his only complaint was that on one occasion he could not take a bath for two weeks.

Besides his parents, he is survived by three brothers, James B. Wilson, Jr., of Norfolk, Thomas E. Wilson, who lives in California, and Eugene P. Wilson, of Clinton, Prince Georges county.

Communists Try To Organize Veterans

HON. OLIN E. TEAGUE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 13, 1968

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, a so-called veterans organization now recruiting and forming units throughout our country—the Veterans for Peace—and funded. Their efforts to infiltrate are Communist controlled, motivated, the ranks of our veterans by urging them to join this organization of pacifist peace marchers is a concerted effort by the Communist Party of the United States to give a semblance of respectability to their undermining efforts against this Nation.

The Communists send their representatives into any area where dissident groups form. They preach the straight Communist line, placing the blame on this country for the war.

Their damaging propaganda is permeating the American scene with its lies and misrepresentations. I think that it is important that the citizens of this Nation be warned against those men who are behind this Veterans for Peace movement. These organizers are well aware that, if they are to succeed, they must accomplish their subversion under ambiguous or even patriotic-sounding titles. There is no question in my mind that many loyal Americans have been duped into becoming unknowing instruments for the Communists. These people have become the mouthpiece for an out-of-town organizer who always shows up anywhere there is going to be a discussion on our Nation's involvement in Vietnam. The only concern these people have for America is to take it over and destroy our democracy.

I would like to give you some examples of how these Communists go about their infiltration and the real reasons for their wanting to organize a Veterans for Peace movement.

Last year the city of Cambridge, Mass., was subjected to an avalanche of patriotic-looking propaganda distributed by the so-called Veterans for Peace, urging a vote on the Vietnam question. These organizers knew well that the typical "peacenik" would make little headway in Cambridge. Instead, there was no evidence of any of the dirty-looking riff-raff that flocked into Washington last October to march on the Pentagon. There were no long-haired, unkempt peaceniks anywhere to be found. Instead, col-

legiate-looking young men and women knocked on doors soliciting signatures for a petition, asking "if they wouldn't like to bring our boys home from Vietnam." This double-talk fooled enough people to get the question on a ballot. What person in his right mind would not like to "bring our boys home" from Vietnam? The true issues were bypassed in securing the signatures.

An attempt at respectability is the first order of business for any Communist activity. It appeals to a person's interest in their country and professes a great patriotism while attacking its leaders. It subtly attacks the administration in Washington, and winds up with a verbal outburst at "warmongers."

Of course, the question was brought to a vote in Cambridge, and I am happy to say that the patriotic Americans there flocked to the polls to defeat this preposterous proposition that we surrender to the Communists and withdraw our help to the struggling South Vietnamese.

But, the tactics of those who oppose this Nation are becoming more sophisticated. They have expanded their efforts and there seems to be a mysterious source for the funds they expend in traveling all over the country to expound their theories. Do you not think it is just possible that the money is being furnished by the enemies of this Nation—namely, the Communist Party. Since many of the persons who travel from place to place involved in organizing these groups and demonstrations have had or now have active Communist affiliations, I would certainly assume that their expenses are not being paid out of their own pockets.

I would like to list some examples that I think will cause all loyal Americans to think before they align themselves with any organization that opposes the policies of this Government concerning Vietnam.

In Madison, Wis., the people have been asked to vote on the Vietnam question through a referendum circulated in much the same way as Cambridge. It is very interesting to note the development of the campaign and the resultant placing of the issue on the ballot for a vote.

At a meeting of the Committee To End the War in Vietnam at the University of Wisconsin campus in Madison on September 28, 1967, a man by the name of LeRoy Wolins made a statement that he wished to inform this committee of the organization of a Madison branch of the Veterans for Peace in Vietnam. This man had no difficulty in finding a place on the program, even though he was not from the university nor even Madison. In his speech, Wolins said the veterans organizations he represented had their beginning with the backing of the Committee for a Sane Nuclear Policy, and that he was one of the founders of the organization in Chicago.

As a part of his speech on that date, Wolins urged this group to organize and elect a commander to act as a spokesman, and that he definitely should be called commander, to correspond to the other veteran organizations' designations. He urged the use of the symbols of the military "for the sake of image" including red, white, and blue colors. Wolins said the group should have a color guard

and take part in all parades. From there on his intention became even more evident. He wanted to get signature advertisements of veterans highlighting quotations from antiwar ex-military men of high rank. He wanted the group to distribute literature against the war at induction centers and Legion halls, and asked that the group write to men in service, hoping to get letters from which excerpts could be taken to be used for propaganda purposes.

A man by the name of Robert Wilkinson was in the group that night, as was a man by the name of Lester Radke.

I think it is well that we take a look at these three men and their backgrounds to see if they are really interested in America or veterans, or Vietnam, or our fighting men.

Mr. Wolins has a most interesting career. He was a card-carrying professed member of the Communist Party of Illinois up until 1946. After that, up until 1966 he has been identified as being active in Communist Party circles. He has served as the secretary of the Chicago Council of American-Soviet Friendship in the years 1955-60. In January 1959 he was a contributor of an article to the Communist Daily Worker. In 1957 he participated in the World Youth Festival, which was controlled by the Communists. In 1960 he was summoned before the House Committee on Un-American Activities concerning Communist Party activities and refused to answer questions. I have no doubt about what he was doing in Madison on that fateful night. It was no accident that he happened to show up at a meeting designed to organize a protest against this Government.

Robert Wilkinson has been identified by a Madison newspaper as the man selected to be acting chairman of the Madison Area Veterans for Peace in Vietnam. But it might be interesting to note some of Mr. Wilkinson's other activities. In March of 1967 the Young Socialist Alliance National Convention was held in Detroit. Reservations were made at a Detroit hotel for all of the delegates, and a reservation was made for Mr. Robert Wilkinson, 202 Marion Street, Madison, Wis. The 1966-67 student directory of the University of Wisconsin lists this same 202 Marion Street address as the location of the University of Wisconsin Young Socialist Alliance. Mr. Wilkinson is also a frequent traveler, having attended a National Student Conference in Chicago in May 1967. This Young Socialist Alliance, which was established in Philadelphia in 1960, has been placed on the Attorney General's list as a Communist-front organization by Executive order.

Mr. Wilkinson also contributes to a newspaper, reportedly printed by the Veterans for Peace, called the Veterans Stars and Stripes for Peace. His latest article in the February issue of this publication attacks the Pacific Stars and Stripes newspaper and all other media which keeps our men in Vietnam informed of the news of the world.

The third man who was present to help organize the Veterans for Peace in Madison was Lester Radke. Mr. Radke was in New York City in June of 1966 where he met with Mike Zagarell, national youth

director of the Communist Party of the U.S.A. An article in the University of Wisconsin campus newspaper on July 21, 1966, stated that "Lester Radke had recently spent a month in Russia and would speak at the general meeting of the Committee To End the War in Vietnam" on that date. In November, Mr. Radke was one of those attending a meeting of the W. E. B. DuBois Clubs of America held on the University of Wisconsin campus. The DuBois club was established by the Communist Party of the U.S.A.

It is also interesting to note some of the activities of the man who serves as chairman of the Madison Citizens for a Vote on Vietnam. This man is Maurice Zeitlin, a University of Wisconsin sociology professor. In 1961 Professor Zeitlin was teaching at Princeton. On December 28 of that year the Princeton Packet, a weekly newspaper carried an article: "Professor Defends Castro; Blames American Policy." The article quotes Zeitlin as strongly defending Castro. At the time, Zeitlin was a sociology instructor at Princeton and spent several weeks in the summer of 1961 in Cuba doing research for his thesis on the Cuban revolution.

In the winter issue, 1962, of the Root and Branch, a self-described "radical quarterly," published at Berkeley, Calif., two articles appeared, written by Zeitlin. Both articles dealt with the Cuban revolution, including an interview with Che Guevara.

In the February 10, 1965, issue of the Wisconsin State Journal, Zeitlin is quoted as charging that the United States was "intervening on behalf of the forces of colonialism" in Vietnam. Both daily newspapers in Madison have quoted Zeitlin many times, always in positions which attack the policies of this Government.

Therefore, in Madison, as it has been in other cities, it is important that the people know the backgrounds of some of the people who are urging them to vote against the policies of their Government. Many of the leaders in this movement and those who are heading up the so-called Veterans for Peace have been involved in Communist-inspired organizations for some time. It is no wonder that they wish the United States to halt the war against those who have their sympathy.

I think it is important, too, that the American people recognize the publication, the Veterans Stars and Stripes for Peace for what it is. This newspaper issued its first edition in September 1967 in Chicago. Just after that a National Conference of the Veterans for Peace in Vietnam was held in Washington, D.C., on October 21. These delegates decided by unanimous vote that the Veterans Stars and Stripes for Peace should be the dominant publication of not only the Veterans for Peace in Vietnam but all other veterans groups having the same aims and purposes.

This publication is one continuous blast of criticism at our Nation's involvement in South Vietnam, but it goes much further than that. It deals in deliberate misstatement of fact. It is evident from their stories and their editorials that their prime concern is organizing pro-

test units all across the country, duping many veterans into believing they are a legitimate organization. Their tactics embody the type of journalism reminiscent of bygone days when sensational tabloids used the remotest figment of the imagination to create a story. For instance, they take a celebration marking the completion of basic training by a number of servicemen—which, unfortunately, turned into somewhat of a brawl—as a protest by these men over their shipment orders to Vietnam. Each article dilutes the facts with biased editorial comment.

To give the impression that the Veterans for Peace is a growing organization they list a single individual as an "organization." The publication received a letter from a man in Honolulu stating, according to the paper, that he was very interested in forming a group of veterans in Honolulu opposed to the war in Vietnam. The letter appeared in their "Letters to the Editor" column. On a subsequent page, they officially recognize an organized group of Veterans for Peace in Honolulu with the man as the head of the organization. They list his home address as the headquarters for the organization. By implication they have made it appear that there is an organized group of dissenters in Honolulu. Henceforth, any propaganda—in order to give impetus to their pronouncements—will show this as an organization in Los Angeles. However, their "selected representative," a Mr. Allen Zak, has been unable to attract any members for his organization. Their so-called organizations are merely their stooges serving in a town who occasionally can boast a membership. Zak, incidentally, writes for People's World, which has been identified as a west coast Communist Party publication. In 1966 he was reported as a member of the Los Angeles Central Club of the W.E.B. DuBois organization. The same Leroy Wolins, who was in Madison to organize a protest group, was present at this national convention in Washington.

The man who is listed as the New York correspondent for the paper is Ron Wolin. This man has been very active in the Socialist Workers Party, which has been designated as subversive by Executive Order No. 10450. He has participated in many of the protest marches in New York City and on several instances acted as the spokesman or master of ceremonies at these anti-Government rallies.

Without question, there are some veterans who will be misled by this expansive—and expensive—array. But, I am just as sure that these veterans have little idea that their organizers and leaders are either Communists or belong to and take part in Communist front organizations.

This same newspaper, the Veterans Stars and Stripes for Peace, carries a directory of these "veteran" peace organizations. One of the men listed as the man to contact in Milwaukee, Wis., is Irv Kurki. In July of 1967 Mr. Kurki attended a trade union and community organizing conference held by the Communist Party of the U.S.A. in New York City. Kurki was indicted by a Federal

grand jury and arrested in November 1965 for failure to report for induction under selective service. He was found guilty in district and appellate Federal courts, and his case is presently under appeal before the U.S. Supreme Court.

And so it goes all across our country where these so-called organizations spring up. In Pittsburgh, Pa., Mr. Louis Bortz, treasurer of the Pittsburgh Veterans for Peace is a member of the district committee of the Communist Party of Western Pennsylvania, and is chairman in Pittsburgh of the North Side Club of the Communist Party of Western Pennsylvania.

Mr. Leo Jackson, one of the 12 persons present at the initial organizational meeting of the Pittsburgh Veterans for Peace is also a member of the Communist Party of Western Pennsylvania.

Adhering to the Communist policy of changing the names of their organizations frequently, Pittsburgh anti-Vietnam leaders resort to this same method of confusing the public. A Mr. Frank Goldsmith, who attended a Communist Party function in Pittsburgh in August 1966, is chairman of a group called the Pittsburgh Committee To End the War in Vietnam. On November 3, 1967, the Vietnam summer, another committee to help organize the march in Washington, changed its name to the Peace and Freedom Center. This organization has taken over the "peace" activities formerly handled by the Pittsburgh Committee To End the War in Vietnam.

Here in Washington a chapter of the Veterans for Peace in Vietnam has been organized and reportedly has attracted the interest of about 50 persons. The acting chairman of the Washington, D.C., group is Mrs. Alice Arshak, Adelphi, Md. President pro tem of the group is David Rein. Mr. Rein was a member of the secret Government Communist Party group at the National Labor Relations Board during the period from October 1937 to midsummer 1942.

In New York City the Veterans for Peace in Vietnam share the same headquarters with the Trade Unionists for Peace. This organization was formerly called the Ad Hoc Committee of Veterans for Peace in Vietnam. In November 1965 the National Communist Party of the U.S.A. requested its members to cooperate with this ad hoc committee.

The Trade Unionists for Peace, also known as Labor for Peace, is a group established by the Communist Party in 1965, because the organizations with the stated objective of obtaining peace in Vietnam had been unsuccessful in winning the support of the "workers."

To further confuse you, and keeping a person guessing at the precise sponsor of a so-called "peace" group, there are other organizations with different names in New York City all sharing the same headquarters. The Veterans and Reservists To End the War in Vietnam has been using the offices of the Committee for Nonviolent Action and the New York Workshop in Nonviolence. Reflecting another switch in names, this group was formerly known as Veterans for Peace, and is separate and distinct from Veterans for Peace in Vietnam. However, it is noteworthy that members of each of the different organizations so designated

attend whichever group is staging a meeting.

To give you another example of how far this name changing can go, members of the Veterans for Peace in Vietnam and Veterans and Reservists To End the War in Vietnam participated as members of the Fifth Avenue Vietnam Peace Parade Committee in August 1967 and the Ad Hoc Veterans Committee for Memorial Day Peace Action participated in a New York City meeting with the group planning the march on Washington scheduled for May 30, 1967.

There is a real and imminent danger in the fact that these high sounding names confuse the average citizen. Their titles and impressive statements infer that large numbers of persons have united to give impetus to the pronouncements, while in reality it is but a single bunch of individuals, frequently changing their names, stating over and over the same propaganda.

I believe there are few Americans who would have anything to do with these so-called peace movements if they were aware that the persons organizing them and directing them are members of the Communist Party. I do not believe that Americans would be a willing tool of these people who are avowed to destroy not only the present administration, but our entire democratic form of government.

Freedom of speech and expression is without question one of our greatest and treasured possessions. But this same freedom of speech should be utilized to expose those who, like wolves in sheep's clothing, speak with the voice of the Communist conspiracy.

GAO Protects the Tax Dollar

HON. CHARLES McC. MATHIAS, JR.

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 13, 1968

Mr. MATHIAS of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, our current financial pinch and recent revelations of apparent misuse of Federal funds at home and abroad have dramatized the need for sharp oversight of the myriad affairs of the executive branch. For many years the burden of this oversight has been borne primarily by the dedicated men and women of the General Accounting Office, the independent agency charged specifically with enforcing economy, efficiency, and fiscal accountability throughout the Government.

In an informative and perceptive article in the Christian Science Monitor of March 11, Mr. William C. Selover summarized the recent efforts of the GAO under the leadership of the Comptroller General, Mr. Elmer B. Staats. Noting that, over the past year alone, GAO findings have produced savings of more than \$190 million, Mr. Selover sketched some of the ways in which the GAO has improved the operations of Government and brought American taxpayers not only economy but effectiveness in the use of their tax dollars.

I include this article in the RECORD at this point:

CONGRESSIONAL WATCHDOG—PROTECTING THE TAX DOLLAR

(NOTE.—The current furor over misuse of U.S. foreign-aid funds spotlights the sharp-eyed work of the General Accounting Office. Set up in 1921 to help Congress keep track of federal spending, the GAO is run by Comptroller General Elmer B. Staats. In the following interview, he details his war on waste and corruption.)

(By William C. Selover)

WASHINGTON.—If you are wondering what's happening to your tax dollar, you are not alone.

More and more people are uneasy about the mounting costs of massive, complex government programs.

But there is one man in the country who is paid full time to worry about it. Elmer B. Staats, the United States Comptroller General, is completing his second year of a 15-year term as head of the General Accounting Office.

But Mr. Staats is doing more than just worry. He is striking out quietly but effectively against waste, incompetence, duplication, and mismanagement at every level of the federal government.

The result:

During this past year alone, the GAO has saved the taxpayer more than \$190 million dollars in actual, measurable costs. Added to that amount are many millions of dollars more in indirect savings attributable to GAO recommendations.

But saving money is not its exclusive interest. "Effectiveness," says Mr. Staats, "is a key word with regard to GAO."

He and his staff of some 2,300 highly trained and skilled professionals are gratified to see that their recommendations have visibly improved the effectiveness of the federal government.

AUDITS MADE, 2,203

Last year, the GAO conducted 2,203 audits and reviews "to determine the extent that government agencies were discharging their responsibilities in an effective, efficient, and economical manner," according to the GAO.

It issued 963 detailed reports on matters it believed needed correction or improvement. Each report made clear proposals or recommendations for constructive changes where necessary.

Of these 963 reports, 161 went to Congress as a whole; 167 to its committees, officers, and members; and 625 to officials of federal departments or agencies. The Budget Bureau requires federal agencies to adopt GAO recommendations within 60 days or explain in writing why it hasn't.

Here is a random sampling of those 963 reports:

The United States Information Service could have saved \$2 million on housing costs for its employees in Brewerville, Liberia, if the agency had purchased housing rather than leased it.

Federal agencies could have saved some \$1.2 million for repairs and maintenance of adding machines, calculators, comptometers, and electric typewriters by using local repair services rather than contracts with the machine manufacturers.

The Defense Department could have saved \$290,000 by sending children of its employees overseas on commercial airlines, at regular children's rates. (Transportation officers, with no clear guideline to select the lowest-cost transportation, had hewed to the reduced fares published in special military passenger tariffs. These were more expensive in some instances than regular commercial fares for children.)

The Internal Revenue Service could improve measures of spotting and collecting unreported taxable income. The increased collections were not determined but were regarded as "considerable."

INDEPENDENCE IMPORTANT

What makes the GAO so important is its independence. The GAO is an arm of Congress, not of the White House. It was set up in 1921 to help Congress keep track of federal spending.

By about 1940, the GAO began to shed its early image of the green-visored accountant stooped over columns of figures. It then began to take on the challenge of recommending broad improvements in the use of tax monies.

Today, the GAO is recognized as an agency that can be expected to render reasonably objective judgments on the federal establishment.

While the comptroller general is appointed by the President, he serves for a 15-year, nonrenewable term. It is almost as hard to remove him as it is to impeach a President. This virtually assures his independence.

High in his seventh-floor corner office, with a postcard view of the Capitol out the windows behind him, Mr. Staats explained in an interview the GAO's role:

"It is an independent review and oversight agency, concerned with the most effective and economical carrying out of federal programs."

Mr. Staats also views himself as a kind of "ombudsman." He says the GAO is very responsive to "private grievances." This is especially true of grievances from businesses having complaints against the federal government regarding contract procedures. In such cases, the GAO settles the claim, and the federal agency is bound by the GAO decision.

Despite all other demands on GAO time, Mr. Staats regards as his most important function that of servicing the needs of the Congress, both its committees and individual members.

One recent example of the way the GAO has helped Congress is shown in a request from Rep. Otis G. Pike, a member of the House special investigation subcommittee of the Armed Services Committee.

Last year Mr. Pike was tipped off by a constituent that the Defense Construction Supply Center had purchased five pieces of hardware at rates of 400 to 5,000 percent higher than the manufacturer's own catalogue list price.

Mr. Pike wanted to know for certain that this was true before confronting the Defense Department directly with the charge and demanding an explanation.

So he went to Mr. Staats for an authoritative, independent investigation.

The GAO furnished verified, documentary evidence that every charge was true. And that was only the beginning. When the GAO looked further, it uncovered more evidence of fraud.

CONTRACTS CANCELED

Last Sept. 27, Mr. Pike reported that when the Defense Construction Supply Center "found the GAO boys looking into . . . [an order of 'loom-woven cotton'] they canceled the last two contracts which they had made and reduced the catalogue price from \$80 a yard to \$5.76."

"Even this figure," Mr. Pike continued, "while it is certainly an improvement on the \$80 figure, is exactly 38 times what it ought to be."

As a result of Mr. Pike's disclosures, the special investigations subcommittee held hearings on Oct. 31 and Nov. 1 last year. Subcommittee chairman Porter Hardy Jr. (D) of Virginia opened by expressing pleasure that Mr. Staats "has extended his full cooperation."

The subcommittee's final report, issued Jan. 22, 1968, charged that the Department of Defense "has tended to blame the overpricing on the lack of experience of junior buyers and overlook the deficiencies in the supervision of these juniors."

The subcommittee demanded that the department tighten its procedures and directed

the GAO to verify the performance of the reforms.

In the absence of an independent auditing organization—and an alert citizen—the findings might not have received such attention. And taxpayers might still be paying 5,000 times what they should for a simple gear.

The general Pike findings have been referred to the Justice Department for possible prosecution.

The GAO has learned to time its findings to provide ammunition for congressional hearings. Some GAO investigations in the past have taken too long to be of much use to congressional committees. This has been a classic complaint from those in Congress. Mr. Staats has moved to change all that.

He says he wants to "relate our material to the time needs of Congress, this will strengthen GAO over any other single factor."

"We want to relate to the interests of the committees."

Congressional sources contacted by this newspaper confirm the fact that the agency is increasingly responding to the precise needs of their committees.

A staff member on the Senate Appropriations Committee says the GAO does "an excellent job."

This staff member says there has been marked improvement in the agency since Mr. Staats came into office. "He has brought to the GAO great stature—he knows what he's talking about."

DEVOTION RESPECTED

Mr. Staats had served for 26 years in the federal government before coming to the GAO. For the last six he was deputy director of the Bureau of the Budget.

"He knows more than anyone else about how this government works," explains a frankly biased admirer.

One reason congressmen respect Mr. Staats is that he is a hard worker.

A Senate Appropriations Committee source recalls a time last spring when the committee chairman decided on a Saturday to hold hearings the following Monday on the legislative appropriations bill—beginning with the GAO. When an assistant called to inform the agency, the only person he could reach was Mr. Staats himself, hard at work on Saturday. Monday morning he was at the hearing bright and early, with his statement prepared.

One measure of the regard with which Mr. Staats is held is seen in the fact that Congress gives him all the money he wants. And the costs are not small. It takes about \$50 million a year to run the GAO with its Washington headquarters, 16 regional offices, and 4 overseas offices.

NEW ROLES SHAPED

Yet that's little enough to pay for the resulting savings. Last year, the GAO paid for itself four times over in direct money saved.

Another sure sign of congressional confidence in the GAO is the fact that in recent years Congress has increasingly looked to it to help carry out proposed new laws.

"There has been a good deal of interest in GAO doing more," says Mr. Staats.

He cited the attention Congress has given to using the GAO to help with administering a new code of congressional ethics, with campaign financing, and with registering lobbyists.

He looks with "some hesitation" on some of these possible new functions. But he does regard it as a compliment to his agency.

Besides his hard work and his knowledge of government, Mr. Staats appears to understand congressmen and their sensitivities. He makes himself available to them in his office or in theirs. He lets them know his job is to be of service to them. That goes for Republicans and Democrats alike.

The previous Comptroller General Joseph Campbell, was less responsive to the per-

sonal factor in dealing with the Congress. "Aloof," was the way one observer described him. It got him into trouble.

Back in 1965, Rep. Chet Holifield (D) of California, chairman of the military operations subcommittee, held hearings into the way the GAO reported to Congress on audits of defense contracts.

The hearings criticized the GAO for nit picking and being overly critical, unconstructive. A lot of criticisms were aired, some valid, some not.

But a committee report called the hearings "highly useful and constructive." It said further that "a healthier climate of working relationship" had been worked out. Into this "healthier climate" Mr. Staats stepped when he became Comptroller General. And he has worked to maintain it.

Asked by this reporter if the GAO might face such another hearing, Mr. Staats replied he doubted that he would allow the situation to "go that far again." He was referring to the breakdown in communications between his predecessor and Congress which preceded the Holifield investigation. As of now, communication could hardly be better.

One of the most exciting challenges Congress has given the GAO to date, according to Mr. Staats, is the current demand to conduct a full-scale investigation into the war on poverty. The agency must report to Congress by December 1, under the terms of last year's antipoverty legislation.

Presently the GAO is mobilizing a 150-man task force to determine the efficiency and effectiveness of the antipoverty effort and to determine if it's actually helping to alleviate poverty.

SOCIAL ROLE IS NEW

Since Congress did not authorize any added funds for the investigation, the GAO must curtail some of its regular tasks to complete what is expected to be one of the broadest investigations it has ever made on a federal program.

Since it will demand new skills and judgments to evaluate a social program, the GAO is hiring special consultants. For an accounting and auditing agency, the task is wholly new.

Mr. Staats is very anxious to do a first-rate job. He thinks the GAO can perform a unique function in evaluating many of the new federal programs, especially in the social-welfare area. No other organization, he says, is equipped to render such independent judgments.

The investigation promises to open up a whole new social-accounting procedure.

Mr. Staats says that if the GAO does a good job now, it will be given more such tasks. He cited manpower-development and urban-areas problems as the two he feels the organization could usefully evaluate for effectiveness, serving both the government and the taxpayer.

When the results of these probes begin to flow in, more taxpayers will doubtless have a clearer view of what's happening to their dollars.

And if the GAO insists on reforms for the greater effective use of that money, American taxpayers can have just a little more confidence in the way their money is spent.

Rev. Earl V. Best

HON. E. ROSS ADAIR

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 13, 1968

Mr. ADAIR. Mr. Speaker, it is a distinct pleasure to rise and say a word in behalf of the Reverend Earl V. Best, of

Indianapolis, who delivered the inspiring prayer at the opening of today's session of the House.

It was a stimulating and comforting message in these troublesome times. In this dark hour facing the Nation, he gave us solace and a moment to reflect upon the gravity of our problems. Through prayer and guidance from divine providence I believe we can look forward to brighter days and more hopeful signs of peace. I am sure we were all deeply touched and lifted by the sincerity and wisdom of what he said.

There is another reason I express my pleasure at Reverend Best's presence. He is a fellow Hoosier. My good friend and colleague, the Honorable RICHARD ROUDEBUSH arranged that he might speak to us. As a former national chaplain of the Veterans of Foreign Wars in 1962-63, the Reverend Best is presently the Indiana State Chaplain for the VFW, a position he has held for 9 years.

During World War II, he was a chaplain in the Navy and served with distinction. At the present time, he is also pastor of the Refugee Christian Church at Noblesville, Ind., in addition to his duties as chaplain for the VFW.

A Summer of Rioting and Disorder

HON. WATKINS M. ABBITT

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 13, 1968

Mr. ABBITT. Mr. Speaker, on February 29, just prior to the issuance of the summary report of the National Advisory Commission on Civil Disorders, I spoke to the House with reference to the indication that the Commission was preparing to make an attempt to in some way justify the disorders which occurred in many of our major cities last summer.

With the issuance of that summary report later that day, and the subsequent issuance of the full report, I am even more convinced that the overall philosophy of the Commission was that because of prevailing conditions in some of the cities, the rioters had a right to take the law into their own hands.

Since my remarks on February 29, I have received a large quantity of mail in support of my position, and I am glad that a number of newspapers and magazines are making similar evaluations.

The Virginia Methodist Advocate, in its issue of March 7, 1968, has an editorial entitled "A Summer of Rioting and Disorder," and I feel that the comments of the editor, Dr. George S. Reamey, are very pertinent to the current discussion.

Dr. Reamey is one of the outstanding religious leaders of the South and has a keen insight into the issues of the day. His editorial points up some of the real problems we face unless we look at the question of disorder in our cities with a realistic attitude. I have much respect for his judgment and recommend to the Members of the House the reading of his fine editorial.

The editorial follows:

A SUMMER OF RIOTING AND DISORDER

If riots are not widespread throughout the nation this summer, it will not be because the President's Riots Commission has not done all that it could to see that they come! More specifically, the bipartisan National Advisory Commission on Civil Disorders, after an alleged eight months intensive study, has just brought in its report which has received widespread publicity.

In a word, the Commission places the entire blame for recent riots on the respective communities in which they occurred, together with the nation as a whole, and, strangely enough, did not attribute any of it to what the Hon. Watkins M. Abbott called "lawbreakers and hoodlums." In other words, according to the Commission, the criminal element which was well-represented in these riots had no responsibility whatever for what took place—hence they should not be blamed or punished!

The report went so far as to look with apprehension upon efforts being made in some cities to arrest and punish the hoodlum elements involved. "The harmful effects of overaction" the report stated "are incalculable. The Commission condemns moves to equip police departments with mass destruction weapons, such as automatic rifles, machine guns and tanks . . ." What would the Commission do? Make national heroes of riot leaders?

The Advocate agrees 100 per cent with Representative Abbott when he says, "The recognition of wrong conditions does not open the door to lawbreakers and hoodlums who can act under the guise that they are trying to rectify the misdeeds of society." He said further in his address to the House of Representatives, that all levels of government "make it crystal clear that this 'disorder blackmail' must stop. We need to state openly and clearly that law and order will be maintained and . . . all criminals punished."

The Riots Commission did deal at length with important segments of the causes of disorder. Society does have a responsibility, and a very important responsibility, to do more to help the underprivileged of all classes. However, we disagree heartily with the Commission's recommendation for a "guaranteed minimum income" for all Americans, regardless of whether they are able to help themselves. To be sure there are the poor who must have help from outside, but the best way to help the able bodied poor is to help them to help themselves! Give them opportunities to get an education and to learn a trade; see that they are provided opportunities for work once they have learned a skill, but to hand out a guaranteed monthly dole—misnamed "annual wage" for the able-bodied who are too indolent to work for it—is one of the best ways imaginable to take away a man's self-respect from him. When a man loses all incentive to help himself, he is a miserable creature.

Our government, on all levels, needs to make it clear that help will be forth-coming, as now much of it is, on the basis of need, but that persons of whatever race who take the law into their own hands do so at their own risk! That rioting and vandalism will not be tolerated. There are duly constituted courts of law to rectify any wrongs that may exist.

The Commission's report, blaming as it does all of the evils of rioting and vandalism on the community at large, and none at all on individuals who participate, and the further predictions that more and more rioting—even revolution—is likely to come forth, is one of the best ways conceivable to bring trouble about. The report puts the rioters—white rioters as well as black—in the position in which they are made to feel they will be letting the Commission down if they fail to stir up all the strife they can!

Buffalo: The Cultural Center

HON. THADDEUS J. DULSKI

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 13, 1968

Mr. DULSKI. Mr. Speaker, my home city of Buffalo, N.Y., is famous for many things over the years. But it is possible that my colleagues may not be aware of Buffalo's role as a truly great cultural center.

Buffalo interests cover the broad spectrum of culture:

The Albright-Knox Gallery, containing one of the most outstanding collections of art in the country.

The Buffalo Philharmonic Orchestra, conducted by the highly talented composer, Lukas Foss.

A thriving group of colleges and universities, including New York's large State university, a State college, and several private institutions of higher learning.

Wide attention to Buffalo's cultural program is being drawn currently with the Second Festival of the Arts Today.

This 16-day program of cultural events is the subject of an informative article in the art section of the March 15 issue of Time magazine.

Since this article so well details what is being accomplished in our city of Buffalo, I am including the text of the Time article:

EXHIBITIONS: WHERE THE MILITANTS ROAM

Most people think of Buffalo, when they think of it at all, as a sooty industrial port on a blustery bluff overlooking Lake Erie. They ought to try shuffling off to Buffalo some time.

Ask any contemporary-art lover and he will tell you that Buffalo is the home of the Albright-Knox Gallery, one of the nation's finest and most up-to-date art collections.

Ask any experimental-music lover and he will tell you that since 1963 Lukas Foss, 45, one of the nation's most venturesome young composers, has been leading the Buffalo Philharmonic through the amelodic intricacies of Krzysztof Penderecki, Luigi Nono and other 20th century composers. Ask an educator and you will learn that Buffalo's 21,000-student private university, taken over by New York State in 1962, is now the largest single unit of the new state university system. A new \$600 million educational plant, designed by the architectural firm of Skidmore, Owings & Merrill, is on the drawing boards, and an impressive and often highly unconventional faculty has been assembled. In-group theatrical circles now know Buffalo equally well: it has a two-year-old, better-than-average repertory theater group.

Sign and Symbol: Buffalo, in the six years since the Albright-Knox added its glass-walled new wing, has taken giant strides toward becoming a vociferously militant acropolis of the avant-garde arts. Though the later term is out of vogue in Manhattan's rarefied critical circles, it is used with force and conviction in Buffalo, where the cab drivers lecture their fares on the horror of the Albright-Knox's modern art, and where Foss reminds his listeners that the word avant-garde is military in origin. The artist, in his view, is meant to act as a sort of spiritual shock-trooper for society, forcing it to become aware of new conflicts and realities whether it wants to or not.

Sign and symbol of Buffalo's new militancy is its Second Festival of the Arts Today,

a 16-day program of cultural events that include premieres of two plays by Edward Albee and an opera by Belgium's Henri Pousseur, the first U.S. performances of new works by Penderecki and Greek-born Iannis Xenakis, a new movie by Underground Mogul Jonas Mekas, John Barth reading his new novella aloud, and lectures by City Planner Constantinos Doxiadis and Designer Buckminster Fuller. The whole shebang got under way last week with a display of 300 constructivist paintings and sculptures called "Plus by Minus: Today's Half-Century" at the Albright-Knox Gallery.

Squares for Imagery: The theme of the festival, in Foss's words, is "perhaps revolution, not in the Communist sense but in the Bucky Fuller sense, meaning that if we don't learn to adapt ourselves to the modern situation now, it's the end—and the artist must show us the way." The star and theme setter of the art exhibit, appropriately enough, is that grand old Russian revolutionary and pioneer sculptor of the 1920s, Naum Gabo, 77, with 28 constructions on display. Though the original idea for the festival was Foss's, the planning and expenses are being borne by a dozen different local and state institutions (even Buffalo's bantam-sized 7,800-student state college got in the act by inviting Merce Cunningham and his dance company to perform two new works during a four-week stay). The festival committee is chaired by the Albright-Knox's director, Gordon Smith, 61, and the residual deficit will doubtless be met by the gallery's long-time Medici, former seven-goal polo player and investment banker Seymour ("Shorty") Knox, 69, who paid \$100,000 to underwrite the first festival, an S.R.O. attraction that in 1965 drew 187,000 visitors.

Most festival-goers begin their tour of events with a visit to the Albright-Knox's "Plus by Minus," a title that the show's organizer, Douglas MacAgy, amplifies on by citing Sherlock Holmes: "When you have eliminated the impossible, whatever remains, however improbable, must be the truth." For the first 20th century abstract artists, the impossible was "the accreted imagery that has been a characteristic of visual art ever since the Renaissance." First to jettison traditional images altogether, as MacAgy shows, was the Russian suprematist Kasimir Malevich, with his revolutionary 1913 drawings of two squares and a circle.

Refound Ancestors: The art that followed—nonobjective, nonemotional and non-utilitarian—was, and for the most part still is, anathema to the common man. To the suprematists, it was an epochal breakthrough, even though Malevich later recalled that he felt "a kind of timidity bordering on fear when I was called upon to leave the world of will and idea in which I had lived and worked; but the blissful feeling of liberating nonobjectivity drew me into the desert, where nothing is real but feeling."

Through Gabo and his fellow constructivists, who took over leadership in the 1920s, the movement expanded to influence Germany's Bauhaus and the Dutch exponents of De Stijl. For art historians, the show is endlessly fascinating; no exhibit has attempted to interrelate these different schools since Manhattan's Museum of Modern Art's "Cubism and Abstract Art" in 1936. What makes the Buffalo survey particularly relevant to 1968 is the demonstration that the lineal descendants of constructivism are none other than the kinetic, op and minimal artists of today.

Maid to Marry: Thesis for the Buffalo show is that "what is happening in art today is not part of a fad or temporary school, but part of a historical moment that happens to have lasted 50 years." To prove it, MacAgy dramatically contrasts the delicate, spiky constructions of Moholy-Nagy and the small, primary-colored canvases of Mondrian with today's huge, brilliantly impastoed canvases by Alfred Jensen and the eerie lights and

shadows of the plastic, metal or kinetic constructions of artists in the U.S. and abroad. Super-king-size constructivist sculptures by Tony Smith and Mark di Suvero are imposingly arrayed on the snow-covered grounds outside the museum, while inside, gallerygoers are invited to stroll around the staircase environment of France's *Groupe de Recherche d'Art Visuel*.

Indeed, the tendency of constructivists to move from freestanding sculpture toward creation of a whole environment is clear in the stage sets that the movement inspired. A prime example is the set originally designed by Liubov Popova for Meyerhold's 1922 production of Fernand Crommelynck's play *The Magnificent Cuckold*. Reconstructed from a contemporary drawing, it was used on opening night in the gallery as the setting for an Ionesco playlet, *Maid to Marry*, as actors clambered up, slid down and crawled in and out of the set's slides and chutes or ducked around the revolving wheels, even Ionesco's dense thicket of non sequiturs became a veritable marvel of wit and perspicacity.

Nor is constructivist principle dead today. For Edward Albee's two new one-act plays, *Boz* and *Quotations from Chairman Mao Tse-tung*, are performed at the Studio Arena Theater within an austere, boxlike stage set outlined with wooden bars. Unfortunately the plays within are as empty as the frame. For the first and last 15 minutes, the stage remains bare, and the audience listens to the meandering, tape-recorded reverie of an unseen woman. In between, the stage becomes the deck of an ocean liner on which Mao and two other characters conduct contrapuntal monologues ranging from Communist agit-propwash to pretentious aphorisms on art, life and love.

Though constructivist works have a common root, two different principles of organization are clearly at work throughout the festival as a whole. The pure, rational, almost classical is represented by the works of the ever-youthful Naum Gabo. Among the most impressive is the cobwebby *Linear Construction in Space #2* (1949-53). But even his historic works, like his famed 1916 *Head*, have gained an altogether different impact by finally being blown up to full scale in recent years.

At the other end of the spectrum are the passionate advocates of clutter, the fertile chroniclers of chance. At one recital, Composer John Cage wandered through the audience gunning down musicians on the stage with the ack-ack-ack of a toy Tommy gun. At another concert, members of Jazz Pianist Cecil Taylor's combo roamed off and on stage at random. And leaving Taylor's concert, the audience was confronted by the same dedication to happenstance in a collection of devil-may-care props and costumes by Robert Rauschenberg, composed for Merce Cunningham's ballets. Rauschenberg assembled his props in the same spirit as his famous "combine" of goat and tire—out of whatever happened to be at hand when inspiration hit.

Whether the principle of organizing art is a dispassionate, cool or reckless chance. Gabo urges festival-goers to linger before the works, no matter how abstract or outlandish. "Lines, shapes, forms, color and movement have a language of their own, but reading takes time," he says. "It is not enough to look. You must see, and see means read."

French Wines for French Menu

HON. FRANK THOMPSON, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 13, 1968

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, in the usual course of events,

the last thing I would do on this earth would be to express a disagreement with my loyal, devoted, and brilliant friend from New York, the Honorable JAMES H. SCHEUER. I have no choice, however, since he has attacked me.

On March 6, Mr. Speaker, Mr. SCHEUER took public issue with my recommendation of two splendid French wines—to wit, Latache 1959, and Tavel. Instead, this brilliant Representative of the Bronx—such a great center of the culinary arts and the home of so very many gourmets, that Michelin is preparing a separate column on it, suggests to me wines of his choice. Mr. SCHEUER recommends, beyond all others Manischewitz and Mogen David and, abandoning temporarily his support of another distinguished authority on the subject, Representative JOHN "Buy American" DENT, offers as an alternative two great wines of Israel, Rishon Le-Zion and Zichron. I agree with Mr. SCHEUER's suggestion relating to the Israeli wines for they are, indeed, magnificent, especially with a menu of matzoh-ball soup, bagels, and lox, but I might point out that my earned colleague has apparently not paid close attention to the menu for which I suggested French wines.

With respect to those enormously great, sweet wines, the Manischewitz and Mogen David, they are most appropriate either spread on English muffins or for dessert. I think, perhaps, that my friend from New York, Mr. SCHEUER, and my great friend from Pennsylvania, Mr. DENT, should get together. Incidentally, Representative DENT suggests the wines of Pennsylvania, New York, or California and, as an alternative, says that at least I could have suggested an Italian wine. I do hope that the two gentlemen meet in a spirit of ecumenism and devise a menu suitable for their splendid suggestions. The Nation, the Congress, and oenologists are all in the debt of my distinguished colleagues.

State Taxation

HON. JOHN E. MOSS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 13, 1968

Mr. MOSS. Mr. Speaker, the Governor of Virginia, I am told, is currently preparing to sign into law an emplaning tax bill recently passed by the Legislature of Virginia. I am sure I express the sentiments of the majority of my colleagues when I point to Virginia's action as setting a precedent which could lead to a Balkanization of the United States. One can almost envision a per capita taxation upon interstate travelers whatever the mode of transportation. This is clearly not consistent with the national interest. For a State to attempt to profit by the interstate commerce generated in airports located adjacent to our metropolitan business areas is indeed without any justification whatsoever.

I am, therefore, introducing, today, a measure which would prohibit any State or political subdivision thereof from placing any tax upon air passengers in

interstate commerce. It would be well for the Congress to nip in the bud this latest attempt to raid the purses of the traveling public by enacting without delay this measure. For the benefit of my colleagues, the text of the measure follows:

H.R. 15932

A bill to amend the Federal Aviation Act of 1958 to prohibit State taxation of the carriage of persons in air transportation

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That title XI of the Federal Aviation Act of 1958 is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new section:

"STATE TAXATION

"SEC. 1112. No State (or any political subdivision thereof) shall levy or collect a tax, fee, or other charge, directly or indirectly, on the carriage of persons in air transportation by any aircraft—

"(1) operated by an air carrier certificated by an agency of the United States to perform air transportation.

"(2) operated by any person subject to regulation by an agency of the United States in the performance of air transportation, or

"(3) operating to or from any airport financed, in whole or in part, from Federal funds."

SEC. 2. That portion of the table of contents contained in the first section of such Act which appears under the heading "TITLE XI—MISCELLANEOUS" is amended by adding at the end thereof "SEC. 1112. STATE TAXATION."

Time for an OEO Look

HON. BILL NICHOLS

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 13, 1968

Mr. NICHOLS. Mr. Speaker, last fall, Dr. Ralph Phelps, of Arkansas, was named regional director of the Office of Economic Opportunity for the southeastern region at Atlanta. Dr. Phelps took a year's leave of absence from a Baptist college in Arkansas which he served as president. I was highly impressed by Dr. Phelps and the attitude he brought with him into this most difficult and challenging job. Here was a man, I thought, that would help to right many of the wrongs that inhabit the poverty program.

But Dr. Phelps was unable to cope with what he called the administrative monstrosity that is the OEO. Dr. Phelps had the right ideas and he made the effort, but he found that unrestrained bureaucracy, like many diseases, is incurable. Our area of the Nation needed a man like Dr. Ralph Phelps to administer OEO programs. We have lost that man.

The March 10 Birmingham News outlined the problem and a possible cure in the following editorial:

TIME FOR AN OEO LOOK

After only five months on the job, Dr. Ralph Phelps has resigned as Southeastern regional director of the Office of Economic Opportunity with a harsh indictment of OEO as an "administrative monstrosity."

According to Phelps, he took the Atlanta-based job with the understanding he was to have the authority to get rid of OEO deadwood in the six-state Southeastern region.

But on this matter, as on program funding and administrative decisions, Phelps charged, he discovered he needed concurrence from higher levels.

"If we are ever going to help the poor," he said, "the bureaucratic, administrative mess must be straightened out."

This is not the first time a high OEO official has quit the anti-poverty agency with a public expression of distrust.

Every time it happens, public confidence is further undermined. But, curiously, OEO officialdom, from Sargent Shriver on down, has seemed to be in no hurry to try to restore that confidence.

Shriver is said to get along famously with congressional committees because he gets on the witness stand and freely admits OEO's previous transgressions, as well as error of his own making. But his finesse as a political diplomat obviously hasn't extended into the public relations field. OEO's image is bad and Shriver hasn't been able to improve it.

And in the South, at least, that image now takes another nosedive with Phelps' resignation and his stormy denunciation of the OEO administration.

If the charges that Phelps and others have made are not true, then OEO had better get busy and prove them untrue. If they are true, then OEO had better do some housecleaning.

There is much good in the anti-poverty program; but it cannot hope to do its job unless the public can believe in it.

This being true, an upcoming investigation of the anti-poverty program by the federal government's General Accounting Office may be exactly the tonic that Shriver's office needs.

GAO—the watchdog agency on government waste and inefficiency—plans to examine OEO (and other agencies administering anti-poverty funds) in all aspects of operations. As proposed, the examination will involve not only a fiscal audit, but also a management analysis. Everybody should benefit.

The analysis will help pinpoint OEO's managerial and administrative weaknesses—and simultaneously its strong points.

It will help measure OEO's effectiveness in terms of how many dollars are actually filtering down to the poor, instead of being siphoned off for administrative salaries and other operating costs; and also in terms of how much the poor are benefitting from the services they are receiving and the programs in which they are participating.

It will give Congress a solid basis upon which to judge OEO's past effectiveness, and concurrently it will provide badly needed guidance to the lawmakers in shaping future anti-poverty legislation.

It will give the general public a clearer image of where OEO has failed, and where it has succeeded. It also will allow the public to judge more intelligently the extent to which OEO is the fumbling, wasteful, scandal-marred agency it is sometimes held up to be, and which Phelps' parting blast in some measure insists it is.

Most importantly, in the long run the survey should result in a greatly improved program for the people who are supposed to be helped by it—the poor.

A healthier, better OEO should emerge.

The Selective Service System

HON. JOSEPH Y. RESNICK

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 13, 1968

Mr. RESNICK. Mr. Speaker, the Selective Service System in effect today is anachronistic, inefficient, and unfair. It

CXIV—407—Part 5

discriminates between students and dropouts, whites and Negroes, fathers, husbands, and single men. It disrupts the lives of our young men at a time when they are trying to make the educational, career, and family decisions vital to their future. It assumes that uncertainty and arbitrariness are virtues. It is used as a vehicle to douse dissent.

In peacetime, the inequities, the System produces are regrettable. In wartime—when we are asking one man to risk his life for his country and telling another that his life can proceed undisturbed—the inequities are intolerable. In short, when we are determining who shall fight and who shall not, perhaps who shall live and who shall not, we must devise the fairest law that we can.

This the U.S. Congress has failed to do. Disregarding the advice of the National Advisory Commission on Selective Service appointed by President Johnson, members of the President's Cabinet, and distinguished American citizens, we have preserved student deferment and the "oldest first" order of call.

STUDENT DEFERMENTS

I am most upset by the 4-year grace period extended to those young men who have the means to go to college. The responsibility to bear arms must rest equally upon all males. The fact that a high school graduate is 50 percent more likely than a college man to serve in the Armed Forces is hardly consistent with this principle. Every year, 100,000 high school graduates are insulated against serving their country by the fortuitous circumstances of birth, wealth, and intellect.

Furthermore, I am not pleased with the image of our institutions of higher education serving as the haven for these young men. Kingman Brewster, president of Yale University, remarked that the ease with which 19-year-olds can avoid service is "a corruption of the aims of education and a tarnishing of the national spirit." If thousands of young men are interested in Descartes, Dante, or D.N.A. only insofar as their draft status is affected, have we not lost track of the purpose of higher education?

THE OLDEST FIRST

While the student deferment is unfair to those young men who do not have the money, the desire, or the skill for college, the policy of drafting the oldest first is hardly fair to the man eligible for the service until he is 35. On the one hand, the Congress is telling all young men to go to college; on the other hand, it is telling them that no matter what they have learned, no matter what plans they have made, the Selective Service System may demand 2 years of their lives at any time until middle age. The consequences on their employability are not too hard to imagine. For example, a recent Department of Defense survey revealed that 48 percent of the Nation's employers place restrictions on hiring draft-eligible college graduates.

Furthermore, there is no sound military reason for preferring older men to younger ones. No less an authority than Gen. Earle Wheeler, the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, maintains that

younger recruits make better soldiers than older ones:

The younger ones are sturdy and they learn quickly, while the older ones are not as eager and not as willing to understand the military service.

THE DRAFT AS PUNISHMENT

My third objection to the law Congress has passed is its failure to make it perfectly clear that the draft is not to be used as a tool to frighten potential antiwar or antidraft demonstrators. On October 26, 1967, Selective Service Director, Gen. Lewis B. Hershey, issued a directive to local draft boards urging them to use the threat of reclassification or accelerated induction in order to reduce demonstrations. To this day, General Hershey still believes that the law gives him authority to use the draft to punish protesters.

This is outrageous. Freedom of speech is one of the most precious heritages we have. This is one of the rights we are fighting to preserve in Vietnam. To restrict it here at home or to subject its expression to disciplinary action is intolerable. Military service is an obligation, rather than a punishment; I see no constitutional justification for using the draft for anything but to raise an armed force.

AN ALTERNATIVE

The law we have passed is unwise and unconscionable. But it is not too late to rectify the situation. I am cosponsoring a bill with 24 of my colleagues which is identical to the bill Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts has introduced in the Senate.

Among other things, the bill would introduce random selection for induction of draftees beginning with the youngest qualified registrant. By subjecting all able bodied young men to the fish bowl, we would eliminate those inequities of the Selective Service System due to wealth. By reversing the order of induction we will be exposing young men to their primary vulnerability at the least disruptive time in their lives.

Furthermore, the bill would prohibit the use of the Selective Service Act to punish draft protesters. Our Constitution demands nothing less.

In his introduction of the Senate bill, Mr. KENNEDY reminded us:

If we are not certain that our draft is as fair as we can make it, then we have curbed the persuading spirit of a free society.

The draft as it now exists is not as fair as we can make it. The bill which I am cosponsoring is much more consistent with the underpinnings of our democratic society. I urge it upon all of my colleagues.

Dedication of New Philadelphia Veterans Assistance Center

HON. JOSHUA EILBERG

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 13, 1968

Mr. EILBERG. Mr. Speaker, on Friday, March 8, 1968, the Philadelphia

U.S. Veterans Assistance Center was dedicated and it was my pleasure to participate in the ceremony. This new multi-agency center was established primarily to serve the educationally disadvantaged, recently separated Vietnam veterans.

I agree entirely with S. W. Melldosian, manager of the veteran's center, when he says:

We must dedicate ourselves to the task of seeking, finding and helping these veterans who so desperately need help but who do not come to us. New methods must be tried, not all will succeed. However, with good will between all agencies of Government represented in this endeavor, we are confident that these young men will be properly counseled to combine work and education so that they will fully utilize their abilities to lead productive lives in our free society.

I herewith place in the RECORD the remarks I made on this occasion:

ADDRESS GIVEN AT THE DEDICATION CEREMONY FOR THE NEW PHILADELPHIA VETERANS ASSISTANCE CENTER, MARCH 8, 1968

Dear Mr. Melldosian and distinguished guests, let me say how delighted I was to receive Mr. Melldosian's invitation to participate at the ceremony formally dedicating the new Philadelphia U.S. Veterans Assistance Center.

Why am I so enthusiastic about receiving this invitation? And, why did I travel all the way up here from Washington today? Because I feel that another milestone in the history of the care of veterans is being forged in Philadelphia today. Philadelphia, and even the Nation is watching us as we launch this new concept in service to the returning serviceman. The veterans administration is already embarked on programs to bring its service closer to the point where interest is first aroused. For the first time in history, the VA is bringing its services as close to the battlefield as its soldiers are fighting with three separate offices in operation in Vietnam. In addition, VA personnel visit the sick and wounded in service hospitals and at separation points. This service is in process of being expanded to cover all such installations.

On January 30th, President Johnson delivered a memorable message to Congress entitled "Our Pride and Our Strength, America's Servicemen and Veterans". Its purpose is made clear in the opening paragraph:

"America holds some of its greatest honors for the men who have stood in its defense, and kept alive its freedoms. It shows its gratitude not only in memorials which grace city parks and courthouse squares across the land—but more meaningfully in the programs which care for him . . . and for his widow and his orphan."

In pointing up the 850,000 servicemen who will return to civilian life this year—19,000 in the Delaware Valley alone—President Johnson brought home the fact that three conditions must exist to insure that these men leaving the service become familiar with the benefits that await them as veterans. They are:

The veteran must be aware of them.

He must be able to choose among them.

He must know that the help he needs will be there when he needs it.

The President, therefore, offered as a means of achieving these three goals the establishment of one-stop centers where a veteran can receive personal attention and counsel on all the benefits the law provides him—not only the familiar veterans benefits administered by the VA, education, housing, equal opportunity in housing and employment, and most of all a job. The President directed that these one-stop assistance cen-

ters be opened in ten pilot cities, one of them being Philadelphia, the others being in New York, Chicago, Los Angeles, Detroit, Cleveland, Washington, D.C., San Francisco, Boston and Atlanta. Ten more are to be opened in additional cities as soon as possible.

Although we are witnessing the formal opening of the Philadelphia U.S. veterans assistance center today, the Philadelphia office opened officially for business on February 19, just three weeks from the Executive order—a fine tribute to Mr. Melldosian, manager of the VA center, Dr. Ryder of the U.S. Civil Service Commission, and the other agencies participating in the local program. Since its opening, the Philadelphia center has concentrated on seeking out specifically the educationally disadvantaged who have recently returned from Vietnam service. For, let us have no illusions about the purpose and meaning of these assistance centers. They are oriented particularly to the disadvantaged among our returning veterans—to those who have the greatest need for the services and assistance this kind of program can offer. The President pointed this up, when he said:

"Consider the man who comes home today. His Government has made a vast array of programs available to him. But what effect are the programs if he cannot find them? And in our major cities, where facilities are often scattered across widely-separated areas, this is a serious problem—particularly for those who need the programs the most."

Certainly, the number 1 consideration, and the problem uppermost in the minds of young returning Vietnam veterans is job opportunities. We must recognize that in the big cities like Philadelphia, when we talk about the educationally disadvantaged, we are talking about young people who have not had the opportunity to finish high school, who have had little vocational training, and prior to military service, had no motivation for either. The President's program is designed primarily to take these young educationally disadvantaged Vietnam veterans and, through proper counseling and assistance, get them placed in jobs. If the job can be combined with education, these young men will have been started on the road to becoming responsible citizens in our community.

We have reason to be optimistic about how successful this program can be, for upon closer examination, we find that we are dealing with men who have made a good adjustment to military life—and a review of military records shows that this is generally true—it follows naturally that they have developed a sense of responsibility to themselves and to their government, and can, therefore, assume some responsibility in a civilian capacity. They have developed personal habits of industry and dependability that private industry is looking for—the kind of habits that should lead to success when combined with further education.

An excellent start has been made at the Philadelphia U.S. Veterans' Assistance Center towards seeking out the educationally disadvantaged.

Procedures have been set up whereby the Veterans' Administration Center receives a copy of each separation notice on recently separated veterans. These are carefully screened particularly for those that show that the veteran did not complete high school prior to entering service or during his military career. Efforts are made to locate these veterans by telephone and letter. The purpose, of course, is to bring to their attention the existence of help through the U.S. Veterans' assistance center. Where possible, specific appointments are arranged. Every known public relations media is be-

ing enlisted to bring the existence of the center to the attention of those for whom it was intended to serve. I also understand that Mr. Melldosian has distributed letters to all clergymen in the Philadelphia area urging them to give wide publicity to this program with their congregations. Knowing Mr. Melldosian as I do, it does not surprise me that he has tried to reach all elements of our society. The staff for the U.S. Veterans assistance center has been carefully selected to perform the greatest possible service for the greatest number who need this service. Mr. Melldosian has chosen two of his most experienced contact representatives to counsel and advise veterans on VA benefits. These include disability compensation and pension for which the veteran may not have filed at time of his separation from service, medical and dental care, service disabled government insurance, vocational rehabilitation, or other educational benefits and guaranteed home and business loans.

Dr. Ryder of the U.S. Civil Service Commission has furnished a personnel staffing specialist to provide Federal job counseling to returning veterans interested in obtaining Federal employment. To furnish him with the necessary authority to carry out the important mission, the President issued on February 9th, executive order #11397, authorizing non-competitive appointments of veterans who have served during the Vietnam era. The executive order combines incentives for better jobs and better education for these veterans. Under the executive order, Vietnam era veterans will be eligible to enter Federal employment, in what are known as transitional appointments at GS-5 and below without taking a competitive examination. The veteran must have completed less than one year of education beyond high school, must meet the job qualification requirements and must agree to pursue an approved part time or full time educational program. His continued employment will depend on satisfactory job performance and educational progress.

Further job placement assistance is being furnished at the center by a representative of the U.S. Department of Labor's Bureau of Re-Employment Rights who counsels veterans on their reemployment rights; and the Pennsylvania State employment service for jobs outside the Federal family.

As Veterans come to the center with problems that do not fall within the jurisdiction of the agencies represented there, arrangements will be made for personal consultant advisory service with a number of cooperating agencies who do not have office space at the center. These are, the Small Business Administration, the Federal Housing Administration, the Office of Housing and Urban Development, the Office of Economic Opportunities, and the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. Other State and city agencies have also offered their valuable assistance where needed in specific problems. President Johnson said:

"A man who has fought for his country deserves gratitude. But gratitude can be no substitute for the job he wants—and needs".

I see as the alternative to this type program the increasing susceptibility of many of these young people to the lure of violent action programs or of wasting their misdirected potential in criminal pursuits.

Two hundred years ago, Thomas Paine said: "These are the times that try men's souls."

These words are just as appropriate today, when we, the greatest nation on earth find our people mired in frustration and self-doubt. We a Nation marching together with one voice in World War II and Korea are divided over Vietnam where a struggle is being waged between those defending the freedom of people to choose what they want

to be, and those who would impose an authoritarian ideology. At home, we are equally divided. Just last week the President's National Advisory Commission on Civil Disorders published its sobering report which hints of "two societies, one black and one white—separate and unequal".

People talk about a moral decay, about a rebellious youth. They would have you believe that this Nation, which you and I cherish, is going the way of the ancient empires. I don't believe this.

We are living in times that require a reappraisal of our national aims and purpose. It is certainly not a time to quit, but a time of action—massive and sustained national effort. Not the least of which is to restore the self-respect and purpose in the lives of those of our society who are less fortunate than we.

I would like to think that the U.S. Veterans Assistance Center here in Philadelphia will provide hope and direction for many young people coming out of Vietnam era service, especially the educationally disadvantaged most of whom are Negro. These men have demonstrated during their military service a self-discipline, intelligence and ability which should be translated into productive lines in our society. It is my fond hope that the counsel and advice given them at this assistance center will help them find jobs and further education.

Look Who's Revising the U.S. Constitution

HON. JOHN M. ASHBROOK

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 13, 1968

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, our Founding Fathers and their version of the U.S. Constitution might well be replaced by a "refounding father" and a new constitution if the leftwing Center for Democratic Institutions at Santa Barbara, Calif., has anything to say about it. Although the New York Times carries no comic strips, it provided an avalanche of laughs in its March 10, 1968, edition, when it reported that Rexford Guy Tugwell, controversial figure in the Roosevelt administration, was busy at work on a new Federal constitution.

It will be remembered that, among other things, Tugwell was the Governor of Puerto Rico from 1941 to 1946. In December 1942, the Chicago Tribune ran a number of articles on Tugwell's tenure of office in Puerto Rico. The first article began with these observations:

In the last 15 months this verdant, tropical island has become a laboratory for socialistic government experiments such as were unknown to the continental United States even in the early days of the New Deal.

It continued with this familiar bureaucratic theme:

Under Governor Rexford Guy Tugwell of the 1933 brain trust, more than 30 new bureaus, authorities, and offices have sprung up like jungle undergrowth. Government costs have jumped almost \$5,000,000 in a year.

The article further elaborated on Tugwell's welfare-state policies:

Puerto Rico's government has become the most expensive under the American flag.

Taxes are the highest in its history. Dollars by the hundreds of thousands have been appropriated for long range social and economic schemes while famine threatens the island and while half its 1,900,000 population receives food and other assistance at public cost.

The Washington Post of June 29, 1946, announced Tugwell's resignation and fond farewell to Puerto Rico:

One of the original New Deal brain trusts, Tugwell has been Governor of Puerto Rico for five years and repeatedly has been under attack in Congress for his alleged left-wing tendencies.

Many taxpayers' dollars have, through bureaucratic schemes, wasted away to nothing since Tugwell left the public scene, and perhaps he has since learned some semblance of fiscal responsibility. Perhaps so, but his association with the Center for Democratic Institutions would seem to indicate he still has much to learn. At any rate, there's not much cause for alarm: the "refounding fathers" efforts will be subject to approval by the American people, who, I am certain, are still partial to the legacy bequeathed to us by the Founding Fathers.

I include the above-mentioned article from the New York Times at this point:

U.S. CONSTITUTION: A NEW SCRUTINY—DEMOCRATIC CENTER REVISES AND REVISES THE CHARTER

(By Joseph G. Herzberg)

Rexford Guy Tugwell, one of President Franklin D. Roosevelt's brain trusters, is working on a 32d draft of a possible new Federal Constitution, a task undertaken on its own by the Center for Democratic Institutions at Santa Barbara, Calif.

Mr. Tugwell, last in public office as Governor of Puerto Rico from 1941 to 1946, gives a preliminary report in The Center Magazine of the effort to rewrite The Constitution. The magazine, published bi-monthly by the center, describes Mr. Tugwell as a "Refounding Father."

As Assistant Secretary of Agriculture in the first Roosevelt Administration, Mr. Tugwell's ideas aroused many controversies. Before he went to Puerto Rico, he was chairman of the New York City Planning Commission. He returned to academic life in 1946, and in recent years has been a consultant at the Center for Democratic Institutions.

Mr. Tugwell said the center undertook a re-examination of the Constitution because of "an uneasy sense of something wrong." Before long, he said, the study began "to fix on alarming signs that much of the nation's activity, both social and economic, had escaped from any direct relation to the Constitution. . . ."

This is said even more pointedly by Robert M. Hutchins, the center's president, whose opening article in the magazine, describing the work of the center, cites the changes in the world and then says:

"Few if any of the subjects that concern us most today are even referred to in the Constitution. The Constitution does not mention cities, bureaucracy, technology or education. It does not speak of political parties, corporations, labor unions, or judicial review."

"Its remarks about communications, the common defense, the power of the President to make war, and the relationship of church and state are primitive in the extreme. On the other hand, the problem with which the Constitution does deal, that of the organization of territory, has by virtue of urban development and technological change taken a shape the Founding Fathers could not have dreamed of."

Mr. Tugwell does not treat the Supreme Court with much reverence.

"Because the Constitution furnished directives for both the Congress and the President, but ones that had become inappropriate in modern circumstances, and because both had to be checked and guided somehow, a way of doing this had been invented," Mr. Tugwell writes.

"There had grown up an elaborate fiction that the Supreme Court was authorized to keep both of them within proper bounds."

This, with other "fictions," says Mr. Tugwell, was "a cloudy construct," providing "no ready or certain references." He says that the Court itself often disagreed and it set up no guide for the future, "since it had a way of reversing itself whenever the majority changed." To which Mr. Tugwell says:

"It seemed to have become more a legislative body than a dispenser of justice in adversary actions. But in a democracy, legislatures are supposed to be representative, and, in a democracy of separate powers, courts may not prescribe duties for the other branches of government; or, especially, prescribe duties for themselves."

THE CHANGING NATION

Mr. Tugwell insists that the Constitution has been ineffectual in meeting problems the nation faced in "its progression from competition to mutuality."

"The Government," he says, "did accept responsibility for individuals' well-being and it did interfere to make it secure. But it really had to be admitted that it was done irregularly and according to doctrines the framers would have rejected."

Thirty-two drafts are not much, Mr. Tugwell seems to say, with the great differences that have arisen among the historians, political scientists and others who have joined the center discussions.

Of the discussion on the legislative, executive and judicial form, Mr. Tugwell says:

"Was there something necessary to democracy in the tripartite form or had the diversity of governmental duties and relationships made other branches of equal, or nearly equal, importance, desirable—such as planning, and generally, the maximal use of resources. This raised the question again whether the federalist form—the division of sovereignty among equal sharers—had actually lost its usefulness. Was it consistent with the idea of diversity within unity?"

Freedom's Challenge

HON. WILLIAM V. ROTH, JR.

OF DELAWARE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 13, 1968

Mr. ROTH. Mr. Speaker, the Veterans of Foreign Wars and its ladies auxiliary are again this year hosting the annual Voice of Democracy contest finals here in Washington. The theme of the contest this year is "Freedom's Challenge."

Miss Christine Ann Crawford of Dover won the State competition, and is representing Delaware in the national finals this week. Particularly in these troubled times, Christine's words merit the attention of all Americans.

The article follows:

FREEDOM'S CHALLENGE

(By Christine Ann Crawford)

The American dream envisions a society where all men, under God, are free to determine their own destiny. Freedom—an ideal

cherished and fought for repeatedly throughout America's history—is but rarely defined. What, exactly, is meant by this freedom which Americans hold so dear? By definition, there are degrees of freedom ranging from total absence of restraint to merely one's unawareness of being in anyway restrained. Somewhere between those two extremes lies the freedom essential to fulfill the American dream. Failure to understand fully the implications of our forefathers' concept of freedom is perhaps today's greatest challenge to freedom's very existence.

Although our forefathers realized the need for a strong central government, they were equally concerned with preserving the rights and the freedoms of the individual. Accordingly, our Constitution guarantees the individual freedom of speech, press, and religion. The Constitution also protects the individual from infringement on his rights by others, but not so clearly spelled out are the responsibilities that go with freedom. Our freedom which was granted was not meant to be, nor is absolute. Our freedom requires each individual to consent to his own self-restraint, thus not hampering the freedoms of others. Each man must realize that no man is free until all men are free. He must respect the law, for it is only under law that freedom will not turn to license. He must participate in government by the giving of his time and effort. He must be willing to make any necessary sacrifice to see that the freedoms of others are preserved. He must understand that freedom is a commodity which must be earned by every generation.

Thus, the greatest challenges to freedom stem from within each of us. Only when our own selfish interests blind us to the needs of freedom so that our desires for security and comfort overshadow the need to stand on our own two feet with confidence is freedom really in danger. It is for this reason that we owe it to ourselves and to the future generations to stand strong, defend the rights of others, grow in knowledge, and pray for the wisdom to recognize tyranny within ourselves as easily as we can see tyranny in others. These challenges to freedom I accept.

Observance of Purim

HON. FRANK ANNUNZIO

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 13, 1968

Mr. ANNUNZIO. Mr. Speaker, the festival of Purim, which is being observed this year between sundown March 13 and sundown March 14, is a holiday of joy and gladness commemorating the survival of Judaism and celebrating the eternal triumph of right over selfishness and evil.

On this occasion Jews throughout the world remember the joy which the Jewish people felt in their deliverance from Haman by the beautiful Queen Esther, who saved her people from extermination. On this day Jews also remember, through various symbols, the sweetness of obedience to God and the protection which God provides his faithful children.

The story of Esther is one of the most moving and beautiful in Jewish literature. It reminds us of the humility, courage, and faith which one woman possessed—which, together with a steadfast devotion to her people, gave them hope where there had been despair, and joy where there had been sorrow.

The story of Esther and Haman is too well-known to all of us. Haman had tricked his king, Assuerus, into issuing a decree of death against all Jews living in the kingdom of Persia. The date of execution, the 13th of Adar, was determined by choosing lots. Haman's plot, however, was discovered by Queen Esther, the Jewish wife of the king. Esther persuaded the king to spare the Jews, and Haman was hanged from the gibbet which he had prepared for Esther's relative, the Jewish elder Mordecai.

This story is eternally significant in that there are always forces in the hearts of men which are represented in the prototypes of Esther and Haman. In the 20th century A.D., just as in the fifth century B.C., there are those whose actions are motivated by hatred and envy. And today, just as in the fifth century B.C., there are those whose determined conviction in the force of right is a triumphant expression of the will of God.

Because of the nature of Purim, and its significance, the feast imposes four religious obligations upon all Jewish adults: To hear the reading of the entire Esther scroll; to participate in a festive meal, which centers around the members of the family; to exchange gifts of sweets with neighbors and friends; and to distribute alms to the needy.

The reading of the Esther scroll is a solemn, yet altogether joyful occasion. Women are obliged to be present at the reading, because it was a woman who brought about the miracle of deliverance. Purim is also known as a children's night at the synagogue, for children participate fully in the celebration, rattling the traditional noisemakers known as gragers at the mention of Haman's name.

The manner of observing the Purim feast is described in the letter which Mordecai sent to all the Jews of the land of Persia, following their deliverance. In this letter he enjoins them to remember Esther's deed by feasting with gladness, and sending portions of sweets to one another and gifts to the poor.

Purim, then, is truly a time of thanksgiving, of prayerful joy in God's deliverance of His people in a time of great danger. It is, moreover, a symbol of Jewish faith in the rightness of God's law, in the mercy of God, and in the determination of the Jewish people to endure and prevail over the most dire adversity.

This holiday is also a reminder to us of the valiant stand which the Jews have always made in the face of oppressive religious discrimination and persecution. On January 31, 1967, I introduced House Concurrent Resolution 114 to express the sense of the Congress in condemnation of religious persecution of persons by Soviet Russia. The compelling need for enactment of this resolution is obvious in view of the closing of places of worship in the Soviet Union, the prevention of religious education of children, and the severe restrictions on activities of rabbis and other religious leaders.

During the Purim observance, it is appropriate for us to join together in renewing our efforts to insure religious freedom for the Jews and for all peoples

who are being harassed and persecuted in practicing their religion. I urge my colleagues, therefore, to give their support to House Concurrent Resolution 114 and similar legislation in order that our belief in freedom to worship may be reaffirmed to all nations.

On this occasion also it is my pleasure to extend greetings to the Jewish people in my Seventh Congressional District of Illinois, as well as to Jews everywhere in this Nation and abroad, and to express my hope for their prosperity and well-being in this and every year to follow.

Situation in Paraguay

HON. DANTE B. FASCELL

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 13, 1968

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, the national elections held in Paraguay on February 11 are worthy of attention on several counts. First, they indicate that the government of President Stroessner has continued to implement its proclaimed policy of revitalizing the democratic political institutions of the country. Secondly, they show that the opposition parties have come to the realization that their participation in the legal processes of government is both possible and useful in restoring democratic forms to Paraguay. Both sides are to be commended for the fair and peaceful manner in which the February elections were conducted.

Paraguay has a turbulent political history. Twenty-six of the country's 50 presidents have been overthrown by coups. Six other presidents have died or were killed while in office. Until 1963 there had been no elections with the participation of opposition candidates since 1928. The 1930's and 1940's were characterized by the Chaco War, revolutions, civil war, dictatorship, and extreme political instability. During 1949 alone four presidents held office.

In contrast, Paraguay's recent record is indeed encouraging. After two decades without legal status an opposition party was permitted to contest the presidential elections in 1963. Two opposition parties competed in municipal elections in 1965, and three opposition parties presented candidates for a constitutional convention in 1967 and for the national elections in 1968. Although there is undeniably room for improvement, these elections give hope for strengthened and viable democratic institutions in a country which has long been a friend of the United States.

In order that my colleagues and the American voters be more aware of conditions in this country to our south, I call attention to these recent articles from Newsweek, the Evening Star, the Christian Science Monitor, and the New York Times:

[From Newsweek, Feb. 26, 1968]

PARAGUAY: DICTATOR WITH A DIFFERENCE

In liberal circles in Latin America it is still fashionable to call Gen. Alfredo Stroess-

ner of Paraguay the last of the hemisphere's old-style dictators. And last week when the 55-year-old Stroessner overwhelmingly "won" election to a fourth straight term as his nation's President, that charge seemed on the surface to have been justified once again. But on a visit to Paraguay's leafy, riverside capital of Asunción, NEWSWEEK's chief Latin American correspondent Dom Bonafede discovered that things are changing in Stroessnerland. Bonafede's report:

By Paraguayan standards, last week's election was a model of democracy in action: Stroessner allowed three candidates to run against him, let an opposition paper characterize his government as "a brutal regime" and on election day itself even lifted for 24 hours the martial law under which Paraguay has lived ever since 1930. Still, the only campaign propaganda I saw in Asunción was Stroessner's. Every government building was plastered with long rows of posters bearing a dreamy-eyed photograph of the President over the single word *realiza*—"he accomplishes."

All this was highly reminiscent of former Argentine dictator Juan Perón's slogan *cumple*—"he keeps his promises." But where Perón's chief accomplishment was to drive a wealthy nation to the brink of bankruptcy, President Stroessner is gradually pulling a painfully impoverished country up by its own bootstraps. Poorly endowed with raw materials, Paraguay has a per capita annual income of only \$200. (Of all the hemisphere nations, only Haiti and Bolivia report a lower income.) And beyond that, Paraguay is still suffering from mind-boggling losses of manpower in two terrible wars—its war with Uruguay, Argentina and Brazil which lasted from 1865 to 1870 and the Chaco War of 1932 to 1935 with Bolivia.

Stroessner himself is, in a sense, a product of the Chaco War. The son of a Bavarian immigrant (from whom he inherited a complexion that leads his countrymen to call him behind his back "the blond one"), Stroessner distinguished himself as an artillery officer in the fighting with the Bolivians and by 1951 had risen to be chief of Paraguay's armed forces. Three years later he seized power in a coup d'état and, with the aid of his goose-stepping army, harshly suppressed all opposition, forcing thousands of people into exile.

Hard Work: From the start, however, Stroessner differed from the conventional *caudillo* in some important respects. Where Juan Perón fancied girls, fast cars and ostentatious luxury, Stroessner's tastes run to hunting, fishing and chess. But the bulk of his busy day, which begins at 5:30 a.m., is devoted to his twin jobs of running Paraguay's government and its armed forces. And no detail is too small for his attention. Every promotion in the 12,000-man armed forces, even those from private to corporal, must receive his personal approval.

All of this has paid off notably for Paraguay in economic terms. The country's currency is one of the most stable in Latin America, and inflation is rigorously checked. Thanks to foreign aid (mostly American), Stroessner has embarked on a far-reaching development program. A 45,000-kilowatt hydroelectric works is nearing completion, and Asunción now has potable water, a working sewage system and a modern downtown hotel. New roads, bridges and hospitals dot the countryside and hundreds of new schools, the fruit of a Stroessner order to "open a new school a week," teach the three R's in the deepest jungle.

Change: About five years ago, moreover, Stroessner began to worry about his image as an iron-fisted dictator. The result was a gingerly campaign of liberalization that culminated in last week's election. Not that Paraguay has yet emerged from its essential totalitarianism. Newspapers that criticize the

government too strongly are apt to find it difficult to get newsprint, unduly obsequious private citizens are occasionally advised to go into exile and no one would dream of attacking *El Presidente* himself. Nonetheless, it was possible for the opposition parties in the recent campaign to hit hard at what they called the three C's of the Stroessner regime—cronyism, contraband and corruption.

The charges were well-founded. Although Stroessner himself lives with dignified restraint, many of his subordinates are involved in all manner of corruption, including participation in Paraguay's huge smuggling racket. Yet despite all this, even the opposition wanted Stroessner to win the election on the ground that he alone can guarantee continued peace and stability in traditionally turbulent Paraguay. Indeed, when one opposition leader was asked recently what he would do if he learned of an assassination plot against Stroessner, he replied unhesitatingly: "I'd run and tell the President as fast as I could."

[From the Washington (D.C.) Evening Star, Feb. 14, 1968]

THE VOTE IN PARAGUAY

Paraguay's 2,000,000 people have lived under President Alfredo Stroessner's rule ever since his seizure of power in 1954, and most of them have found him to their liking. This they have once again demonstrated by reelecting him to another five-year term—his third—with a margin of over 4 to 1.

The opposition parties have charged widespread fraud in the registration of voters, and a leftist group has accused the police of strong-arm methods during the campaign. Relatively speaking, however, this week's election probably was one of the freest Paraguay has had since attaining independence from Spain in 1811. Although not in as untrammelled a way as in our own country, the opposing candidates were at liberty to appeal for support at the polls and criticize openly, even to the point of attacking the Stroessner government as "a brutal regime representing the imperialism of the oligarchies."

There is little ground, of course, for such a charge. Although Stroessner continues to run an authoritarian system, Paraguay has enjoyed more freedom under him than under any predecessor in generations. He has instituted reforms that have stimulated a measure of economic progress and that promise to improve the lot of the people in terms of literacy, health and general well-being. The process is painfully slow in a country with little natural wealth and a tradition of dictatorship. Nevertheless the Paraguayans have been moving forward, even if only by small steps, in keeping with his pledge to lead them to "the luxury of democracy."

More, Stroessner has established order and stability in a land that had been a victim, before his coup, of chronic political chaos. He and his government—the first in the Americas to support the United States against the Kremlin in the Cuban crisis—are strongly anti-Communist. That is one of the factors that account for the size of the vote he has won. He suits his countrymen. Not without reason, they apparently feel that his rule, despite its dictatorial aspects, is far preferable to what might ensue under the leadership of some new untied personality and party.

[From the Christian Science Monitor, Feb. 13, 1968]

VOICE OF OPPOSITION GAINS IN PARAGUAY (By James Nelson Goodsell)

In an election which opposition leaders called "a step forward to democracy," Paraguayan strongman Gen. Alfredo Stroessner has won another five-year term as President of his small South American nation.

Even though General Stroessner easily outdistanced his three rivals for the post, the fact that there was opposition was in itself a significant step for the nation.

Sunday's voting was only the third in which opposition candidates were allowed to take part since Paraguay gained independence from Spain in 1811.

The opposition in the Feb. 12 balloting had not expected to win. But the liberalization of voting arrangements in recent years has given a measure of hope to those opposing General Stroessner that they may eventually be able to play a more effective role.

The Stroessner victory was a substantial one—about a 2-1 margin over the three opposition candidates. With 85 percent of the votes counted, General Stroessner had 490,000 votes against 107,080 for his nearest rival Dr. Gustavo González of the Liberal Radicals, the main opposition party.

TWO SPLINTER GROUPS

Dr. Carlos Levi Rufinelli of the Liberal Party polled another 22,785 votes and Carlos Caballero Gatti of the Febrerista Party, 12,260.

This proliferation of rival candidates, while obviously a stumbling block in efforts to form a cohesive opposition force, was expected in a nation which has seldom enjoyed legalized opposition.

The history of Paraguay, a land-locked nation of 2.5 million inhabitants, is a tortured one. Ruled by one dictator after another, Paraguayans have seldom experienced the give-and-take of political life common to many of their South American neighbors.

For years under General Stroessner, who took power in a military coup in 1954, the pattern continued. But times are changing in South America and some liberal trends have obviously reached Paraguay.

CONTROL MODERATED

General Stroessner began moderating the extremes of his dictatorial control about two years ago—although many observers note that this moderating trend took place only after he had securely held power for 10 years and perhaps felt that relaxation of some control would not seriously jeopardize his position.

Nevertheless, Dr. Gonzalez, the leading opposition candidate, told newsmen in Asunción, the Paraguayan capital, that if the government's "democratic spirit" continued, his party would win the next presidential election in 1973.

Some observers think such an eventuality unlikely—even though they expect the Radical Liberals to do increasingly better in upcoming elections. "They will have to show new legislative strength," said one observer, who noted that General Stroessner's Colorado Party won control of both the Chamber of Deputies and the newly created Senate.

STABILITY STRESSED

The Colorado Party, which held 40 of the 60 seats in the Chamber of Deputies, apparently won a similar number in Sunday's balloting for the new Chamber. And the 30-member Senate was similarly divided.

During the electoral campaign, General Stroessner and his Colorado Party argued that he had brought stability and economic progress to the country for the first time in the 20th century.

Most of Paraguay's development projects, however, are being financed by foreign loans. The United States Government, for example, has loaned impoverished Paraguay \$30 million since 1961.

Opposition candidates argued that the state of Paraguay's economy, while not entirely due to General Stroessner's strongman rule, is in part the result of his harsh control of the nation.

Paraguay's Constitution was altered last August to allow, among other things, General

Stroessner to run for a third term. The old Constitution limited the president to two terms.

Before adoption of the new Constitution, the 11 bishops of Paraguay's Roman Catholic Church issued a statement attacking the new charter. They declared it carried over from the old Constitution the concept of a "dictatorial" president and the state of siege, allowing the president to make arrests at will.

General Stroessner has ruled under a state of siege since coming to power. He lifted it Sunday for 24 hours for the election.

[From the New York Times, Feb. 13, 1968]

PARAGUAY INCHES FORWARD

Alfredo Stroessner had insured himself another term as President of Paraguay even before tossing his sombrero into the ring, but Sunday's elections were significant despite the inevitability of the result. They were far from free but they were freer than any other elections held during General Stroessner's fourteen years as Paraguay's dictator.

Opposition parties charged fraud and accused General Stroessner's police of voter intimidation, but the results by themselves provide some measure of the greater freedom and more relaxed climate. The Radical Liberal party, competing in a general election for the first time in nearly thirty years, made a respectable showing—more than 20 per cent of the Stroessner total—and was restored to its old role as the major opposition to the governing Colorados.

As recently as the last Presidential election in 1963 it would have been impossible for a freely circulated opposition newspaper to call the Government "a brutal regime representing the imperialism of the oligarchies," as one did this time. In the intervening five years, with some backing and filling, General Stroessner has slowly relaxed his iron grip on the country's political life, though technically continuing a state of siege.

In a country long ripped apart by civil strife it is noteworthy that the opposition parties, except for the proscribed Communists, have elected to coexist and work within this limited freedom rather than continuing on the sidelines. Paraguay is still a long way from genuine freedom but there has been some progress.

Use and Abuse of Credit Reporting—III

HON. CLEMENT J. ZABLOCKI

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 13, 1968

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Speaker, recently I introduced into Congress new legislation which would protect American consumers from erroneous, incomplete, and malicious credit reports by allowing an individual to see his own credit report.

The bill, H.R. 15627, has elicited a gratifying response from all over the Nation. People have written me to relate their experiences in being denied credit because of mistakes in credit reports and the difficulties they have experienced in obtaining corrections.

Although consumer protection legislation against untrue credit reports has been needed for some time, recent developments within the credit industry have made enactment of such a measure more pressing.

Those developments involve the computerization of credit reporting in national networks. This will make possible the transmission of credit data from coast to coast in a few moments.

These new systems of credit reporting are an innovation which will undoubtedly revolutionize the credit industry. Those of us who are engaged in setting national policies should take particular interest in these developments. For that reason I am including at the conclusion of my remarks an article entitled "Credit Reporting By Computer," from the February 1968, issue of Credit World. It was written by J. E. R. Chilton III, executive vice president of Credit Bureau Management Co., of Dallas, Tex.

Mr. Chilton believes that the new system will "virtually eliminate human error," since accurate identifications can more readily be made.

While this may be so, the new systems will, however, result in other complications for consumers seeking credit. At least initially these systems will be able to transmit only a minimum of information about a subject. The report received from a distant city may well contain only partial and incomplete information.

Because of the secrecy in which the credit reporting system is clothed, it will be almost impossible for an individual to trace back through the system to correct an error. This situation requires that the American consumer be given the right to view the information being used against him by potential creditors.

I am hopeful that the House Banking and Currency Committee will soon schedule hearings on H.R. 15627.

The article follows:

CREDIT REPORTING BY COMPUTER

(By J. E. R. Chilton III)

(NOTE.—J. E. R. Chilton III is executive vice president of Credit Bureau Management Company, parent of Credit Bureau Services, Inc., Dallas, Texas, and 44 other bureaus in six states. He is the third generation of Chiltons involved with Credit Bureau Services, which will soon become the first completely computerized credit reporting operation in the world. Currently continuing its manual operations for several months in parallel with an ACBoFA pilot program, CBS has set March 1, 1968 as the target date for going completely operational with the \$2,000,000 computerization program in its Dallas office.)

About four years ago we began investigating computers. They held out the possibility of greater speed and accuracy in credit reporting.

In today's credit world, rapid decisions based on good judgment are more essential than ever before. Hence our search for efficiency via computers.

But in 1963 we got a flat "no!" from the computer industry. Computer hardware wasn't available then which met our needs of random, instant access to more than a million credit records. So we waited for the "third generation" of computer systems.

IBM's System/360, announced in 1964, had the required memory capacity and speed. With this third-generation computer available, Credit Bureau Services of Dallas made a feasibility study. The object: automate all credit records in Dallas County.

Next month, it will be a reality—no longer just an objective.

Credit records of 600,000 Dallas metropolitan area families are stored in the computer. An average of 5,000 daily inquiries will be handled in the new system, which will be twice as fast as before. And the system can store at least one million credit records. It is fast, flexible and has virtually eliminated human error. The advantages go on and on.

Credit Bureau Services will be the first completely computerized credit bureau in the world. As the "pilot bureau," it may well be the standard automated system for the credit reporting industry.

This computerization effort, known as "Project CB-360," is a joint venture of Credit Bureau Services, members of the Associated Credit Bureaus of America, International Business Machines and the Credit Bureau of Greater Houston.

This joint project team in two and a half years developed a system for complete computerization of credit bureaus in metropolitan areas. It was essential that common industry standards and computer language be developed to permit, eventually, a national network of computerized credit centers with the ability to "talk to each other."

Under the conventional manual system (still the rule in other credit bureaus), a merchant telephones his inquiry. The call is routed to one of many reporters stationed by rows of card files. This reporter first locates the card file on the individual being checked and verbally relays the information to the caller. A complete written report is provided upon request.

The computer at Credit Bureau Services will change things drastically. The reporters will operate 48 keyboard consoles which resemble slightly oversize typewriters. (They can, in fact, be used as electric typewriters.) Each one of the operators has instant access to all credit records.

Errors are virtually eliminated, since the computer will not respond unless it is given specific identification of the subject of the inquiry. The multitude of John Smiths, for example, are safe from confusion. If the names are identical, the computer will request more specific (i.e. NAME NOT FOUND, GIVE ADDRESS) until the machine is able to definitely distinguish the particular subject from all others. Only then will a credit report be printed out on the operator's console.

Record search and print-out usually takes only a few seconds. By keying the computer (from any console) to "listen," an authorized operator in the bureau can add new information to any individual's record. The date of each addition or revision is automatically recorded.

Within the next year, two more steps are scheduled: 1) Putting remote consoles on the premises of major credit report users. (Then they will have direct access to the computer without using a telephone.) And 2) installing new consoles at Credit Bureau Services that have tv-like screens.

Twenty or 30 of these should be in operation by mid-1968. And then when a reporter requests information from the computer, the report will almost instantly appear on the screen. This will save the time now needed for the computer to print out its report. Printed reports will still be used when merchants request them or when other circumstances dictate their use.

Some advantages of the computerized system are: 1) Greater reporting speed than ever before (saves look-up time). 2) "Out of file" problem eliminated completely. 3) Greater accuracy. 4) Automated "tape dumps" will facilitate speedy reporting of trade information by automated credit bureau members. 5) Member terminals will give direct access to the computer by large credit grantees from their own premises. 6) An automated system is expected to help

hold the line on future reporting costs. 7) "Computer Alert Service." And 8) computerization will allow new uses of the credit bureau, including varied selective promotional services.

Credit Bureau Services headquarters building itself was designed as an integral part of our newly automated operation. Occupied in early 1966, the million-dollar structure was engineered around the computer, but with due regard for aesthetics.

The conversion project, putting all the information on 600,000 area families into the computer's memory, was monumental. It began in September, 1966. One hundred extra people put in more than 350,000 man-hours working two shifts daily. All records are now stored in a "Data Cell Drive" (computer random access memory device) about the size of an office wastebasket. File cabinets storing the same information occupied about 3,000 square feet of floor space.

A team of 25 data processing experts from four organizations (ACBoA, IBM, Credit Bureau Services and the Credit Bureau of Greater Houston) were involved in working out the "how" of conversion. They all worked as part of a complete inner-management structure.

Stanley S. Morton, general reporting manager of Credit Bureau Services, was a prominent member of this team. His job was to implement the conversion and work with all members of the team as the job progressed. Since the entire project was a "first time," the "planning" stage continued right along with the actual conversion process.

To make the changeover from manual to computerized operation as smooth as possible, each aspect of the program was tested and evaluated thoroughly before being put "on line." Manual and computer operations were both in effect on a parallel basis for several weeks. This "shakedown period" allowed every detail to be checked and smoothed out without inconveniencing credit granters. Refinements will continue to be made, of course, as we gain more experience.

Through the coordination of the Associated Credit Bureaus of America, an ultimate network of computer centers capable of reporting to each other is envisioned within the next five or six years. Through establishment of such centers in 23 key population areas, it is estimated that any member of the network will have access to the credit records of approximately 85 per cent of the credit users of the United States.

The importance of this system is being constantly magnified by the ever-increasing mobility of the American public, and the rapid expansion of credit granting as a regional and national service.

Proper planning, however, is essential. This pilot project is an excellent example of how organization can benefit an entire industry as well as its individual members. The advantages of a national network of computer centers that "speak the same language" are evident when one considers the consequences if each credit bureau in the nation were to be computerized on a different system with noncompatible languages.

Credit Bureau Services was selected as the pilot project because of its reputation as an innovator and particularly because of its pioneering efforts in the development of techniques and services to aid the credit granter. We were also willing to make the considerable investment necessary—nearly \$2 million.

In 1897, Credit Bureau Services of Dallas established the "Red Book," one of the first known consumer credit rating guides in America. In 1967, the year of our 70th anniversary, the company grew to include 45 credit bureaus in six states, the largest privately-owned group of consumer credit bureaus in the world.

Ultimately, "Project CB-360" may bring to national credit reporting the vital efficiency and compatibility that is necessary for all concerned: firms, consumers and credit bureaus.

We are happy that Credit Bureau Services has the role of proving it can be done.

Another Call for Peace Initiatives in Vietnam

HON. RICHARD L. OTTINGER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 13, 1968

Mr. OTTINGER. Mr. Speaker, Life magazine has just published its second editorial calling for a change in U.S. policies on Vietnam.

It seems clear to me that unless the United States takes the initiative in seeking peace, unless we are willing to take at least as many risks in the pursuit of peace as we have been willing to take in the pursuit of a military solution, we will become interminably bogged down in a steadily escalating, steadily widening Asian land war.

I commend Life's editorial to the attention of my colleagues, and especially to the attention of those in the administration responsible for formulating and executing our policies in Southeast Asia. Time is fast running out and the voices of reason should be heeded now.

The article follows:

Vietnam: Let's Not Have More of the Same

President Johnson faces an excruciating decision about Vietnam. The immediate question before him last week was whether to grant General Westmoreland's request for another 100,000 or 200,000 troops to meet the new military situation brought about by General Giap's big Tet offensive. But this is just part of a larger decision, for the character of the Vietnam war has changed radically.

We are close to the point where the calling up of the Guard and the Reserves, and the possibility of controls, would put new strains on our manpower and economic resources, and indeed on the American political fabric.

Even after six weeks, the full consequences of the Tet offensive are still under study at the White House, producing alternate bursts of hope and gloom, sobriety and wishful thinking. The trapped and dug-in mood of Washington's policymakers is one of the most depressing aspects of the situation. "Everyone is out of bright ideas," says one of them. In Saigon the government, whose overthrow was one of Giap's chief objectives, has at least survived. Its army acquitted itself well during the worst of the Tet fighting and is mostly intact. But the problems now facing the Thieu-Ky government are staggering—over 600,000 new refugees, miles of city rubble, a stunned economy, shattered communications and pervasive fear in the cities as well as in the countryside.

At this climactic point in the Vietnamese war, there are perhaps five courses open to U.S. policy. They are these:

Severe Escalation. The extreme hawks would not just send more troops but add new bomb targets (Haiphong harbor) and new battlefields (such as invading Laos or North Vietnam). A few even talk recklessly of using tactical nuclear weapons. The risks

of a new world war in such major escalations range from unacceptable to outrageous.

More of the Same. The U.S. could support Westmoreland's present strategy—a war of attrition—with as much manpower as he needs for as long as it takes to defeat the Communist forces in the field. This might mean years.

One More Try. Or the U.S. could pursue "more of the same" but not indefinitely. We might launch major offensive operations of our own with the hope (but obviously no announcement) that one big effort could end the war soon. Looking back over the past few years, the President sometimes thinks he should have applied more massive force sooner. As General Gavin says, a limited war should be limited in time as well as in space.

Change of Strategy. The U.S. could re-examine the strategy of attrition, the war of body counts. Instead of seeking out Giap's main-force units, we could put more emphasis on clearing and holding the populated areas, on pacification and on uprooting the V.C. infrastructure (Life Editorials, Jan. 5 and 12). Many dedicated missions, military as well as civilian, have worked hard at these very things, but this side of the war has never been given overriding priority.

Withdrawal. The U.S. could start pulling out with whatever dignity we can muster, on whatever terms we can get, taking what comfort we could in Walter Lippmann's argument that this need not be a U.S. military "defeat" but rather an acknowledgment of a costly policy mistake. Cold comfort for Saigon.

Of these five alternatives the first and fifth are unnecessarily desperate.

The other three provide a reasonable frame for argument. At the Tuesday luncheon, where the President sets war policy with Rusk, Rostow and now with new Defense Secretary Clark Clifford, most of the talk is believed to favor the "More of the Same" alternative, i.e., more troops in support of the same old war of attrition. We consider this a bad choice.

There are too many gaps in any journalist's information—including the imminent possibility of new offensives—to say flatly that Westmoreland should not have more men. If the sole purpose of sending more men is to enable Westmoreland to continue what he has been doing, we are opposed. In some ways, more "white faces" in a land that already sees too many of them will make our problem worse. Even if Westmoreland recovers his mobility, it is a Red Queen kind of progress—back to where we were before Jan. 30. And Giap can send in more troops, too. The attrition strategy reminds some Westmoreland critics of "the Haig syndrome"—named after the bulldozing British marshal of World War I—"Give me another 100,000 men, Sir, and I can assure you we will have finished the job by Christmas." Except that Westmoreland makes no such promises these days.

It is time to reassess our strategy in Vietnam. It has been based, we believe, on an error expressed by General Wheeler in 1962, an error which still governs too much official thinking: "The essence of the problem in Vietnam is military." On the contrary, the essence of the problem is political. As General Wheeler and others would agree, the true goal and purpose of our presence in Vietnam is to leave behind a viable self-governing country, and its military dimension is the physical security of the South Vietnamese people. The momentum of military responses has diverted us too far from this goal.

Redirecting ourselves to the goal means de-escalating our war with the North Vietnamese. It means avoiding pitched battles with their main-force units in underpopu-

lated wilderness like Khesanh and concentrating on the closer defense of South Vietnam population centers, even though this may involve abandoning considerable real estate. It means shifting the emphasis of American participation from combat to the more intensive training and equipping of South Vietnamese forces; and if more men are needed, the South Vietnamese (who are at last drafting their 19-year-olds) should supply them. Instead of widening the war's perimeter, we should even reduce it for the sake of better security where most of the people live.

The strategic bombing of North Vietnam, beyond the rear of the battleground, should be halted. Its military effectiveness has long been questionable anyway. A bombing halt would be the most audible invitation to reciprocal de-escalation on Hanoi's part. It is also the quickest way to learn what Hanoi means by "negotiations," which U Thant now assures us we could begin in days. A lot of Americans, as well as the rest of the world, would feel better if, before making any new troop commitments, we had made a more convincing effort to negotiate. One way to test Communist intentions would be to determine how ready they are in negotiations to move to a complete cease-fire on the battlefield.

Another reason for favoring some de-escalation is the political effect on the Thieu-Ky regime, which has yet to shape up as the focus of South Vietnamese hopes and loyalties. Giap's attack on the cities did not generate mass conversions to the V.C. side, but neither did the war-weary population rally further to the government. The government needs to widen its political base instead of nervously jailing its opposition. The future of South Vietnam is, at this juncture, greatly dependent on the behavior of its own leaders. We cannot pass a miracle and turn South Vietnam overnight into a brave democracy, but we can avoid the blunder of protracting its dependence on U.S. arms or becoming ourselves the captives of its policies.

In recent weeks we have been given a hard lesson in how not to fight this war; we have not lost all chance of bringing it to an acceptable conclusion.

Priority Objective: "More for Our Money"

HON. FLORENCE P. DWYER

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 13, 1968

Mrs. DWYER. Mr. Speaker, in my continuing effort to bring attention to what I believe must become one of our top priority objectives—the reorganization, coordination, and policy direction of our many and varied urban area programs in order to obtain better service and greater results—I include in the RECORD the text of a recent radio broadcast I made on this subject and the texts of two supporting documents, an article from the Newark, N.J., Sunday News of January 14, 1968, and a section from the report of the National Advisory Commission on Civil Disorders, both of which add disturbing new evidence of the fact that we cannot achieve our social objectives by neglecting the tough problems of program administration and coordination.

The material follows:

TEXT OF THE REGULAR BIWEEKLY RADIO REPORT OF REPRESENTATIVE FLORENCE P. DWYER, MARCH 8

The report of the President's Advisory Commission on Civil Disorders seems to have

achieved at least its initial objective—attracting attention and causing discussion and controversy. But in the midst of debate over who is responsible for racial strife, what should be done about it, and how much we can afford to spend to solve the problems, almost no one has focused attention on the one thing we can do and should do *right now*—that is, make the programs we already have and the money we already spend produce greater results. In brief, we must get more for our money!

This will sound familiar to many of you. It is a theme I have been developing and stressing for several years in an effort to improve the quality of governmental service to the people. The place to start is with what we have.

What do we have? We have more than 400 Federal programs designed, in one way or another—housing, education, job-training and the like—to restore our urban areas and to provide hope and opportunity for low-income residents of those areas. For the fiscal year beginning next July first, the President has requested approximately 22 billion dollars for these purposes. During the present fiscal year, we're spending about 19 billion on the same programs.

I don't need to tell you that that's a lot of money. And even though much of it doesn't reach the poor directly, since a lot is spent on buildings, supplies and salaries, there is enough available to make a substantial impact on our problems. But just how substantial has the impact really been? How much are we accomplishing?

The answer—all too clearly—is not enough! Though it was buried deep in volume three of its report, the Commission on Civil Disorders devoted two hard-hitting pages to the trouble. Pointing out that new social development legislation—and I quote—"has put great strain upon obsolescent machinery and administrative practices at all levels of government," the Commission defined the problem in the following language:

"... federal programs often seem self-defeating and contradictory: field officials unable to make decisions on their own programs and unaware of related efforts; agencies unable or unwilling to work together; programs conceived and administered to achieve different and sometimes conflicting purposes."

"In short," the Commission concluded, "there is a clear and compelling requirement for better coordination of federally funded programs, particularly those designed to benefit the residents of the inner city. If essential programs are to be preserved and expanded, this need must be met."

Obviously, I agree wholeheartedly.

This is not theory. This is hard reality. And this reality was also emphasized on last Sunday's "Meet the Press" program when six Mayors discussed the needs of their cities. High on their list of priorities were better coordination, better administration and simplified procedures for using Federal assistance.

Closer to home, the very same complaints were voiced by top officials in New Jersey's State government in a recent and remarkably candid interview with the Newark Sunday News. No less than the State Budget Director, the State Transportation Commissioner and the State Community Affairs Commission all agreed on the chaos created by uncoordinated Federal programs. The Budget Director termed it "an indescribable morass." The Transportation Commissioner was described as "shaking his head in disbelief." And the State Community Affairs Commissioner proposed—as I have for several years—that we need a single coordinating agency in Washington.

But this is only one of the things we need. And all of them are in the form of legislation—ready to go if only the Congressional majority and the Administration would give the "go" signal. We need, for example, a re-

organization of the Executive Branch; we need the Intergovernmental Cooperation Act; we need better accounting and programming systems; we need consolidation of the multiple grant programs; we need a systematic review of grant programs to eliminate those not needed and strengthen the rest; and we need a workable urban policy and the central coordinating agency to make it work.

If we're really serious about solving our problems, this is where we must start. Talking about hundreds of billions of new Federal dollars while the war in Vietnam is costing 30 billion a year is unrealistic. And appearing to blame all white Americans for "racism" while millions are standing ready to help is no way of insuring the understanding and cooperation that are essential to the huge job before us.

We've all got a lot to do. So let's be sure we do it well.

[From the Newark (N.J.) Sunday News, Jan. 14, 1968]

FEDERAL FUNDS: HARD TO GET

(By Peter Carter)

TRENTON.—New Jersey expects to get about \$300 million in federal funds this year to add to the contemplated state budget of more than \$1 billion.

Without the federal money, programs of highway building, urban renewal, pollution control and other areas of vital state action would wither away.

But the task of getting federal dollars has become so complex that some state officials wonder at times whether it's really worth the trouble.

State Budget Director Abram M. Vermeulen calls the 459 different federal state aid programs administered by more than 100 federal agencies and subagencies "an indescribable morass."

He notes that for New Jersey to establish a modest historical site with a surrounding recreational area with federal help would involve five separate applications to four U.S. bureaus in three separate federal agencies administering five different programs.

KALEIDOSCOPE

Should state officials somehow be successful in finding their way through this maze, they would then get five separate grants, each with its own set of standards and accounting requirements.

State Transportation Commissioner David J. Goldberg, charged with the task of improving commuter railroads as well as building more highways faster, looks at the federal state aid kaleidoscope and shakes his head in disbelief.

The federal government established a transportation department to coordinate programs for all types of transport improvement. Common sense, according to Goldberg, would dictate that federal aid programs for improving commuter railroads and other mass transit would be in this department.

But common sense does not always rule on the banks of the Potomac. The U.S. Transportation Department, indeed, does not administer the state aid program for mass transit. This program is in the Housing and Urban Affairs Department (known as HUD) to those who wrestle daily with the myriad federal grant programs).

More than a year ago, New Jersey submitted a \$15 million application for mass transit funds to electrify the Northern New Jersey trackage used by the Pennsylvania and Jersey Central Railroads between South Amboy and Little Silver and to purchase 40 new self-propelled cars to run at sustained speeds of 90 m.p.h. over the improved trackage.

The application has yet to be approved by HUD.

COMPLEXITY

But HUD is far from being the only federal agency that can cause confusion. For years the state has been applying to HUD for

money to give to municipalities for planning. The forms, procedures and techniques had become standardized.

Then along came the antipoverty program with more funds for planning. Did it tie into the existing program? Of course not. It set up its own forms, procedures, grants and accounting requirements.

This year at the state, county and local levels in New Jersey, hundreds of thousands of man hours worth millions of dollars will be spent trying to get federal money despite the "indescribable morass." In some cases, the federal dollars will be lost because the complexities were not figured out in just the right way.

Much of the cost of the man hours spent will be absorbed by the federal government, which pays for administrative expenses involved in getting and accounting for federal money.

SINGLE PACKAGE

But despite the federal reimbursement, the thicket of federal programs and requirements breeds larger bureaucracy of all levels of government, not to mention the confusion, delays and missed opportunities.

Vermeulen, as a member of a federal task force appointed to do something about the "indescribable morass," has suggested Congress enact a bill to enable federal agencies to combine related grants into a single financial package, with simplified standards and accounting procedures.

Under such a bill, an application for a grant for a modest historic shrine and surrounding recreational area would require only one application to one federal agency, headed by a project manager.

State Community Affairs Commissioner Paul N. Yevisaker believes the ultimate goal, as the states get more reliant on federal dollars, should be a system whereby each state would make one big application for all types of federal aid annually to one coordinating agency in Washington.

FEDERAL PROGRAM COORDINATION

(Except from the report of the National Advisory Commission on Civil Disorders)

The spectacle of Detroit and New Haven engulfed in civil turmoil despite a multitude of federally-aided programs raised basic questions as to whether the existing "delivery system" is adequate to hold new purposes of national policy. Many who voiced these concerns overlooked the disparity between the size of the problems at which the programs are aimed and the level of funding provided by the Federal government.

Yet there is little doubt that the system through which federal programs are translated into services to people is a major problem in itself. There are now over 400 grant programs operated by a broad range of federal agencies and channeled through a much larger array of semi-autonomous state and local government entities. Reflecting this complex scheme, federal programs often seem self-defeating and contradictory: field officials unable to make decisions on their own programs and unaware of related efforts; agencies unable or unwilling to work together; programs conceived and administered to achieve different and sometimes conflicting purposes.

The new social development legislation has put great strain upon obsolescent machinery and administrative practices at all levels of government. It has loaded new work on federal departments. It has required a level of skill, a sense of urgency and a capacity for judgment never planned for or encouraged in departmental field offices. It has required planning and administrative capacity rarely seen in statehouses, county courthouses and city hall.

Deficiencies in all of these areas have frustrated accomplishment of many of the im-

portant goals set by the President and the Congress.

In recent years serious efforts have been made to improve program coordination. During the 1961-1965 period, almost 20 executive orders were issued for the coordination of federal programs involving intergovernmental administration. Some two dozen interagency committees have been established to coordinate two or more federal aid programs. Departments have been given responsibility to lead others in areas within their particular competence—OEO, in the poverty field; HUD in Model Cities. Yet, despite these and other efforts, the Federal Government has not yet been able to concert talent, funds and programs for concentrated impact in the field. Few agencies are able to put together a comprehensive package of related programs to meet priority needs.

In short, there is a clear and compelling requirement for better coordination of federally funded programs, particularly those designed to benefit the residents of the inner city. If essential programs are to be preserved and expanded, this need must be met.

Hawaii Observes Ninth Anniversary Of Statehood With Gratitude

HON. SPARK M. MATSUNAGA

OF HAWAII

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 13, 1968

Mr. MATSUNAGA. It was 9 years ago yesterday, on March 12, 1959, that the distinguished House majority leader of the 86th Congress requested unanimous consent for the consideration of the Hawaii statehood bill which had been passed the day before by the Senate.

Our colleagues who were privileged to sit in this Chamber on that occasion will recall the words of the majority leader. He said:

We are going to culminate a very historic event here today in the life of our country . . . I also want to compliment the leadership in the other body for the outstanding manner in which that leadership has acted in bringing about the early passage of this bill in the Senate in a period of about four or five hours . . . That is the kind of leadership the country needs. The country needs firm leadership, good leadership, progressive-looking leadership, a leadership that recognizes responsibility and rises to the occasion. The kind of leadership that is weak and uncertain is properly subject to criticism, but a leadership that is fair and honest, decent and tolerant, firm and effective, and which produces results, is the kind of leadership that should be complimented. I particularly refer to that great leader and great American, the senior Senator from Texas (Lyndon Baines Johnson).

The ensuing vote of 323 to 89 favoring the passage of the Hawaii statehood bill indeed culminated "a very historic event."

The people of Hawaii are deeply indebted to the then majority leader, the present Speaker of the House [Mr. McCormack], and the 322 other Members of this body who voted to end the territorial status of an insular people and to extend to them the rights, privileges, and duties of statehood.

Mr. Speaker, I did want to take this opportunity to let our colleagues know

that the action and the words of the majority leader of 9 years ago and those of the gentleman of New York, Mr. Leo O'Brien, who served as floor manager during consideration of the Hawaii statehood bill, and the support they were able to win by their outstanding leadership on that memorable day, are still remembered and, in truth, will never be forgotten by a grateful people.

Title IV, Part 1 of the Reorganization Bills

HON. CHARLES McC. MATHIAS, JR.

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 13, 1968

Mr. MATHIAS of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, it has now been more than a year since the landmark Legislative Reorganization Act was passed by the other body. I regret that the intervening year has not brought final action on this important measure by the House, and hope that progress can be made without further delay.

I would like to include in the RECORD at this point a comparison of the provisions of part 1, title IV, of S. 355 and similar provisions of other bills, dealing with oversight of congressional operations and related matters. This comparison was prepared by the Republican task force on congressional reform, which, under the leadership of the gentleman from New Hampshire [Mr. CLEVELAND], has taken the lead in keeping the issue of congressional reform before us and continuing to call for action on reforms too long delayed.

The comparison follows:

TITLE IV—CONGRESS AS AN INSTITUTION PART 1—JOINT COMMITTEE ON CONGRESSIONAL OPERATIONS

Section 401—Establishment of Joint Committee on Congressional Operations

S. 355: Creates a Joint Committee on Congressional Operations, to be composed of ten members, as follows: (not an evenly bipartisan committee)

Five Senators, appointed by the President Pro Tem—a majority and a minority Senator serving on Government Operations Committee, a majority and a minority Senator serving on Rules and Administration Committee, and one other Senator from any committee, including the two above;

Five Representatives, appointed by the Speaker, in the same manner as Senate.

Vacancies will not affect power of joint committee to function; are to be filled in same manner as original appointments.

In even-numbered Congresses, the chairman of the Joint Committee shall be a Representative, and the vice chairman of the Joint Committee shall be a Senator. In odd-numbered Congress, just the opposite.

Bolling: No provision. See next section—Bolling would have the two Government Operations Committees carry the responsibility for periodic examination of organization and operation of the Congress.

Reid: Same as Bolling.

Print No. 3: As in S. 355, Print No. 3 establishes a ten-member Joint Committee; however, there is no requirement that appointees must serve on any specific committee in either house or that any appointees must necessarily be from minority party in either house.

(NOTE.—Section not amended by Senate. See Final Report page 45: "1. Congress shall establish a Joint Committee on Congressional Operations, consisting of 10 members, 5 of whom shall be appointed by the Speaker of the House of Representatives and 5 by the President pro tempore of the Senate. No fewer than two of the five appointed by the Speaker shall be members of the House Committee on Government Operations and one shall be from the majority and one from the minority, and no fewer than two of whom shall be members of the Committee on House Administration and one shall be from the majority and one from the minority. No fewer than two of the five appointed by the President pro tempore shall be members of the Senate Committee on Government Operations and one shall be from the majority and one from the minority, and no fewer than two of whom shall be members of the Senate Committee on Rules and Administration and one shall be from the majority and one from the minority.")

Section 402.—Duties of joint committee

S. 355. The duties of the Joint Committee (see also Sections 406 and 407) shall be to—

(1) make a continuing study of the organization and operation of the Congress, recommending such improvements as the committee determines would help Congress to better meet its responsibilities;

(2) make a continuing study of automatic data processing and information retrieval systems, recommending such applications to House and Senate operations as the committee determines might be feasible;

(3) identify and call to the attention of the Congress any court proceeding or action which in the Joint Committee's opinion is of vital interest to either or both houses; subject to approval of the President pro tem, the Speaker, and the majority and minority leaders of both houses, the Joint Committee is authorized to provide for appropriate representation on behalf of the Congress, or either house, in any such proceeding.

Subsection (c) provides that the Joint Committee shall report its recommendations to both houses "from time to time."

Subsection (d) provides that "Nothing in this Part shall be construed to authorize the Joint Committee to make any recommendations with respect to the rules, parliamentary procedure, practices, or precepts of either House, or the consideration of any matter on the floor of either House."

This proviso was contained in the resolution creating the first Joint Committee on the Organization of the Congress in 1945-46 and was repeated in the resolution which established the current Joint Committee. It is a controversial paragraph, said to have been drafted as a precaution against recommendations to modify filibuster rule or seniority system.

Bolling and Reid bills do not establish a Joint Committee on Congressional operations. In lieu thereof, both bills (this section identical) provide that—

"The Committees on Government Operations of both the Senate and the House shall jointly make periodic studies, but not less than once every five years, of the organization and operation of the Congress and shall, as a result, recommend improvements as deemed necessary to strengthen the Congress and enable it better to meet its responsibilities. The first such study shall commence during fiscal year 1970." (Sec. 401 of Bolling and Reid.)

Section 404 of the Bolling bill provides that the Committees on the Judiciary of both houses shall identify any court proceedings of vital interest to either or both houses. (No similar provision in Reid.)

Print No. 3: Strips Joint Committee of all responsibility except that of studying auto-

matic data processing applications to Congress and of identifying court proceedings per above (without, however, authority to provide for representation).

See Final Report pages 46-48:

"2. The Joint Committee on Congressional Operations shall make a continuing study of the organization and operation of the Congress and shall recommend improvements in such organization and operation with a view toward strengthening Congress, simplifying its operations, improving its relationships with other branches of the U.S. Government, and enabling it better to meet its responsibilities under the Constitution."

"4. The Joint Committee on Congressional Operations shall be authorized and directed to explore and evaluate automatic data processing and information retrieval systems, with a view to determining the feasibility of their use in congressional operations and recommending such installations as may be found appropriate.

"5. The Joint Committee on Congressional Operations shall be given continuing responsibility for identifying court proceedings and actions affecting the vital interests of the Congress as an institution and for determining, with the approval of the leadership of both Houses, whether the Congress should be appropriately represented in these actions.

"6. The Joint Committee on Congressional Operations shall be designated as the supervising agency for such functions as lend themselves to central supervision rather than separate direction in each House."

"8. The Joint Committee on Congressional Operations shall be required to report from time to time to Congress on its operations and the results of its studies, together with its recommendations."

See also under "Smith-Curtis Draft."

Section 404—Staff of Joint Committee

S. 355. Authorize the Joint Committee, by majority vote, to appoint and prescribe duties of not more than six professional and six clerical staff members—the usual language, "without regard to political affiliations and solely on the basis of fitness," etc.

The Joint Committee is also authorized to hire such additional personnel as it might need to carry out its functions with respect to the disposition of executive papers (see Section 406) and to contract for services of temporary experts and consultants.

Bolling. Does not apply.

Reid. Does not apply.

Print No. 3. Authorizes only one professional and one clerical for the committee; section otherwise same as S. 355.

(NOTE.—Section not amended by Senate. See Final Report pages 47-48: "7. The Joint Committee on Congressional Operations shall be authorized to appoint staff members on a permanent basis, and to employ, on an intermittent basis, such expert consultants or legal counsel as it may need in the conduct of its duties.")

Section 407—Office of Placement and Office Management

S. 355: Creates an Office of Placement and Office Management of the Congress, under supervision of the Joint Committee on Congressional Operations, for the purpose of accepting applications for employment with Congress, testing qualifications of applicants, furnishing Members, committees, and officers (upon request) advice and information re office management and practices, utilization of office equipment, etc. The language of the bill states clearly that no Member, committee, or officer of either house is required to use the facilities of this office.

Bolling: Same provision as S. 355 except that jurisdiction over the Office would reside in the House Administration and Senate

Rules and Administration Committees. (Sec. 402 in Bolling.)

Reid: No provision.

Print No. 3: Creates an Office of Placement and Office Management, under supervision of the Joint Committee. However, unlike S. 355, provides that all staff (not just Director of the Office) shall be hired by majority vote of the Joint Committee. Also, all of the duties of the Office as proscribed under S. 355 are stricken with the exception of the general directive that the Office shall assist Members, committees, and officers of both houses "seeking competent personnel with specified qualifications and to furnish advice and information with respect to office management procedures."

(NOTE.—Section not amended by Senate. See Final Report page 50: "3. An Office of Personnel and Office Management shall be established. This Office shall act as a central clearinghouse for job applications, to test applicants' qualifications, and to assist Members or committees in their efforts to obtain competent employees. The Office shall also provide assistance to Members, on request, in adopting better office management practices, in the efficient utilization of office equipment, and in improved handling of the Members' workload.")

Sections 403, 405, 406, and 408—Powers of joint committee, records of joint committee, transfer of function, expenses

S. 355: Section 403 gives the Joint Committee the usual powers to sit and act, require attendance of witnesses, etc. Bill specifies that recommendations made by the Joint Committee must have the approval of a majority of the committee's members.

Section 405 directs the Joint Committee to keep a record of its actions, including votes of members on roll call votes, to keep files, etc.

Section 406 transfers to the Joint Committee the functions, records, and property of the Joint Committee on Disposition of Executive Papers. (See under Sec. 404.)

Section 408 provides that expenses of the Joint Committee will be paid from the contingent fund of the House.

Bolling: None of above applies.

Reid: As per Bolling.

Print No. 3: Sections 405, 406, and 408 are same as S. 355. In Section 403, S. 355 gives the Joint subpena power; Print No. 3 deletes that provision.

(NOTE.—No amendments to any of above by Senate. See Final Report page 46: "3. The functions of the Joint Committee on Disposition of Executive Papers shall be transferred to the Joint Committee on Congressional Operations.")

Contempt citations—Bolling bill only

Section 403 of Bolling bill would amend the Rules of the House in order to provide that contempt citations issued by any committee must be considered by the Rules Committee before action could be taken by the House.

See Supplemental Views of Messrs. Curtis, Hall, and Cleveland, Final Report page 88, recommendation no. 7:

"We recommend that all citations of contempt be referred to the Joint Committee on Congressional Operations before they are reported to the floor of the House for further proceedings.

"One of the necessary powers of any legislative body is to protect itself against acts designed to undermine and contravene its functions. The means employed by the Congress is through the contempt procedure, a procedure which calls to the attention of the Congress the act which threatens it and provides for punishment of the offender, either through the courts or through the bar of the House against which the contempt has been directed."

"Most contempts today arise from actions of those called before committees of the Congress as witnesses. There is no need to call attention to the importance of our committee structure but the point that concerns us is the manner in which contempt citations are handled.

"At present, it is the practice for the committee which has been the subject of the act of contempt to serve as first judge of the matter. It is the committee itself which reports the matter to the parent body, acting as both victim and prosecutor.

"We question both the soundness and the justice of such a procedure and for that reason we recommend that contempt citations be referred in each case to an impartial committee—the Joint Committee on Congressional Operations. This committee would screen the evidence and report its findings and recommendations to its parent body."

Smith-Curtis draft

Draft material prepared on behalf of Mr. Smith (of California) and Mr. Curtis would extend to the Joint Committee on Congressional Operations the following duties: To study and investigate—

(1) lobbying activities under the Lobbying Act,

(2) violations of the statutes prohibiting lobbying with moneys appropriated by the Federal Government,

(3) Executive Branch publicity and propaganda activities and expenditures not specifically authorized by law, and

(4) activities designed to influence any Government agency in making recommendations to Congress or in that agency's rule-making or policymaking functions.

(Note.—More on above under comparison of Title V.)

See Supplemental Views of Messrs. Curtis, Hall, and Cleveland, Final Report pages 87-88.

"2. Lobbying with appropriated moneys—The joint committee has made excellent recommendations to tighten up the procedures governing lobbying by private organizations and interests. A complete job calls for enforcement of the above-cited criminal statute with respect to lobbying by the executive branch. We urge the proposed Joint Committee on Congressional Operations to study this matter and report to the Congress its recommendations for insuring enforcement of Title 18."

See also in these Supplemental Views: recommendations No. 1, for creation of "Committees on Procedures and Policies" for Senate and House; No. 11 re "Executive privilege," and No. 13 re "Bipartisanship of new joint committee," Final Report pages 85-87 and 91.

Things That Count

HON. LOUIS C. WYMAN

OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 13, 1968

Mr. WYMAN. Mr. Speaker, once again an advertisement of the Warner & Swasey Co. of Cleveland, Ohio, appearing in U.S. News & World Report, sets the tone for a major concern of all Americans. This time it deals with a parents' creed for young people soon to assume responsibility for managing a confused society.

So often the advice of others than parents is heeded by youth. So often parents perhaps do not undertake to advise to the extent they should. But the

message of the following excerpt comes through loud and clear. It is worth the attention of everyone.

I WANT MY BOY TO HAVE ALL THE ADVANTAGES I CAN GIVE HIM

Such as having to earn his own allowance by running errands, cutting lawns.

Such as getting good grades in school—getting them because he wants to, and because he knows what it would do to me if he didn't.

Such as being proud to be clean and neat and decent.

Such as standing up and standing proud when his country's flag goes by.

Such as addressing elder friends of his parents as "sir" and "ma'am".

Such as having to earn his own way in the world and knowing he has to prepare for it by hard work, hard study, and sacrificing some of the pleasures and ease his friends may get from too-indulgent parents.

These are the advantages I want my son to have, because these are the things which will make him self-respecting and self-reliant and successful. And that is the happiness I want him to have.

VFW Conference

HON. ROBERT L. F. SIKES

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 13, 1968

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, we in Congress were happy to have with us this week delegations from the distinguished organization, Veterans of Foreign Wars, who were in Washington for their annual conference. It is a pleasure for me to submit for reprinting in the RECORD, the statement of Joseph A. Scerra, commander in chief, Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States, before the Committee on Veterans' Affairs, House of Representatives, on March 12, 1968.

The statement follows:

STATEMENT OF JOSEPH A. SCERRA, COMMANDER IN CHIEF, VETERANS OF FOREIGN WARS OF THE UNITED STATES, BEFORE THE COMMITTEE ON VETERANS' AFFAIRS, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, MARCH 12, 1968

Mr. Chairman, and members of the committee, permit me to express my deep appreciation, as well as that of my fellow officers and all the members of the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States for this opportunity to appear before your Committee.

I shall, of course, direct the major portion of my comments to our views on veterans' benefits and our legislative program. But due to the grave significance of the international circumstances in which we find ourselves, it is my hope, Mr. Chairman, that you and your distinguished committee will permit me to digress for a moment, in my initial remarks.

As you know, this is the occasion of our annual conference of National and Department Officers. I am happy to report a most successful year. Our programs are going forward with dispatch. For the fourteenth consecutive year we have increased our membership. Our numbers will far exceed 1,400,000 when we close our books this summer. My comrades who have filled this room to overflowing and their counterparts throughout the world are, of course, responsible. No Commander in Chief has ever had a more dedicated staff.

With me also, this morning, are fifty-four patriotic young Americans of whom we are very proud. They are the current winners of our annual Voice of Democracy Contest representing each of the fifty states, the District of Columbia, Korea, Okinawa, and the Canal Zone. Each of these young people has an opportunity to win one of five scholarships, totaling \$13,500. The winners will be announced at our Congressional Banquet tonight.

For the record, I would like this Committee to know that this year more than 400,000 boys and girls from over 8,000 public, private and parochial schools took time from the regular activities of their busy lives to think, write and speak up on "Freedom's Challenge". Additionally, you should know that the monetary value of scholarships and awards presented to contestants in this country and overseas by the Veterans of Foreign Wars and its Ladies Auxiliaries at the Post, County, District and State levels amounted to more than \$200,000 this year. The Voice of Democracy Program is truly one of the largest scholarship award programs available to the youth of our Nation.

Certainly no one could wish more wholeheartedly than the members of this Committee, Mr. Chairman, and the members of my own organization, that there might be an end to war. But wishful thinking does not deter the communist aggressor from his goal of conquest.

Once again we are engaged in armed conflict on foreign soil—an undeclared war it is true, but one which surpasses in its violence, its casualties, its human suffering, and the personnel and equipment committed, all but three of the official wars in which this Nation has engaged. With tongue in cheek, I exclude Korea—for as you know, Mr. Chairman, from your own distinguished military record, and that of your gallant sons, war is war, regardless of the name we give it.

More than half a million young Americans are presently fighting for human freedom in Vietnam. Fifty thousand stand precarious guard in Korea. A substantial portion of our fleet, and many of our aircraft ply the far reaches of the Pacific, where Red China girds her loins with nuclear power for the ultimate destruction of America.

In the trembling bastion of freedom we call Europe, another 200,000 Americans honor our continuing commitment to NATO.

Thus, there does not appear upon the preview of history, an honorable end to essential military service for the young men of this Nation. It is, therefore, the hope and the collective purpose of the Veterans of Foreign Wars that certain improvements in veterans' benefits may be effected, and made a permanent right of all veterans of either wars or conflicts in our Nation's cause.

Your Committee has done much already to make this hope a reality of law. For this we thank you.

I am sure that you in turn are familiar with the tremendous work being done by the men of our Rehabilitation Service under the dedicated leadership of Committee Chairman Past Commander-in-Chief Joseph J. Lombardo and Director Norman Jones; of our Legislative Service under Legislative Chairman James E. Van Zandt, a Past Commander-in-Chief and a former member of Congress, and Legislative Director Francis Stover; of the perceptive contributions to National Security being made by our distinguished National Security Committee under the guidance of Committee Chairman General Earl Rudder, President of Texas A & M University, and General J. D. Hittle; and the overall competence and intelligent supervision of our Washington Office by Executive Director, Past Commander-in-Chief Cooper T. Holt. Again we thank you, for the cooperation you have given them. We are proud

of them, and we are equally proud of our long, productive, and amicable association with your Committee.

It is no secret, Mr. Chairman, that the Veterans of Foreign Wars has steadfastly supported the President in our position in Southeast Asia. We may, on occasion, voice some variant view on military strategy, such as a blockade of North Vietnam, but we stand unflinchingly behind United States policy in Vietnam. It is, however, the number one concern of all our members that this conflict be brought to an early and successful conclusion. We of the V.F.W. will never countenance a substitution of the Dove for the Eagle as the Bird emblematic of this Great Nation, but neither will we view with favor an Eagle decimated by indecision and delay.

For this reason, together with the lessons taught by the history we have made, we grow impatient with those who espouse the dogma of appeasement. We view with scorn the poor, pathetic creatures who wear men's clothing, but refuse to serve their country. We take unyielding issue with those free-loaders of democracy who align themselves with draft dodgers, card burners, anti-American demonstrators, and the communist disciples of "Peace at any Price." The creation and security of a strong and independently free nation in South Vietnam, standing as a bulwark against communist aggression, is of great importance to the Veterans of Foreign Wars and the National Security of our Country.

It was my great privilege and honor to be selected by the President to serve on the delegation which witnessed the free elections in that troubled land. Neither I nor the organization I represent have any doubt whatever as to the cause for which our young men fight.

Upon my return from Vietnam I called our National Legislative and Security Committees into session here in Washington. As you know, these committees are made up of distinguished Americans. They have carefully analyzed the three hundred resolutions which our members adopted at our National Convention in New Orleans. It was their purpose to recommend a priority Legislative and Security Program for 1968, which would be truly representative of our organizational goals to the second session of the 90th Congress. This they have done, and that program has been officially approved. Each of you has been furnished with a copy. It would be deeply appreciated, Mr. Chairman, if a copy of that program, entitled "Top Priority Legislative and Security Goals of the V.F.W. for 1968," together with a digest of our V.F.W. resolutions, might be made a part of my remarks at this time.

Thank you, sir. In addition, to augment those recommendations, I should like to stress a few remaining considerations:

The second message on veterans which President Johnson sent to Congress on January 30th was received with great enthusiasm by our members. We were pleased to note that this message recommended more varied assistance to Vietnam veterans than that enjoyed by the veterans of World War II and Korea. It did not, however, provide for immediate financial assistance upon termination of military service. We of the V.F.W. strongly favor the inclusion of mustering out pay, based upon the length of service and overseas duty. This was a benefit enjoyed by the veterans of previous wars, and one which proved extremely helpful upon the initial return to civilian life.

We are hopeful that a third message on veterans will be forthcoming from the President, when he has received the recommendations of his Advisory Commission, through the Administrator of Veterans Affairs.

You will note that our priority legislative program contains seven basic points: Compensation, Pension, Veteran Preference, GI Bill, National Cemeteries, Medical Care, and a Senate Veterans Affairs Committee, com-

parable, we hope, in its dedication and service to both the veteran and the Nation, to this great Committee.

Some of these have already been considered by the President in his message on veterans. Others, I feel certain, are being considered by the Veterans Advisory Commission.

One program which was not mentioned by the President is compensation for the service-connected disabled, and the dependents of service-connected deceased. Although increases have been granted, the Compensation Program has not kept pace with the ever-mounting costs of living in the American economy during the past decade. The V.F.W. continues its support for the proposition that this program deserves the highest priority of favorable consideration. We believe that such compensation payments should be well above government standards for other assistance programs. We believe also that payments for disability should reflect an extra measure of compensation for combat or extra-hazardous service.

We do, however, especially commend your subcommittee on compensation and pensions for the many improvements and the cost of living pension increase which it recommended, and which was approved by your full committee, and adopted last year.

Again, in keeping with your commitment to prevent disproportionate losses in pension payments because of Social Security and other income increases, your Pension Subcommittee has recommended a Bill (H.R. 12555 which will restructure the Pension Program. This Bill should provide a solution to the recurring problems created for the veteran by a few dollars increase in retirement pay. We believe this Bill represents a giant stride in the right direction.

The V.F.W. has been the leader for many years in the campaign to effect the continuation and expansion of our National Cemetery system. We vigorously opposed the policy which closed five National Cemeteries and produced the illegal restrictive regulation which now bars the burial of most veterans at Arlington.

We were happy to note that the President took the initial step essential to the reversal of this policy in his Message to Congress on January 30th, when he said:

"Every veteran who wants it—those who risked their lives at Belleau Wood, Iwo Jima, and the DMZ—should have the right to burial in a National Cemetery situated reasonably close to his home. I have asked the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to make certain that the recommendation of the Commission include proposals to assure this right. . . ."

The V.F.W. is gratefully aware, Mr. Chairman, of the important contribution you have made in this area by your willingness to assume jurisdiction of legislation dealing with National Cemeteries. It was your leadership which sparked the reversal of the closure policy, when you went before the rules committee last year and convinced them that such legislation is primarily a veterans matter within the province of your own Committee. We now look forward with abiding faith that our own mandate of a National Cemetery in every state will one day be achieved.

Veterans preference has always been a matter of paramount concern to the Veterans of Foreign Wars. It is one of the most precious rights of the returning veteran. We are happy to note that now the President has expanded that concept—which heretofore has often been frustrated by the attitudes of certain individuals in high places. Veterans who left high school to join the armed forces will be given greater assistance than ever before, provided they demonstrate a desire to improve themselves by attending school on a part-time basis under the GI Bill.

Time lost can never be regained, but the

programs approved by Congress will go a long way toward returning veterans to civilian life.

Our organization rose to challenge the closing of thirty-two V.A. facilities in 1965. Congress having shared our concern, seventeen of those facilities are still serving the veterans of this Nation.

Despite the continuing increase in the number of veterans, there nevertheless has been a reduction in the number treated on a daily basis in our V.A. hospitals. There are many reasons for this. There is one, however, with which the V.F.W. particularly takes issue. I refer to the "Economic Means Test", which is a strong deterrent to many veterans who actually need the services of these hospitals.

A year ago the Congress made provision for the use of V.A. hospitals on a beds available basis by retired military personnel. These veterans are normally in far better economic circumstances than many civilian soldier veterans, they are not required to meet the "Economic Means Test" nor should they be required to do so. However, the same principle should apply to the civilian veteran, who enjoys none of the benefits of professional military tenure. He also should be freed from the stigma and disability of this test.

We are also alarmed at the increasing evidence that medical care for veterans is not keeping pace with the high standards of university-type hospitals. The V.F.W. recognizes this committee as the guardian of the medical program for veterans, and will be happy to join with it in any suggested effort to upgrade the medical program of the Veterans Administration, including facilities, equipment, and the appropriation of adequate funds to recruit and retain essential medical personnel.

These, Mr. Chairman, and members of the Committee, are a few of our legislative goals for the current year. May I again express our sincere gratitude and deep appreciation for this opportunity to appear before you. Many of us will be visiting with you individually throughout the day.

And may we hope to return your hospitality in some small measure by playing host to each of you at our annual Congressional Banquet at the Sheraton-Park Hotel tonight. All Members of the Congress are cordially invited. The dinner will begin promptly at seven—with a somewhat more relaxing interlude commencing at six.

Thank you for your attention.

The 50th Anniversary Dinner of the Baltic-American Committee for the Independence of Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania Held in Philadelphia on March 9, 1968

HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 13, 1968

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, it was my high honor and privilege to deliver the principal address at the 50th anniversary dinner of the Baltic-American Committee held last Saturday evening, March 9, at the Sheraton Hotel in Philadelphia. The committee was also kind enough to present me with an award.

I would like to include in the RECORD, Mr. Speaker, remarks delivered by the Honorable Joseph Kajeckas, Chargé d' Affaires a.i. of Lithuania, on that occasion; the citation for the award presented to His Eminence John J. Cardinal

Krol of the Diocese of Philadelphia; a series of press releases issued by the Baltic-American Committee; a statement issued by Vice President HUBERT H. HUMPHREY for Baltic Freedom Day on June 12, 1966; a letter by Secretary of State Dean Rusk of February 8, 1968, to Mr. Joseph Kajeckas on the occasion of the 50th anniversary of Lithuania's independence, and remarks delivered by Mr. Kajeckas at wreath-laying ceremony at the Liberty Bell on behalf of all three Baltic nations.

The aforementioned material follows:

SPEECH DELIVERED BY JOSEPH KAJECKAS, CHARGÉ D'AFFAIRES A. I. OF LITHUANIA, AT A BANQUET AT THE SHERATON HOTEL, PHILADELPHIA, PA., MARCH 9, 1968, IN COMMEMORATION OF THE 50TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE DECLARATIONS OF INDEPENDENCE OF ESTONIA, LATVIA AND LITHUANIA

It is an exaggeration to say that our gathering this evening marks a milestone in the history of civilization. We gather as peoples and friends of the Baltic republics of Estonia, Latvia and Lithuania—countries which have become a paradigm of man in the twentieth century. The Baltic countries are a symbol and a challenge to all men, because their history in the twentieth century points up the undeniable fact that our era is an age of maximum danger, and an age of maximum opportunity.

That the twentieth century is an age of maximum opportunity is happily demonstrated by what the Baltic countries were able to accomplish during the first half of this century. After a hundred years and more of Russian Czarist domination, the Baltic countries in 1918 emerged from the darkest age of their history. They emerged to become the forerunners of that rage for freedom which has since characterized the struggle and the pride of both nations and individuals in this century. This century is, indeed, a century of emergent nations and emergent individuals.

The story of the Baltic states from 1918 until 1940 is a fabulous success story—a story that is well told in the short and glowing account of the late American President, Herbert Hoover. He had been involved in administering a program of relief and rehabilitation in the Baltic states at the very beginning of the period of independence. Later, he recounted his impressions of a later visit to the Baltic states in 1938:

The standard of living in the Baltic states was about as high as any standard of living in Europe. . . . The contrast with Russia was so great that Russian people were constantly attempting to escape from Russia into the Baltic states. . . . I should say that those three states had made more progress from the very low beginning they had had 19 years before, than probably had ever been made by any series of states on record.

Tragically, however, these successes of the Baltic states were to be short lived. The wanton disregard for human dignity and basic human rights which characterized the 1940 Soviet aggression in the Baltic states is indicative of the fact that our century is, besides being an age of opportunity, an age of maximum danger. The story of Stalin's Russia is only matched for systematic destruction of authentic human values by the record of Hitler's Germany.

What is specifically endangered, finally, is man himself—man beyond the collectivity to which he is pledged: man in his elemental yearning for the safeguarding of his identity, his honorable loves, his honorable achievements and commitments to value. It is a sign both of opportunity and danger that man today can almost reach the moon: his technology and his systems can be liberating

forces, but the age of cybernetics and superior machines can also be the means of diminishing man, of making him smaller than he has ever been before. It was this insight into the modern predicament that led J. Robert Oppenheimer, the well known physicist, to sound an apocalyptic warning several years ago. In an address delivered to honor the second centennial of Columbia University, he described the desperate interior frustrations and struggles of a modern scientist:

This is a world in which each of us, knowing his limitations, knowing the evils of superficiality and the terrors of fatigue, will have to cling to what is close to him, to what he knows, to what he can do, to his friends and his tradition and his love, lest he be dissolved in a universal confusion and know nothing and love nothing.

Those words of Robert Oppenheimer are ominous words, yet they are hopeful words as well. They imply that man can not only endure but prevail if he clings to basic human values, and the traditions in which such values are realized.

That is what the present predicament of the Baltic states is all about. My own country of Lithuania, for example, is possessed of an ancient heritage, an ancient language, and ancient culture. For at least two thousand years, Lithuanians have been possessed of an ethnic and geopolitical identity. The burning question now is this: shall Lithuania live, or will it die, absorbed into the amoral system of the Soviet Union? Shall the Baltic nations survive as entities of free and independent people, or will they be swallowed up by the impersonal forces of the so-called status quo?

I refuse to accept the latter alternative. Rather, I am encouraged to believe that the just cause of the Baltic states will ultimately prevail. I am especially encouraged to believe that by the fact that we are all here tonight. Our common commitment and common devotion to a just cause—the cause not only of the Baltic states but of worthy human existence—will succeed. It will succeed especially because of our hearts and our hands and our voices. It will succeed because of men such as Congressman Daniel Flood of Pennsylvania, who has always been such a true and devoted friend of the Baltic peoples. It will succeed because we are the type of men who have learned the sorrowful and hopeful lessons which this century has taught us, and because we have no illusions about the status quo. Rather, we know that our struggle is a fateful struggle for man's dignity and the chance he has to reconstruct a sensible and peaceful world. We will succeed in the spirit of Benjamin Franklin of Philadelphia, who said "We may make these times better if we bestir ourselves!"

THE BALTIC-AMERICAN COMMITTEE FOR THE INDEPENDENCE OF ESTONIA, LATVIA AND LITHUANIA

CITATION—HIS EMINENCE JOHN J. CARDINAL KROL

His Eminence John Cardinal Krol is a dedicated shepherd of his flock in the Archdiocese of Philadelphia and a shining example to all of the people regardless of creed, ancestry or race.

Since he became the Archbishop of Philadelphia in 1961 and was elevated to the position of Cardinal in 1967 his duties and obligations have been multiplying. At the present time he is the vice-president of the National Conference of American Catholic Bishops and recently received an appointment from the Vatican to the Commission to Revise the Code of Canon Law. And yet Cardinal Krol has found the time to work in the field of race relations, to labor on behalf of nationality groups, to give assistance to the downtrodden and the poor.

To the Baltic-Americans he is a constant source of inspiration in their efforts to remind the free world of the atrocities of Communism against God and man in Estonia, Latvia and Lithuania. He has recognized the needs and purpose of the national parishes realizing that each nationality's heritage enriches the American way of life. He has encouraged and supported St. Casimir's College and Seminary in Rome which prepares priests for Lithuanian parishes in the United States and for Lithuania when her full religious freedom will once again be restored. Whenever requested he has proclaimed days of prayer for the persecuted faithful of Estonia, Latvia and Lithuania.

Finally, His Eminence has blessed the work of the Baltic-American Committee and has greatly encouraged its efforts by agreeing to act as the Committee's honorary chairman.

Therefore, in sincere appreciation, this 50th Anniversary Award is being presented to His Eminence John Cardinal Krol.

PRESS RELEASE ISSUED IN PHILADELPHIA, PA., BY THE DIPLOMATIC REPRESENTATIVES IN THE UNITED STATES OF ESTONIA, LATVIA AND LITHUANIA, ON THE OCCASION OF THE COMMEMORATION IN PHILADELPHIA OF THE FIFTIETH ANNIVERSARY OF THE DECLARATIONS OF INDEPENDENCE OF ESTONIA, LATVIA AND LITHUANIA

Fifty years ago, the Baltic countries of Estonia, Latvia and Lithuania declared their independence and liberated themselves from the control of Russia.

In doing so, these three countries shook off over a hundred years of Russian Czarist domination, and assumed their rightful place among the family of free and independent nations. In the struggle for independence, the peoples of Estonia, Latvia and Lithuania were inspired and guided by the spirit which had successfully prevailed in the United States—a spirit symbolized by the Liberty Bell enshrined in Philadelphia. That spirit of self-determination had been championed by such great American leaders as Woodrow Wilson at the close of the First World War, and earlier by Abraham Lincoln.

In declaring their independence in the modern era, the three Baltic nations were fulfilling again the historical and geopolitical destinies which had, centuries before, made them instrumental factors in the shaping of modern Europe. And during the period of modern independence which began in 1918, the Baltic states achieved spectacular successes in the art of peaceful, democratic government. Those successes were a fitting tribute to the democratic spirit of the freedom-loving peoples of the Baltic nations; but these gains came to an abrupt end in the summer of 1940.

In the summer of 1940, in utter disregard of numerous solemn international treaties and agreements which guaranteed the independence and territorial sovereignty of the Baltic states, the Soviet Union occupied and enslaved Estonia, Latvia and Lithuania. The means of subjugation are now notorious—deportations, genocide, mock elections, and the degrading processes of totalitarianism. The fate of the Baltic republics has thus become a paradigm of Soviet duplicity and treachery.

But the Baltic countries have never lost their will to regain their rightful freedom and independence. The people of Estonia, Latvia and Lithuania, whether in their homelands or abroad, continue to yearn and work earnestly for the day when their countries can be free again. They are confident that the force of freedom is not a force that can be defeated.

The government and people of the United States have steadfastly supported the just aspirations of the Baltic peoples to freedom; it is therefore fitting that this fiftieth anniversary of the Declarations of Independence

of the Baltic States be commemorated with honor and pride here in Philadelphia. The Baltic peoples are certain that the spirit of devotion to freedom, as symbolized by the Liberty Bell in Philadelphia, will continue to inspire the Baltic peoples and all peoples which have been cruelly enslaved by the Soviet Union.

FLAGRANT SOVIET ATTEMPTS TO PREVENT BALTIMORE INDEPENDENCE

Some months after Lithuania, Estonia and Latvia had declared their independence, the Soviet Union openly launched attacks against the efforts of the three Baltic countries to establish their national states. As an example of the attitude of the Soviets, I might cite what *Izvestia* said on Christmas Day of 1918:

Estonia, Latvia and Lithuania are directly on the road from Russia to Western Europe and therefore are a hindrance to our revolution. This separating wall has to be destroyed. Soviet Russia must gain access to the Baltic coast and replant there the Red Flag of the proletarian revolution. Soviet troops must occupy Lithuania, Latvia and Estonia. The Baltic Sea must become a Soviet Sea.

SOVIET COMMITMENTS WHICH WERE LATER DISHONORED

The seizure of the Baltic states by the Soviet Union in 1940 can truly be called "flagrant", because rarely have small countries been protected against a large neighbor by such a wealth of solemn agreements and treaties binding under international law. For example, in the case of my own country, Lithuania, Soviet commitments to honor Lithuanian sovereignty were carefully spelled out in a peace treaty, a treaty of nonaggression, and a convention for the definition of the aggressor. The wording of these agreements left no doubt as to Soviet obligations. For example, the Peace Treaty which the Soviet Union and free Lithuania concluded in 1920 contained this wording:

Russia recognizes without any reserve the sovereignty and independence of the State of Lithuania with all juridical consequences resulting from such recognition and voluntarily and forever renounces all sovereign rights possessed by Russia over the Lithuanian people and territory.

BALTIC PROGRESS DURING THE PERIOD OF INDEPENDENCE

The progress which the Baltic countries made during the period of independence between the world wars was really phenomenal progress. Spectacular strides were made in agriculture and land reform, industry, transportation, finance, social legislation, education and cultural progress. A short and glowing account of that progress was given a few years ago by the late President Herbert Hoover. He had been involved in administering a program of relief and rehabilitation in the Baltic States at the very beginning of the period of independence. But then he recounted his impression of a later visit to the Baltic States in 1938:

Russia at that time was drastically rationing all food and clothing. They had an entirely unstable currency, if you could call it a currency at all. The Baltic States, in contrast, had a free economy. Their currency was stable, their currencies were convertible into gold, they were accepted all over the world. Their fiscal policies were all balanced, their industries were thriving; their agriculture was making an astonishing progress. The result was that the standard of living in the Baltic states was about as high as any standard of living in Europe. . . . The contrast with Russia was so great that Russian people were constantly attempting to escape from Russia into the Baltic states. The contrast was enormous and I should say that those three states had made more progress from the very low beginning they had had 19 years before, than probably had

ever been made by any series of states on record.

That was the late President Hoover's account of independent Baltic progress, and I think it is a very concise and eloquent account.

WHAT LENIN SAID ABOUT MILITARY OCCUPATION

What happened in the Baltic states in 1940 is adequately described by Nikolai Lenin himself, the founder of the Communist Russian state. He had said the following:

If a small or weak nation is not accorded the right to decide the form of its political existence by a free vote—implying the complete withdrawal of the troops of the incorporating or merely strong nation—then the incorporation is an annexation, that is, an arbitrary appropriation of a foreign country, an act of violence.

THE GROSSLY ILLEGAL CHARACTER OF THE SOVIET TAKEOVER

The Soviets frequently try to justify their military takeover of the Baltic states on the grounds that free elections were held incorporating the Baltic states into the Soviet Union. In fact, however, the type of elections which were held were typical Soviet elections, with one slate of candidates. There is a macabre but amusing incident connected with those elections. Through some Soviet oversight, a London newspaper published the official results from a Russian news agency twenty-four hours before the polls were closed. That, in a nutshell, demonstrates what kind of treachery was perpetrated in the Baltic countries.

WHAT A CONGRESSIONAL COMMITTEE SAID ABOUT THE COMMUNIST TAKEOVER

A Select Committee on Communist Aggression of the United States House of Representatives submitted a report in 1954 which contained the following conclusion about the Soviet takeover in the Baltic countries:

The evidence is overwhelming and conclusive that Estonia, Latvia and Lithuania were forcibly occupied and illegally annexed by the USSR. Any claims by the USSR that the elections conducted by them in July 1940 were free and voluntary or that the resolutions adopted by the resulting parliaments petitioning for recognition as a Soviet Republic were legal are false and without foundation in fact.

WHAT SUMNER WELLES SAID ON BEHALF OF THE UNITED STATES IN 1940

On July 23, 1940, Acting Secretary of State Sumner Welles issued a statement on behalf of the government. It read in part:

The people of the United States are opposed . . . to any form of intervention on the part of one state, however powerful, in the domestic concerns of other sovereign states, however weak. . . . The United States will continue to stand by these principles, because of the conviction of the American people that unless the doctrine in which these principles are inherent once again governs the relations between nations, the rule of reason, of justice, and of law—in other words, the basis of modern civilization itself—cannot be preserved.

STATEMENT BY VICE PRESIDENT HUBERT H. HUMPHREY, FOR BALTIMORE FREEDOM DAY, JUNE 12, 1966

Freedom and nationhood are rightly prized throughout the world. The peoples of Estonia, Latvia and Lithuania cherish—with particular fervor—the ideals of liberty and sovereignty.

On the occasion of Baltic Freedom Day, 1966, Americans of every ancestry extend greetings to our fellow citizens of Baltic descent and to their kinsmen abroad.

The U.S. Government is committed now, as in the past, to the right of self-determination of the Baltic and all other peoples.

Our Government has soundly refused either to condone or to accept the forced illegal annexation of the Baltic Nations and their territories into the Soviet Union. To the contrary, throughout the forums of the world, including the United Nations, we have repeatedly reaffirmed the right of Baltic peoples to restoration of sovereignty.

So, too, we continue to recognize the diplomatic and consular representatives of the pre-World War II Baltic Governments.

Reliable reports confirm that the Baltic peoples do continue to revere their respective national and cultural traditions. Despite alien occupation, oppression and mass deportation, the love of liberty burns strongly in Estonian, Latvian and Lithuanian hearts. We Americans deeply respect these brave peoples for their steadfast devotion to freedom. The United States re-pledges itself to the universal principles of independence, personal liberty and human dignity.

At this very time, in another part of the world, the sovereignty of another small nation—Viet Nam—is crucially at stake. Brave American fighting forces, as well as civilians, are giving their all for Vietnam's freedom. In this spirit, we re-dedicate ourselves anew to the cause of freedom everywhere.

THE SECRETARY OF STATE,
Washington, February 8, 1968.

Mr. JOSEPH KAJECKAS,
Charge d'Affaires ad interim of the Legation
of Lithuania, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. CHARGE D'AFFAIRES: On the occasion of the fiftieth anniversary of Lithuania's independence, I am very pleased to extend to you best wishes on behalf of the Government and people of the United States.

Throughout its long and proud history, the Lithuanian nation has endured with fortitude many periods of trial and alien rule. Unhappily, in our own time, Lithuania's re-establishment as an independent state was followed only twenty-two years later by its forcible incorporation into the Soviet Union. The Lithuanian people have responded to this situation through the years with unyielding courage and unfaltering hope for freedom and national independence. The firm purpose with which the Lithuanians both at home and abroad have struggled to preserve their national heritage is the best assurance of their survival as a nation.

Americans look with understanding and sympathy upon the just aspirations of the Lithuanian people to determine freely their own destiny. The United States Government, by its continued nonrecognition of the forcible incorporation of Lithuania, affirms its belief in Lithuania's right of self-determination.

Sincerely yours,

DEAN RUSK.

STATEMENT BY J. KAJECKAS AT WREATH-LAYING CEREMONY BY THE LIBERTY BELL, ON BE- HALF OF ALL THREE BALTIMORE REPRESENTATIVES

We are all very proud to participate in this ceremony at the Liberty Bell. During the happy days when my own country, Lithuania, enjoyed free and independent life in this century, the people of my country had their own Liberty Bell, a replica of this historical Bell, and on it was inscribed: "He who is not willing to fight for freedom is not worthy of its blessings." Generation after generation of my own countrymen have demonstrated heroism in fighting for freedom, and so have the peoples of Estonia and Latvia. That is the spirit that brings us all here today. We are proud of what our countries were able to accomplish during the period of independence that began for our countries in 1918, and we and all our countrymen are determined that Estonia, Latvia and Lithuania will be free again.

The New Communist Scheme for Greece

HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 13, 1968

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, as I have indicated on previous occasions, our concern with our NATO alliance compels us to objectively remain alert to developments within each of the allied nations. The increasing Soviet role in the Mediterranean emphasizes the extreme geographical importance of Greece as a free world bastion; therefore, I feel it most timely that the Greek Press of Chicago discussed in the following detailed editorial commentary on February 28, the latest Communist moves in that area.

The editorial follows:

THE NEW COMMUNIST SCHEME FOR GREECE

The international communist conspiracy finally succeeded in bringing America to a point where, deeply involved in a land war in Asia, would be lacking the strength, vigor and willingness to entangle itself in similar situations anywhere else in the world. Thus, the field remains wide open for communism to move in at will.

The test was already made and proved successful for the communists. We have only to compare two revealing incidents: the incident in the Gulf of Tonkin and the Pueblo incident.

Two American destroyers were attacked by communists in the Gulf of Tonkin and as a result we have more than half a million men fighting in Viet Nam for years.

An American ship was recently captured with its crew in North Korea. And we do not retaliate to free the men and the ship.

Communism is now free to move anywhere and is moving. The big move is witnessed today in the Mediterranean. The Soviet naval build-up is continuing at full swing. Soviet ships freely and continuously pass through the Dardanelles. Arab nations controlling the entire southern shores of the Mediterranean are welcoming the Russian fleet. Malta announced the other day that the Soviets may avail themselves at the naval facilities formerly used by the British. There is always a communist submarine base in operation in Albania and Yugoslavia provides other Adriatic bases to communism.

Two submarines—a French and an Israeli—vanished mysteriously in the Mediterranean, almost at the same time, in recent weeks and Morton A. Kaplan, University of Chicago political science professor and chairman of the University's Committee on International Relations, was reported by the Chicago press as having reasons to suspect the submarines may have been destroyed by a new and super-secret weapon the Russians are now testing. Whether it is a pure speculation or not it is beside the point. The point is that the Soviets flatly announced they are in the Mediterranean—and everywhere for that matter—to stay.

The question is: are they going to stay or are they going to spread?

As the Free World shrinks and shrinks and shrinks as a result of British withdrawals, French opposition and European unwillingness to share the burden of its defense, as America is deeper and deeper and deeper submerged in a blood-letting land war on Asiatic soil, communism moves in to fill the vacuum in the abandoned areas and neutralize the remaining.

There is not a single government in Scandinavia today willing to challenge communism. Some Scandinavian governments are already controlled by the communists and leftists have a decisive voice in the balance.

Red bombers appeared off Newfoundland recently, within 70 miles of the North American mainland, Moscow says it cannot restrain Syria who wants renewal of the hostilities with Israel, while Jordanian forces are resuming the fighting. A South Yemen people's republic was quietly created at Aden without opposition and the Sudanese airfields are now available to the Red airforce. The Malagasy republic is wooed by the Russians. The Iranian government turns to the Kremlin for arms and war is extended to Laos.

In the meantime, Russian army maneuvers in the Balkans last fall were the most extensive since the end of World War II.

Anti-American demonstrations are the order of the day in many capitals of the Free World. They were recently witnessed in countries considered as staunch allies of the U.S. such as Turkey. And they were the bread and butter of communists and so-called "center union" coalitions in Greece, before the April 21, 1967 military take-over put an end to them.

Yet, Greece is today the front line of the Soviet push. Communism is training and arming the thousands of its Greek disciples who fled the country following their total defeat in 1950 and the thousands of the Greek children who were kidnapped behind the Iron Curtain.

The mass kidnapping of these thousands of Greek children was a clear indication of the communist plans for Greece. It was a stern warning that the communists will come back to try again to take over Greece and those children will be used to this end. All information coincides that the kidnapped children are submitted to continuous and thorough training in guerilla warfare and intense indoctrination to communist ideals. In 1967, the military take-over in Greece and the smashing victory of the Israeli forces disrupted the communist time table for a complete domination in the Mediterranean. But the Soviets were quick in recovery and as long as we continue our preoccupation in Viet Nam the opportunity for a new communist try in the Mediterranean remains an irresistible temptation for the Kremlin.

The international communist conspiracy for a world domination is a basic premise of the U.S. and Free World foreign policy. To contain it we committed ourselves totally. We have no illusions that a communist move anywhere in the world may be unrelated to the general strategy of communism. Communists in Viet Nam cannot fight without Soviet arms. They can only fight as long as the Soviets want them to fight and we should have no illusion of the nature of the conflict. The Viet Nam war is a war between the U.S. and the Soviet Union in which others are fighting for the Russians. The same holds for any communist move anywhere and the picture becomes very clear when we have an answer to this simple question: What kind of a world would it be if, for any reason, the U.S. is defeated? There should be no doubt that it would be a world dominated by the Kremlin.

With this background and these thoughts in mind let us take another close look in what the communists are now trying to do in regards to Greece.

"Democracy must be restored to Greece and we have to do it now. Greeks are tortured and every political element of Greece from the King and Karamanlis to the extreme left, representing 99% of the Greek People are in accord for a united front against the Junta."

This is the new platform communism uses in its continuing effort to enslave Greece. It is a platform that may convince a lot of Americans to subscribe to the new movement. Especially the ignorants. Because those who follow the Greek political scene closely know better.

Every Greek and most of the Greek-Americans know the truth and the basic

facts. They know that the King still is the King. He receives his salary and is under the obligation under the existing Constitution to cooperate with and follow the directives of the present Government. Karamanlis and his party leaders would not join forces with the communists under any circumstances. Even George Papandreu and, certainly, every conservative element in the Center Union coalition never subscribe to the communist plan. Neither did any segment of the organized Greeks home or abroad. The platform therefore is 100% communist. It is doubtful if Andres Papandreu himself, who comes to Chicago to teach economics—as his sponsors claim—will manage to campaign politically since he seems to subscribe to the communist scheme.

Our task therefore, as Americans and Greek-Americans is very simple. We should remain vigilant. We should expose the communist conspiracy at all times. As long as the communist plans are fully understood and exposed communism has no chance to prevail in Greece.

Okolehao: Hawaii's Drink of Kings

HON. SPARK M. MATSUNAGA

OF HAWAII

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 12, 1968

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Speaker, as we shiver from the cold of a late winter snow here in the Nation's Capital, I wish to call attention to a product which evokes all the warmth and pleasure of a tropic isle—and that is, Hawaii's "drink of kings," okolehao.

This refreshing liquor, distilled from the sacred ti root, was first made in Hawaii nearly 200 years ago. Okolehao was soon adopted as the national drink of Hawaii and, in fact, there was a time when it rivaled sugar and pineapple as a trademark of the island State.

Since ancient times, the ti plant has been a symbol of peace among the Polynesian people, and it was used as a flag of truce during time of war. Early Hawaiians revered ti plants as sacred, and they are still used around Hawaiian homes to guard against evil and unhappy spirits.

It is interesting to note, also, that the coolness of fresh ti leaves is highly recommended to draw off the pains of aching foreheads, which might occur should one imbibe too heavily of beverages which do not produce the same happy results as those which come from the beverage of the ti root.

Okolehao, a compound Hawaiian language word, took its name from the shape of the large iron pots—"okole" for bottom, and "hao" for iron—in which it was originally distilled. The pots were obtained from the early whaling ships, and historians credit one William Stevenson as the first who introduced this mode of distilling during the reign of Kamehameha I.

Today, ti root okolehao is the best ever made in Hawaii—and this is due principally to the efforts of Richard K. Kimball, the able and energetic president of Ti Root Okolehao Hawaii, Inc.

Most of the ti root is harvested in Waipio Valley, where once lived the kings

of old Hawaii. After processing in the modern distillery located high in the uplands of Kona, on the island of Hawaii, the drink is then shipped to Honolulu for bottling and marketing.

Okolehao has a flavor all its own. Perhaps the most eloquent tribute paid to okolehao came from the noted author Christopher Morley who wrote:

As medicine for the four horsemen that ride mankind (Pain, Fatigue, Boredom, Foreboding) it is one of the Pacific's great gifts.

For the benefit of my colleagues who may not know about this ancient liquor with a thoroughly modern taste, I wish to make a recent article about okolehao a part of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

At the same time, I invite my colleagues to try okolehao for themselves to learn why it won a prize for Hawaii in the Paris Exposition of 1889, and why it is still regarded as the unsurpassed "spirits of aloha" among connoisseurs of fine liquor the world over.

The article, "Okolehao: Out of Limbo and Back Into Limelight," from the Tuesday, February 20, 1968, issue of the Honolulu Advertiser, follows:

OKOLEHAO: OUT OF LIMBO AND BACK INTO LIMELIGHT

There was a time when okolehao as a trademark of Hawaii rivaled sugar, pineapples and Duke Kahanamoku.

In its heyday, this product of the Islands, a liquor fermented from the root of the ti plant, won a coveted prize at the Paris Exposition of 1889.

Now it's making a comeback after years in limbo.

Last year Richard K. Kimball purchased a controlling interest in Ti Root Okolehao Inc.

Kimball is a former owner of the Halekulani Hotel.

"The Tuesday night cocktail hour was a regular feature at the hotel," he said. "I served all the usual drinks like whisky, bourbon and vodka."

"But many tourists asked me why we didn't have any Island drinks."

So Kimball began introducing okolehao at the parties.

"The result was fantastic," he said. "Everybody ignored the other drinks and stayed with okolehao all night."

Kimball bought into Ti Root Okolehao Hawaii Inc. about two years ago when it seemed the company might go under. His infusion of capital saved the firm and left him with majority ownership.

A new process to darken okolehao was discovered recently. Kimball says this has improved the flavor of the Hawaiian drink.

He also plans to market a colorless version to be known as "luau oke." It will be 20 per cent okolehao and 80 per cent cane.

Kimball advises his guests to mix okolehao with passion orange.

"That makes a smooth drink—and a real Island drink," he said.

Since ancient times the ti plant has been a symbol of peace among the Polynesian people.

It was used as a flag of truce during war time.

Ti plants, used in abundance at luaus, were and still are planted around Hawaiian homes to guard against evil and unhappy spirits.

The coolness of fresh ti leaves is highly recommended to draw off the pains of aching foreheads.

Okolehao was first made in Hawaii approximately 150 years ago.

Early writers on the Islands trace it to one Long Willie Stephenson who is supposed to

have arrived in Honolulu from Australia at the time of Kamehameha I. His nickname was "John Okolehao" because of his capacity.

Peter Corney, an eyewitness to production in Hawaii in 1818, told how the native Hawaiians pounded the baked ti roots with stone poi pounders, mixed it in a barrel or on the bottom of an old canoe, "till the mass was in a state of fermentation."

"To my mind, okolehao is the only genuine Hawaiian drink," Kimball said.

American Policy in Vietnam—Appearance of Dean Rusk

HON. LESTER L. WOLFF

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 12, 1968

Mr. WOLFF. Mr. Speaker, unconfirmed reports that the administration is planning a substantial increase in our troop commitment in Vietnam are echoing through the Congress. It is indicated that the United States is giving consideration to the deployment of an additional 200,000 to Vietnam.

I rise, Mr. Speaker, in opposition. My objection and deep concern over this matter stems from military reports that the enemy in this type of guerrilla war can successfully neutralize the impact of our escalation by adding one man for every 10 or 20 men the United States commits. Also, since any substantial increase in American forces will require many months, it would be simple for the Vietcong and the North Vietnamese to piecemeal meet our escalation.

The net effect then, of such an increase in our troop commitment, will be a continuation of the debilitating stalemate with which we are now faced. Moreover, escalation will place that stalemate at a more dangerous level. We must, therefore, reject this unsuccessful policy of "more of the same."

The North Vietnamese, despite our bombing raids and despite our defense positions along the northern and western borders of South Vietnam, have had little difficulty maintaining their troop strength. Even their losses during the recent Tet offensive have been replaced. If we raise the stakes through escalation, more troops, we must recognize that the enemy is prepared to meet any such escalation. We do not want a "numbers game" with the North Vietnamese and the administration must understand the intensity of the American people's resolve on this matter.

That resolve is: We do not want more of the same; we do want alternatives, new ideas leading to an end of this torturous struggle.

I would repeat a plan I have offered to President Johnson for deescalation of the war. Implementation of this plan will mean a major step has been taken toward a just peace, instead of another step along the road to an expanded war.

First. Recognizing that civic action leading to the establishment of economic and social viability is essential if the South Vietnamese population is to know democracy in concrete terms. I have suggested that we enlist civilian civic action

teams from other Asian nations to aid in the vital pacification program.

Second. South Vietnamese troops now unsuccessfully engaged in pacification could be released from that assignment and take a rightful role in the static positions along the DMZ and Laotian and Cambodian borders. This is basically the South Vietnamese war and the American forces have undertaken a disproportionate amount of dangerous missions.

Third. American forces should revert to securing vital high population areas and fulfilling the rightful role as an advisory and supply force. This is the role we had prior to escalation; it is our proper role. According to a poll reported in today's New York Times such a plan would have the immediate support of 69 per cent of the American population.

The quest, Mr. Speaker, is for deescalation; for a reassessment of our role in light of our responsibilities; for a review of the priorities facing the American people. The high aims of the administration and the integrity and responsibility of the American people will not be met by escalation ad infinitum.

Coral Gables High School Honor Students Visit Washington

HON. DANTE B. FASCELL

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 13, 1968

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, last month, it was my privilege to welcome to Washington an intelligent and aware group of young men and women from the Youth for Good Government and the Social Studies Honor Society of Coral Gables High School, Coral Gables, Fla. This group, unlike many others which visit Washington, came not to see the sights but to complement their classroom training with close-range observation of our Government in action.

Mr. Speaker, the cooperation of many outstanding leaders, like yourself, afforded these young people the unique educational opportunity of discussing today's issues with the actual members and officials of the legislative, executive, and judicial branches of our Federal Government.

While in Washington, the Coral Gables students had the privilege of meeting Speaker JOHN MCCORMACK, the majority whip, the gentleman from Louisiana, Congressman HALE BOGGS, and the distinguished minority leader, the gentleman from Michigan, GERALD R. FORD. In addition, the Florida group met with Secretary of Transportation Alan C. Boyd, Supreme Court Justice Byron R. White, Presidential Assistant Barefoot Sanders, Assistant Secretary of Housing and Urban Development Philip Brownstein, and Assistant Deputy Attorney General John McDonough. Other meetings were held with various officials of the State Department, the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, the Federal Bureau of Investigation, and the Voice of America.

I want to express my great appreciation to all concerned for the time taken from busy schedules to meet with this fine group of young citizens. With the benefits of such outstanding educational opportunities, these students from Coral Gables High School returned to Florida, I am certain, with a fuller understanding of what democracy is and of how their Government operates.

The following list names the chaperons and students from Coral Gables High School who visited Washington from January 29 through February 2, 1968:

CHAPERONES

Mrs. Molly Brilliant, Mr. Jack Robin, Mr. Jeffrey Rosinek, Miss Katharine Valletta.

STUDENTS

Priscilla Adams, Vicki Alexander, Marc Baskin, Susan Benjamin, Martin Bilsker, Maxine Cohen, Diana Cormier, Tracey Corwin, Randy Coverman.

Laura Gabe, Margaret Good, Gary Goodwin, Alan Greenberg, Lee Harrison, Elaine Hennis, Tamara Hoffman, Joan Horwich.

Bruce Jamison, Karen Lee Jones, Ralph Kazer, Deborah Kindler, Lynn Klein, Abby Kolber, Mark Lomaskin, Janis McKinley.

Gina Nicholas, Gary Ottenberg, Ronald Phinney, James Pickar, Richard Bruce Rosen, Karen Lee Rosendorf, Bonnie Rosenstein, Stefanie Ross.

Richard Saffir, Sherril Siegel, Eric Smith, Ronald York Stillman, Jr., Stella Stitsky, Maria Suarez, Barbara Weisglass, Scott Weiss, Carla West, Peggy Ulrich, Alan Jay Yesner, Evan Zagoria.

President Acts to Meet District's Critical Housing Needs

HON. ANDREW JACOBS, JR.

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 13, 1968

Mr. JACOBS. Mr. Speaker, President Johnson has proposed imaginative programs in his message on the District of Columbia to help meet the critical need for decent, low-cost housing in Washington.

For generations thousands of Washington families have known only substandard housing—poorly heated, poorly insulated, and rat infested.

During the Johnson years substantial progress has been made. The District has often led the Nation in pioneering housing programs. The first Turnkey project in the United States—engaging private enterprise in public housing—was built here.

The first new community constructed on surplus Federal land will be erected in the District. And Washington was selected for a model cities project to renew entire neighborhoods.

The President has now built on these successes in his message. He has pledged to end retaliatory evictions of tenants who report housing code violations, so that intimidation of residents will promptly end.

In addition, the President has developed a program to encourage nonprofit sponsors to develop low and moderate income housing for the people of the District. The District government would be empowered to advance "seed money"

for the early stages of development and a revolving fund for the program would be established—financed by unclaimed property in the District.

These programs will bring the 800,000 residents of the District closer to the day we all hope for—the day when every citizen in our Nation's Capital will have a decent place to live.

We must act boldly to bring this day closer.

Vietnam: A Christian's Conscience

HON. GEORGE E. BROWN, JR.

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 13, 1968

Mr. BROWN of California. Mr. Speaker, last November 27 and 28, the Southern California Clergy and Laymen Concerned About Vietnam sponsored informal and unofficial public hearings in Los Angeles on the Vietnam war problem. I was privileged to participate in the conducting of those hearings. In the testimony given during the 2-day session was a statement of Christian conscience by an outstanding Episcopal layman, Dr. George Gibbs, professor of economics and accounting at Claremont Men's College.

Dr. Gibbs' statement is an excellent expression of the increasing moral concern among our citizens about the Vietnam disaster. I commend the reading of this statement to my fellow Congressmen. I do not believe that any nation can long continue a policy that the people hold to be immoral without some serious consequences.

With unanimous consent I offer this statement for insertion in today's RECORD, as follows:

VIETNAM—A CHRISTIAN'S CONSCIENCE

(By George Gibbs, C.P.A., Ph. D.)

If there is one thing about American policy in Vietnam that is clear above all others, it is this: it is immoral. It is immoral by any and all standards of morality; national, international and religious.¹ Nearly all religious leaders of all faiths are in agreement on this point.² "For what is a man profited, if he shall gain the whole world, and lose his own soul?"³ One of the clearest statements has come from the National Council of Churches which urged "Taking Risks for Peace."⁴ I am proud that the Council of the Episcopal Diocese of Los Angeles, of which I am a member, specifically endorsed the stand of the National Council and so advised President Johnson last December.⁵

When American soldiers are dying on the battlefield, loyal citizens do not like to oppose their own government. But noble sacrifice does not dignify an ignoble cause. I do not defend the Communists or those who support them. But neither do I want to kill them, and I do not want our boys to be killed by them, especially not as part of an operation which violates the very precepts for which our country stands. If American soldiers are being shot, it is only because they are there, in Vietnam, 10,000 miles away from our shores, shooting at the Vietnamese. I respect the patriotism and the heroism of our men fighting in Vietnam, utilizing, as they must as long as the war continues, all of the powerful weapons of destruction the great-

est power on earth can provide them. But one must also respect the patriotism and heroism of our Vietnamese adversaries, fighting against fantastic odds and representing a country so small it could be tucked away in a corner of one of our states. What has become of the great American sense of fair play?

As a veteran of four years of World War II, I believe in defending our country.⁶ The Vietnamese we are killing are not endangering the United States. It is we who are endangering Vietnam, North or South, endangering the very existence of any kind of a Vietnam. We are making a wasteland of both the North and the South and in the process destroying an entire people, a people with a history and culture many hundreds of years older than our own. Support of a democracy is a great cause, but everyone knows there has been no real democracy in Vietnam, either South or North, and it is precisely our military policies there, our killing of those we profess to want to help, the deepening hatred resulting from our assault on one group of Vietnamese in the name of another, that is the greatest impediment to the development of democracy. Military power is not enough, it never has been, it never will be and no amount of beating a people to their knees will achieve a free society, one in which we have already inculcated a hatred and bitterness which will haunt us for generations.

The only conceivable excuse for this action of ours, which violates every Christian norm, is that our leaders think it somehow serves the national interest of the United States. I do not agree that it serves the national interest of the United States, however one defines it. Many of us so witnessed in "An Appeal to Conscience."⁷ There can be no political advantage in fighting a war which we can't win and which involves us more every day in the dangers of World War III. But even if there were a narrow political advantage, our policy in Vietnam is harmful to the real interest of the United States. The political philosophy of our country has always been based on Christian moral principles and ideals. If we abandon these, and if any sizeable segment of our people cease to believe in them, then we have lost a critical ingredient of a democratic society.

Our policy in Vietnam is making a mockery of the very moral principles and high ideals that are the fiber of America. We have brought on our heads almost universal condemnation from abroad. Increasingly our own people see the ever-widening gap between what we profess and what we do. I don't think we can "win" the war in Vietnam in any meaningful way. But even if we should be able to win it, militarily by still further escalation, we will have destroyed them and ourselves in the process. Christianity has always had to wage war against militarism. One cannot profess to believe in God whose son taught "Thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself"⁸ and also said "Love your enemies, bless them that curse you, do good to them that hate you, and pray for them which despitefully use you and persecute you."⁹ These are abiding truths which still reign long after the Hitlers of history are dead and forgotten.

More than seven hundred people in Claremont and Pomona Valley, where I live, have already joined in a "Community Council for Opposition to the War in Vietnam."¹⁰ Such groups are arising all over the nation as our citizens feel stronger tugs of conscience. They have called for immediate and unconditional cessation of our bombing in both North and South Vietnam; negotiations among all parties to the conflict; which means including the National Liberation Front, leading to a prompt cessation of hostilities; withdrawal of our forces from Vietnam; and elaboration of a new defense policy in the Pacific to avoid future Vietnams. This is a policy that would be not only

Footnotes at end of article.

morally just but also in the national interest of the United States.¹¹ "Therefore let's help stop this 'war' before any more Americans, their allies, or Vietnamese are wounded or killed whether it be by bullets, Napalm, 'A' bombs or other death dealing vehicles."¹²

The old testament writers gave us the same good advice many years ago when they wrote:

"They shall beat their swords into ploughshares, and their spears into pruninghooks: nations shall not lift up sword against nation, neither shall they learn war any more."¹³

"Lord God of Hosts, be with us yet, lest we forget, lest we forget."¹⁴

How much easier to ignore our consciences and drift with the crowd lulled to accept the inevitability of war, dissent put down with sly murmurs and lately open shouts of treason.

Are all brave men to be condemned by official yammerings for daring to raise a question as to the basic immorality engaged in by those who play a gigantic evil game of mass murder in the name of brotherhood?

With Rudyard Kipling I pray:

"For heathen heart that puts her trust
in reeking tube and iron shard,
All valiant dust that builds on dust,
And guarding, calls not thee to guard,
For frantic boast and foolish word—
Thy mercy on Thy people, Lord! Amen."¹⁵

FOOTNOTES

¹ "Vietnam: A Moral Dilemma," editorial in *Christianity Today*, January 20, 1967, p. 28.

² See Statement of Pope Paul VI, *Los Angeles Times*, December 9, 1966.

³ Bible, King James Version, Matthew XVI, 26.

⁴ *Los Angeles Times*, December 10, 1966. *Witness*, (National Episcopal magazine), December 22, 1966, p. 3. *The Episcopalian*, "More Than Social Action," February, 1967, p. 26.

⁵ Diocesan Council commended moves for peace "as a God-fearing nation" Telegram sent 12/14/66.

⁶ Lt. Comdr. USNR. Participated as Boat Group Commander in Iwo Jima and Okinawa invasions.

⁷ "An Appeal to Conscience," released 9/21/67 at the 62nd Triennial General Convention of the Episcopal Church, Seattle, Washington. Signed by many Bishops, Presbyteries and Lay persons.

⁸ Bible, King James version, Matthew XIX, 19 also XXII, 39, also in the Old Testament, Leviticus, XIX, 18, and in *The Book of Common Prayer*, p. 69.

⁹ Bible, King James version, Matthew V, 44.

¹⁰ Full page advertisements in the *Claremont Courier* and in the *Progress Bulletin* Pomona, June 11, 1967 (*Courier*, June 3, 1967), signed by more than 600 persons.

¹¹ *Los Angeles Times*, editorial "Reassessment in Vietnam," June 4, 1967 and my letter to the Editor, June 7, 1967.

¹² "Gibbs Protests War," *Claremont Collegian*, May 3, 1967, p. 3.

¹³ Bible, King James version, Isaiah II, 4 and Micah IV, 3.

¹⁴ God of our Fathers Known of Old, *The Hymnal of the Protestant Episcopal Church in the United States of America*, 1940, words by Rudyard Kipling, 1897, hymnal number 147.

More Threats of Civil Disobedience

HON. WILLIAM LLOYD SCOTT

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 13, 1968

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I note that at a press conference yesterday, accord-

ing to a news article on page B1, continued on B12, column 5, in the March 13 edition of the Washington Post, Mr. Julius W. Hobson, an employee of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, charged that the Federal Government discriminates against Negroes in its hiring and promotion and that he plans to circulate a petition to that effect among employees of Federal agencies. If Mr. Hobson had stopped at this point, there would be little criticism to be found against him. However, he is quoted in the Washington Daily News, March 13, page 16, as saying that if he gets nowhere with these tactics, he will consider civil disobedience tactics in Federal buildings. Similar statements were made by him on a TV newsbroadcast over channel 4, March 12, at 11 p.m. With remarks and threats of this kind, I find a great deal wrong. While no one in this country would deny the constitutional right to petition for a redress of grievances, no one has a constitutional right to a Government job. It seems that anyone who would advise employees of Federal agencies to interfere with the daily operation of the Government is going beyond his constitutional rights and it is something to which we should not close our eyes and ears. I certainly believe that the Government that employs Mr. Hobson should investigate his activities and that if he is found to be breaking the law, this would constitute sufficient grounds for his dismissal from Government service and possible prosecution. Therefore, I am requesting that the Attorney General, the Civil Service Commission, and the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, where Mr. Hobson is employed, make an investigation into his activities and his statement that he would consider civil disobedience tactics in Federal buildings.

The articles in the Washington Post and the Washington Daily News are included herewith:

[From the Washington (D.C.) Post,
Mar. 13, 1968]

CITY RELIGIOUS LEADERS BACK KING'S CAMPAIGN—DRIVE CALLED ALTERNATIVE TO VIOLENCE—COMMUNITY ASKED TO PROVIDE AID TO DEMONSTRATORS

(By Robert L. Asher)

A top-echelon committee of more than 55 religious and civic leaders has endorsed the Rev. Dr. Martin Luther King's plans for a Poor People's Campaign here next month, with a strong call for community sympathy and assistance.

In a resolution to be distributed to at least 10,000 members of churches and synagogues, the Interreligious Committee on Race Relations described Dr. King's move as a worthy alternative to violence in the face of persistent poverty.

The Committee's action is viewed by leaders as setting the stage for citywide efforts to make the event a peaceful and meaningful demonstration of goals sought by America's poor.

Further calls for support of Dr. King are expected from the Council of Churches, the Catholic Archdiocese and the Jewish Community Council, all of which have representatives on the influential Committee.

The group, which termed Dr. King's expressed aims "basic to any standard of human dignity," is headed by Bishop John Wesley Lord of the Washington Methodist area. Co-chairmen are Bishop Henry C. Bunton

of the Christian Methodist Episcopal Church of Washington; Rabbi Martin S. Halpern; the Most Rev. John S. Spence, auxiliary bishop of the Catholic Archdiocese of Washington, and Bishop Smallwood E. Williams of the Bible Way Church.

Isaac Frank, executive vice president of the Jewish Community Council of Greater Washington and secretary of the group, said many members plan sermons and discussions with their congregations on ways to help the poor who visit here.

Other Committee members include Philip J. Olin, administrative assistant to the Episcopal bishop of Washington; the Rev. Geno Baroni, director of the Archdiocese's Office of Urban Affairs; William Calomiris, president of the Metropolitan Washington Board of Trade; Police Insp. Vernon E. Culpepper, and the Rev. Philip Newell Jr., director of the Urban Institute of the Council of Churches.

The Rev. Walter E. Fauntroy, vice chairman of Washington's City Council and local representative of Dr. King's Southern Christian Leadership Conference, is also a member.

The Committee said it interprets Dr. King's campaign as a drive "making visible those whom our affluent society has allowed to become invisible," striving for "minimal standards of human decency" in jobs, incomes, housing, education and health care.

"We further believe," said the group, "that the American people and the Congress of the United States must quickly and resolutely bring about the accomplishment of these goals. . . ."

"Dr. King offers a clear alternative to the self-defeating violence of spontaneous revolt by a direct and deliberate nonviolent attack upon the roots of that revolt—the debilitating but hidden violence of despair."

In a separate action, the D.C. Health and Welfare Council Board voted to offer its facilities and assistance to Dr. King, including tents, eating areas, counseling and child care.

The Presbytery of Washington also was studying the Interreligious Committee's resolution for possible action.

And at a press conference yesterday, civil rights activist Julius W. Hobson said he will arrange meetings for Dr. King with heads of Government agencies to discuss problems of discrimination in Federal agencies.

Charging that the Federal Government discriminates against Negroes in hiring and promotion, Hobson said he plans to circulate a petition among employees calling for an investigation.

[From the Washington (D.C.) Daily News,
Mar. 13, 1968]

HOBSON RAPS FEDERAL HIRING—LINKS WITH KING'S CAMPAIGN

Julius Hobson, Negro activist and Federal government employee for 22 years, yesterday began what appeared to be a full-scale crusade against alleged discrimination in Federal employment.

Mr. Hobson, who successfully tackled de facto segregation with his school suit here, told a press conference that "the biggest discriminator against black people in this country is the Federal Government"—and marshaled a batch of statistics to back up his case.

The civil rights leader said he would use Dr. Martin Luther King's April "poor people's campaign" here as a focus for his attack. He said he would begin by circulating a petition among Federal employees seeking a Congressional hearing on Federal job discrimination and would set up conferences for Dr. King with Federal officials.

DISOBEDIENCE TACTICS?

If he gets nowhere with these tactics, Mr. Hobson said, he would consider civil disobedience tactics in Federal buildings, or possible court action.

Claiming that "in Federal agency after agency there has been a default of responsibility to insure equal employment opportunity," Mr. Hobson cited these statistics, among others:

Negroes comprise about 9.7 per cent of classified employees in the Federal civil service, but only 1.6 per cent of them are above the GS-11 grade.

The Civil Service Commission had 818 Negro classified employees as of June, 1966, and 6.7 per cent or 600 of those were in grades below GS-5. Some 85 per cent or 762 were in grades below GS-9 and 21 or 2.6 per cent were between GS-9 and GS-11.

In contrast, Mr. Hobson said, the commission employed 3,239 white classified employees, and more than half (1,691) were at grades nine through 18, and 733 or 42 per cent in grades 12 and above.

The Selective Service System has 51 employees above GS-11, none Negro; the Government Printing Office 92 above GS-11, none Negro; and the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation 726 above GS-8, none Negro.

Mr. Hobson, who is employed as a statistician-economist with the Social Security Administration, declined to give his own grade, but said he hadn't had a promotion in six years, "and it will be a cold day in June when I get one."

Joint Statement on Vietnam

HON. THOMAS M. REES

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 13, 1968

Mr. REES. Mr. Speaker, recently I joined with 17 of my colleagues in proposing what we believe could be meaningful basic guidelines for a negotiated settlement of the Vietnam conflict.

The statement which we authored does not address itself to the question of the best means to initiate negotiations, although we believe it would be a long step toward this goal if the United States were to give greater emphasis to our declarations about self-determination by making explicit the kind of honorable and just settlement we would accept consistent with our aims. Our policies should take into account the differing positions of North Vietnamese and National Liberation Front and should give our adversaries reason to believe that their basic interests would be acknowledged in a settlement.

My own position is that there can never be negotiations as long as we are bombing North Vietnam. The policy of bombing in the north has been tried and has failed to accomplish its objectives of significantly reducing the infiltration of men and supplies into the south and of bringing the Hanoi government to the negotiating table, while it has increased the risk of catastrophic involvement with Communist China and the Soviet Union, including the possibility of nuclear war.

The time has come for the United States to halt the bombing of North Vietnam. We should first pull our troops into defensible positions, so as not to endanger them unduly, and then stop the

bombing unilaterally and unconditionally. We should next launch a massive peace offensive, enlisting the aid of those world leaders who have advocated the bombing pause, so as to bring Hanoi, the NLF, and the Government of South Vietnam to the conference table.

With this personal preamble, I wish to introduce the statement which I and my colleagues put forth as a possible basis for negotiating the end of this tragic conflict:

Vietnam: JOINT STATEMENT, MARCH 4, 1968

The undersigned Members of the House of Representatives are deeply disturbed by the present course of events in Vietnam. We are convinced that the conflict cannot be ended in the near future by military means. At the same time, we oppose unilateral withdrawal or any action inconsistent with U.S. national interests.

While the undersigned hold different opinions as to the best method of achieving a solution to the conflict, we are agreed that more imaginative and intensive efforts should now be made to get negotiations started and that the passage of time, with steadily mounting casualties on both sides, will only make less likely a solution by negotiated settlement.

President Johnson has on many occasions stated that among our objectives is true self-determination for the South Vietnamese.

We believe a long step forward would be taken if the U.S. were to give greater emphasis to our declarations about self-determination by making explicit the kind of honorable and just settlement that we would accept consistent with our aims. We have never done this. We have only kept repeating a kind of first position, which would give the NLF no role whatever in South Vietnam and therefore could not possibly be within the negotiable area for them. It seems obvious that some bold and imaginative new moves are called for.

Therefore, we have undertaken to set forth below seven points which in our view could be put forward by the U.S. government as consistent with announced U.S. objectives, which could command world-wide approval, and ought to be acceptable to Hanoi and the NLF.

In our view these basic principles for a peaceful settlement in Vietnam would include the following:

(1) The people of South Vietnam, including the NLF, should be given the opportunity to determine their own political future through free and fair elections in which all parties would be free to participate.

(2) For a period preceding such elections, a general cease-fire, supervised by an appropriate international body, banning military operations and terrorist acts, would have to be in effect and be effective. During this period, mutually acceptable interim governmental arrangements (both in areas previously controlled by Saigon and in areas previously controlled by the Viet Cong) must be provided.

(3) Overall supervision of the arrangements for the elections, including campaigning, and of the conduct of the elections would have to be provided by a mutually acceptable body. Probably, this body would be of an international character, but it might instead be a Vietnamese Joint Commission or a combination of the two. The elections would have to be free from any external interference or internal terrorism.

(4) To the extent necessary to comply with the foregoing, the 1967 Constitution would have to be modified, or perhaps replaced, pursuant to agreed procedures.

(5) Subsequent to these elections, all foreign troops would be gradually withdrawn from South Vietnam on a mutually agreed, reciprocal and phased basis which would assure no possible advantage to one side over the other.

(6) International guarantees and arrangements should be provided to assure that the results of the elections not be overturned by renewed outside interference or by a coup of the right or the left.

(7) The question of future relations between North and South Vietnam, including the possibility of reunification, would be left for future discussion and negotiation, primarily between the government of North Vietnam and the new government of South Vietnam.

Obviously, there will be many difficult questions to be resolved concerning the application of these principles and the method and timing of putting them into effect.

Within the scope of each principle, there would be various alternatives. For example, the elections referred to could be for a constituent assembly to draw up a new constitution, or for the election of a new government under the 1967 Constitution appropriately modified, or conceivably on some sort of referendum. (Constitutional safeguards to prevent undue control by a monolithic minority, as well as to protect minority rights, would have to be devised and accepted, perhaps through some form of proportional representation in the elected government.)

As another example, the international body which it is expected would be needed to supervise the cease-fire and the pre-elections arrangements and the elections themselves might be (a) the U.N. (which has had much experience in supervising elections), (b) a beefed-up International Control Commission, or (c) a new body created by agreement for the purpose.

One of the most difficult problems would be the establishment of mutually acceptable interim governmental arrangements during the pre-election and election period. The NLF and Hanoi would be highly skeptical of any arrangements which would leave the Saigon government in all the key positions of power; similarly Saigon (and the U.S.) would be properly unwilling to accept voting results from Viet Cong controlled areas if the V.C. had remained in effective control. One approach to the problem might be through a form of international trusteeship, comparable to the United Nations administration of West New Guinea during the period after the departure of the Dutch and before Indonesia assumed control.

Another exceedingly difficult problem would be to devise the nature of the international guarantees to prevent frustration of the will of the electorate by violence.

But these are all matters that could be worked out at the negotiating table, if the parties concerned, including the present government of South Vietnam, Hanoi and the NLF and other Vietnamese groups involved, had agreed on the basic principles we have set forth.

JONATHAN B. BINGHAM, New York; JOHN A. BLATNIK, Minnesota; EDWARD P. BOLAND, Massachusetts; LEONARD FARBSTEIN, New York; DONALD M. FRASER, Minnesota; FLOYD V. HICKS, Washington; ANDREW JACOBS, Jr., Indiana; JOSEPH E. KARTH, Minnesota; ROBERT W. KASTENMEIER, Wisconsin; ROBERT L. LEGGETT, California; JOHN E. MOSS, California; THOMAS P. O'NEILL, Jr., Massachusetts; RICHARD L. OTTINGER, New York; THOMAS M. REES, California; HENRY S. REUSS, Wisconsin; JAMES H. SCHEUER, New York; HERBERT TENZER, New York; SIDNEY R. YATES, Illinois.